

**FINANCIAL CONSTRAINT AND THE
NEED TO CONCEPTUALIZE**

BRIAN D. MERTZ

B. A., University of Alberta, 1972

A One-Credit Project
Submitted to the Faculty of Education
of The University of Lethbridge
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF EDUCATION

LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA

December, 1991

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This paper identifies and discusses some of the perceptions of faculty and administration in a post-secondary educational institution that faces severe financial shortfalls in its operational budget.

There was a general consensus among those interviewed on the issue of accountability. It was felt that government funded institutions such as colleges have a duty of accounting to the citizens for the funds that have been expended. As the amount of money governments have available diminishes, the need for ensuring that services are both necessary and efficiently offered will escalate.

Related to the issue of financial accountability is concern for the presence of well founded and clearly stated goals and objectives. Without exception, those interviewed for this paper questioned whether politicians and senior government administrators have articulated where they believe the advanced education system in Alberta is headed. Concern was expressed that goals and objectives must be set on a provincial level before local priorities can be established in any meaningful way.

Faculty members interviewed felt strongly that College administrators needed to do more lobbying of officials and

politicians associated with the Department of Advanced Education. It was suggested that increased funding might not be available, but should program re-allocation or re-alignment occur on a provincial level, the local institution needed to be well represented. There may be a role for local instructional staff to play in assisting with the development of closer relations with respective government departments.

Once the goals, objectives, and overall system for delivery of post secondary education have been clarified at the provincial level, the College should undertake the establishment of local priorities. There was considerable concern for the development of an objective rating system which when applied to instructional programs would determine their effectiveness, efficiency and, in turn, their importance in the overall offerings of the institution. Some fear was expressed that where faculty were shown that their program was ranked poorly they may respond in negative ways. There was, however, more support for the notion that faculty in programs which might be threatened would in fact be motivated to seek improved ways of operating. They would more likely work to enhance their program's rating in the institution. In cases where programs of instruction simply did not comply with institutional priorities and where elimination of the instructional area was imminent, at least staff affected would be sufficiently forewarned that they might be able to make plans to relocate in a more controlled manner.

In order to facilitate these new approaches to the management of the College, several of those interviewed stressed the need for a "new professionalism". Both administration and faculty were called upon to become more objective and less self serving in their decision making.

The true test of this professionalism might first be encountered in the forthcoming budget preparations where severe cutbacks appear to be necessary. A number of faculty identified specific areas of program and support service which they feel should be cut back. Administrators seemed more concerned with trying to preserve the status quo. They wished to employ strategies that would ensure instructional efficiencies and at least short term fiscal savings through promoting cost saving policies such as early retirement.

The overall message of the paper is one which calls for shared leadership. In order to cope successfully in difficult financial times, administration and faculty will need to work openly, honestly, and cooperatively with each other to ensure only needed services are provided, at a scale that is warranted, and with as much efficiency as possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
A BRIEF HISTORY	2
STATEMENT OF MISSION AND MANDATE	6
A NEED FOR ACCOUNTABILITY	7
DO WE KNOW WHERE WE ARE GOING?	12
THE GOVERNMENT LOBBY	16
INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES	18
PROFESSIONALISM	22
INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM RATING SYSTEMS	30
FISCAL MANAGEMENT	34
CONCLUDING STATEMENT	45
REFERENCES	46
APPENDICES	49

1. Statement of Mission and Mandate

Introduction

This paper examines some of the realities of a post secondary education institution as it adjusts its operations in an attempt to cope with difficult financial times.

The primary method of gathering information to form the foundation of the report was through individual personal interviews with ten members of the faculty and administration employed by the institution. Those interviewed were selected because of their anticipated concern with the financial situation and the author's perception that they were active, informed participants. The questions evolved as interviews were conducted in accordance with new information learned and the perspective of those being interviewed. At the commencement of each interview the purpose and nature of the project was explained and a release form was signed by each individual agreeing to participate. All interviews were audio taped resulting in a total of 107 pages of typed manuscript. These data were then reviewed for themes which subsequently formed the basis for this report. Direct quotes are used throughout to illustrate major points with contributor anonymity being preserved through the assignment of fictitious names.

No attempt is made herein to suggest that this work is free from bias or objective in nature. This paper is an attempt to expose some of the perceptions and fears offered by employees attempting to

make sense out of a difficult situation. The reader must judge whether these perceptions are well founded or not.

A Brief History

This historical overview is provided at the outset for the benefit of those who are unaware of the history of the college movement in Alberta. The information presented shows the highly developed nature of the college movement in the province.

The development of colleges in Alberta has been subjected to a number of strong influences, primarily the church, universities, and the Provincial Government. The college movement in Alberta commenced with the establishment of Mount Royal College in Calgary by the Methodist Church in 1910. Instruction was in high school courses primarily, with selected other subject areas such as business and music.

Camrose Lutheran College (now Augustana University College), established later in 1910, was and still is owned and operated by the Lutheran Church. Subsequently it affiliated with the University of Alberta and obtained status as a junior college in 1959. Numerous other denominational colleges were established in Alberta, many of which continue to operate today.

Agricultural and vocational colleges were also established during the same period. Between 1913 and 1951, seven colleges were

created including Olds, Vermilion, and Fairview. They are still in operation today and true to their founding purposes are offering practical and "scientific" farming courses as well as home economics and a variety of career and general interest courses.

The Southern Alberta Institute of Technology in Calgary originated in 1916, while the Northern Alberta Institute of Technology in Edmonton wasn't created until 1962. The most recent technological institute, Westerra, was opened in 1983 in Stony Plain.

In the earlier portion of our province's development, the higher educational scene, with the exception of the universities, was dominated by denominational, agricultural, and technical institutions. The public junior college movement commenced in Lethbridge with the chairman of the public school board, Gilbert Paterson, initiating a promotional campaign which took ten years to become recognized by the province. Paterson encountered the college concept in California and was convinced this was the answer to providing university education locally. He clearly envisioned an institution which would have its beginnings in the offering of the first two years of university training then growing into a degree granting four year institution.

Ultimately, Paterson's vision was realized, but in a form he had not anticipated. The Lethbridge Junior College was established in 1957 and offered a variety of first year university transfer courses which met with great success. Technical, business, and general interest

courses were then added to the list of available offerings. Subsequently, second year university level transfer courses were offered but the transfer program was removed in 1967 when the University of Lethbridge was established on a different site within the City of Lethbridge.

Subsequent to the creation of Lethbridge Junior College, four other colleges were established, similar to the Lethbridge College model. They were: Red Deer, Medicine Hat, Grande Prairie, and Grant MacEwan in Edmonton. Conflict between the colleges and universities was present since their creation and continues today. During the 1960's the role of the college was seen to be one of offering first and second year university level courses in order to take the access pressure off the universities, and to take university education to the smaller centers, closer to the student's home. The Committee on Higher Education in Alberta clearly pointed out however, that: "While the extension of junior colleges may remove some of the enrollment pressures of the university, this should not be regarded as the major function of such colleges.... The main function of the junior college is to make higher education more readily available to the people of Alberta so that the total number of students enrolled in post-high school institutions will be greater than if junior colleges were not in existence." (Small, 1972, p. 111)

In 1965, Dr. Andrew Stewart was commissioned to once again conduct a review of the relationship of colleges and universities. He reported that: "The primary purpose must be to extend post-school

education opportunities to young people who, having completed the programs of the schools, do not, either by choice or by failure to meet the required conditions, go on to university. The main purpose is to provide a valid alternative to university for these young people. It will be necessary to articulate the programs in the schools and the programs in the [colleges] to provide progressive educational experiences." (Stewart, as quoted by Farquhar, 1967)

During the sixties, Lethbridge Community College continued to focus on career training and general interest courses. In the seventies, the College continued to expand, adding new career programs as well as college preparatory courses (upgrading). The 1980's saw L.C.C. expand from its campus in Lethbridge to more than a dozen sites throughout Southern Alberta. "By the end of the decade, 37 career programs, six apprenticeship areas, and courses in 26 other program areas were available...credit courses had grown to 5,600 annually with another 12,700 adults served annually through 27,500 non-credit course registrations." (L.C.C., 1991, p. 2)

Currently, the College recognizes a diverse mandate offering courses ranging in nature from recreational, through high school upgrading, to trades, technologies, and careers based education. It serves Southern Alberta directly and also helps satisfy some of the educational needs of the remainder of Alberta, the other two prairie provinces, and British Columbia.

The history of L.C.C. and the other post secondary educational institutions of Alberta is an interesting one indeed. It has included conflict, rapid expansion, and role ambiguity since its inception. The discussion which follows shows these problems have yet to be resolved.

Statement of Mission and Mandate

The overall direction in which an institution is heading is generally reflected in its mission and mandate statements. The College's mission outlined in the most recent planning document, the "Institutional Development Plan" states: "The mission of Lethbridge Community College is to meet educational needs of adults throughout their lives by providing excellent learning opportunities through high quality programs and services." (L.C.C. 1991, p. 7)

The document goes on to clarify this very general statement by suggesting that the College's mandate includes:

- offering programs and courses leading to career entry and career advancement as a principal focus
- complementing career courses by offering "preparatory upgrading, general interest courses, and public service activities"
- serving learners of all ages, socio-economic, educational and ethnic backgrounds
- servicing the educational needs of students and employers on a regional, national, and international basis
- public accountability for all funds spent

-maintaining cooperative relationships with business and industry, including financial and educational partnerships (L.C.C. 1991, p. 7)

The College's mission statement is too general to provide anything but the broadest idea of what the College is about. The above selection of points, edited out of the official College "Statement of Mandate", serves to clarify the mission statement and reflects the overall direction the College feels it should be heading. The mandate suggests that the College should be providing career training and facilitating those who do not qualify for entry directly into those career training programs with upgrading so that they at some future date might be able to qualify for a certificate or diploma level career training program. University transferability and degree granting are not mentioned. College direction is discussed further in a subsequent section of this report. A complete copy of the mandate statement can be found in the appendices of this paper.

A Need For Accountability

The advanced educational institutions of Alberta have enjoyed many years of prosperity. Revenues from the provinces' rich natural resources have provided vast amounts of funding for capital as well as operational growth in our colleges and universities. We have been in a mode where money has rarely been an obstacle and, not surprisingly, we have come to adopt an overall strategy centered upon growth and development.

Currently, indications are that we have reached the end of this period in our history. Revenues from oil and gas, farming and forestry (to name only a few) have declined remarkably in the last five years. In the past few years, deficit funding on the part of government and the cutting of obvious excesses within the advanced education system have been all that was necessary to cushion our programs and services from the weakening financial reality. The economic turn around we were all looking for, and hopeful of, has not come. What has materialized instead is the reality of diminished financial support for nearly all government services, including advanced education and accordingly, Lethbridge Community College.

In the history of advanced education in Alberta, we have never faced a dilemma as disruptive to our institutional, professional, and personal plans and aspirations. Our tradition has always been one of expansion, growth, and development. Our approach appears to be in need of change. We will need to adjust to a new way of looking at our situation. There is likely no more growth money. In fact, there is a strong possibility of less money being available in our budgets from year to year. This is a particularly threatening vision when one considers that even to maintain the existing level of service increased amounts of funding are required due to the effects of inflation and other cost increases which are of a contractual nature. The current estimate for L.C.C. is that an annual budget increase in the order of 1.5 million dollars is required to just maintain current programs and services.

In times of financial restraint we hear calls for accountability on an ever increasing scale. These are times when all of us need to make an accounting of how we spend public money. Questions like: "Are we using our funds wisely?" and "What are our priorities?" have to be addressed. Publicly funded institutions must take some initiative in this process of self examination. We must be sure that the tax money we are using to operate our advanced educational institutions is being spent wisely. That is, that we are funding according to the citizens' priorities and that we are spending the public purse as the majority of citizens would have us spend it.

The main issue we face today in colleges and universities is not lessening financial resources. The depleting financial resource of the province is a reality, not an issue. What this reality has done, however, is to cast light upon the real issues which include a long list of management topics. The funding shortfall has simply caused us to take a closer look at what we (and others) are doing and ask why!

For the purposes of this paper, management and/or leadership at L.C.C. is seen to have become a responsibility shared by all in the institution. Each of us in the advanced education system has a role to play, a responsibility to each other and the system in an overall sense. In the past, rather than confront problem areas, we, at all levels, have chosen the easier route of looking the other way or "throwing more money on the problem" in hopes that it would go

away or at least become less noticeable. Because of the reality of shrinking financial resources, we are being forced to re-examine some of those neglected problem areas. We are being called upon to deal with these circumstances whether we like it or not, yet this is not necessarily a negative situation. If people were less inclined to adopt: "this new way of doing business" and offered resistance, then they may very well experience negative consequences personally. Taken in the overall context, however, the actions that need to be taken now might be necessary, and from some individuals' perspectives, long overdue.

One contributor to this paper likened this financial situation to an opportunity. She suggested: "I don't see financial restraint and the kinds of things that financial restraint is driving as negative. I think that with proper leadership and proper management practices put in place the post secondary institutions generally will end up being much better." (Smith) Some might question this notion of "being much better", but it will be questioned from the "old" perspective. The point here is that bigger is not always best. We have likely been trying to be bigger for so long that it will be a major re-education of our management, workers, and clientele to accept that an operation which is modest in scale yet effective and efficient might in fact be truly "better".

Some have accepted the reality that: "we are in for some tough times" and that: "we are past the point of saving everybody." (Jones) That is to say that the financial circumstances we find ourselves in

today will in fact remain difficult, or worsen, and that all of the employee positions which were created during the affluent economic times cannot be maintained during these times of economic recession. Jones, quoted above, is a manager at Lethbridge Community College who has accepted that some employees will be lost as we are forced to re-assess what we do and to compensate for reduced financial resources.

One L.C.C. faculty member interviewed for this paper suggested: "...government has a right to demand some outcomes for the dollars it is providing to public institutions. The citizens have a right to demand that from government, not only at our College, but across government services in general. There will need to be an accounting for how the money is being spent. Rationalizing why a program exists and what it actually does accomplish will be asked in a much more detailed and serious manner." (Brown) As Brown suggests we will need to begin asking more and better questions to determine if the services we are providing are actually accomplishing what they have been established to do. We will need to examine all services provided by the College, both internal and external, to identify if they are necessary, efficiently provided, and at the most appropriate scale.

Do We Know Where We Are Going?

Accountability is an excellent concept but it's like promoting efficiency without a discussion of effectiveness. It is fine to be doing things right but how do we know if we are doing the right things? "There has to be a letting go of the idea that each institution is independent and self-governing. They exist as a system of advanced education and advanced education needs to be more accountable. University courses with four or five students in them...do we need that kind of thing...can we afford that?" (Brown)

There are two key points that Brown makes in her statements as quoted above. She touches on the notion of outcomes and accomplishments. Her suggestion is that government and ultimately the public has a right to demand certain specific and identifiable results for the expenditure of provincial financial resources. It follows therefore that we need an efficient system of education. But this is predicated on the notion that we know what we are doing or in fact the direction we are heading. What direction is Lethbridge Community College pursuing? It seems this question has been dealt with in the official mandate and institutional plan document, however, whether the College community as a whole has accepted this overall direction is questionable. Is the College really intended to offer courses to Albertans outside of the southern region? And more difficult yet to answer is the question of whether the College should be serving the educational needs of residents of British Columbia, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, not to mention Americans

and those beyond the Continent. Educating these out of province students is clearly at the expense of Albertans. This practice has been included in the newly drafted College mandate statement, but it has not been officially sanctioned by the provincial government through the Department of Advanced Education.

The second major point submitted earlier by Brown deals with the notion that a system of advanced education exists in Alberta. There is no such system. No specific system serves to integrate the offerings of each individual institution on an overall provincial basis at the present time. It seems unlikely that a college could ever formulate a mandate statement to in turn clarify the College's mission statement, without first knowing the educational plan for Alberta from the provincial Department of Advanced Education.

Lethbridge Community College has developed a series of planning documents and strategies over the years essentially without direction from the provincial government. Now that funds are in short supply, the province is showing greater interest in what each advanced education institution in Alberta is doing. Each institution has submitted an "Institutional Development Plan". Advanced Education is now reviewing each of these documents in an attempt either to rationalize what exists or, perhaps, to attempt some change and re-alignment. Reactions to the process have been mixed. Some, who have enjoyed the free reign approach taken by the province in the past, resent this "interference". Others fear that empires, perhaps constructed largely on the basis of personal self

interest, might now come under scrutiny and face re-defined priorities. Still others view what is happening as long overdue and can accept that a thorough reassessment is desirable.

One difficulty in this latest planning approach becomes apparent at the outset. The name of the planning exercise was Institutional "Development" Plan. Once again, our traditional notions of growth cause the imaginations of some to see dollar signs. The instructions that were given to program heads and faculty in soliciting information for the document were in fact requests to identify growth areas. This approach places everyone in a difficult situation. Should one accept one's own perceptions about the failing economy and abstain from submitting a grand wish list that will likely not materialize. In doing so, any opportunity for growth in the future might be lost. Conversely, should one dare to dream great visions only to find that your dream did not coincide with the dreamers who are in charge of the Provincial Treasury. In such a case your dreams are likely dashed anyway. Mixed sentiments such as these served to bias the document at an early stage of development.

How can an institution such as the College be expected to formulate a ten year plan without the guidance afforded through general principles and priorities from Advanced Education? How can a division or a specific program, internal to the College, be asked to formulate a long range strategy without knowing the rules of the game at the institutional level? Planning from the grass roots upwards is a fine concept, providing that what the grass roots come

up with will be accepted by those at the higher and more powerful levels of the organization. This, of course, is not the case in the advanced education "system". Elected officials at the provincial level have some notions on where advanced education in Alberta is headed in the future, as do senior provincial bureaucrats. This is evidenced by occasional news announcements and directives to College administration. But they have not as yet consolidated their beliefs and communicated these in a comprehensive fashion to the institutions themselves. It is for this reason that their priorities or "rules of the game" must be clearly decided upon and communicated at the outset, not at the completion of the planning event.

Consider the effect on the institution's plan if, after all is completed locally, the Deputy Minister of Advanced Education, for example, were to suggest that training programs will operate exclusively for Albertans. The effects would be devastating to certain programs. What if the Department of Advanced Education ruled that uniqueness would be the highest priority? That is, there will only be one campus designated to train each career area, (diploma or degree notwithstanding). Recreation might be taught exclusively at the U. of A., Engineering the U. of C., Nursing the U. of L. and Business Administration at L.C.C.. This might in fact be a reasonable principle to establish but rules of this magnitude must be in place at the outset or at least early in the planning exercise. Once clear and complete guidelines which will touch all institutions have been established, the individual institutions can create similar kinds of guidelines at the local level. Subsequently, divisions and

programs can establish their plans in a fashion that is in line with these overriding parameters. It is only in this fashion that a comprehensive and coherent sequence of meaningful objectives can be established to guide advanced education from the classroom level to that of the political forum.

Having said this, it must be acknowledged that such a procedure isn't easy to bring into reality. In my interview of College staff, Wilson said it best with his comment that: "We are not prepared to allow governments to tell us what to do, yet we bash governments because they won't tell us what to do. We want them to tell S.A.I.T. [Southern Alberta Institute of Technology] what to do, but we don't want them to tell L.C.C. what to do. They are trying to get us to narrow our mandate so they can have an overall view of what each of us is trying to do to meet the needs of Albertans into the next decade. They have a much better picture than we have but we are not prepared to let them do that. We will have to go political if the Deputy wants things that are not in the best interests of our College".

The Government Lobby

Several of those interviewed for this paper suggested the College senior officials have not done enough to lobby governments in the past. There was a suggestion that excessive time and energy was spent "fussing" about local institutional details to the detriment of items of larger importance which needed to be discussed in the

political arena. The nature of the government lobby required today might be changing from that which used to occur. Previously, governments were lobbied for money. There is an indication that instead of lobbying for increased budgets today, we should be pursuing our fair share of program realignment, should it occur. The lobby of today involves negotiating policy matters, the nature of which would be to the advantage of L.C.C.. For instance, if there is to be only one of a particular training program in Alberta, and L.C.C. is currently offering the same type of training, officials should lobby to have it located in Lethbridge.

Administration must keep in mind that the College is very diverse in its range of program offerings. One or two persons cannot maintain the necessary level of communications with all branches of government that is required for effective negotiation. The involvement of Deans, Chairpeople, Coordinators, and Instructors themselves will be absolutely necessary if the channels of communication between government and the College are to be maintained effectively. This will not happen by chance. Senior administration must take the initiative to encourage this type of communication and follow through with travel funds, the necessary release time, and direction to faculty and administration to actively pursue such relationships with officials in Advanced Education.

Institutional Priorities

I believe that we have established that clear direction must be provided throughout all levels of the advanced education system in Alberta. One important issue that falls directly out of this matter is the fixing of institutional priorities. The current President of L.C.C. has repeatedly stated that those who will be affected by a decision will have the opportunity to have input into that decision making process. A system for ensuring that this is in fact the case needs to be put in place. It is easy to make statements such as this but, as sincere as the intention might be, it is difficult to bring the intent of the message into reality.

It does no one any good to have input into a decision just days or weeks before the effects of that decision become a reality. The intent of the President's statement must surely be that where a program or faculty member is threatened, enough notice of this situation will be given to allow for the adjustment of the program to better conform to the needs of the institution. If a specific program or position is targeted as being in trouble it would seem reasonable that at least a one and, preferably, a two year period of grace be given to allow for the adjustment. During this period of time many different possibilities might present themselves. The faculty involved might see opportunities to change the program to become more efficient, and more effective, or they might even accept that the decision to terminate is valid and unavoidable and at

least be allowed a reasonable period of grace to find other employment or properly wind down the program.

Wilson suggested that: "If we can't afford to run a program the way it's running, we need to ask what do you think we can do differently...not to affect the quality of the program and to continue to meet the demands of industry?" Saunders suggested: "If I am seen as lowest man on the priority ranking and could be negatively effected, I'm going to be motivated. Uncertainty breeds negativeness. If I were low man on the totem pole, I can work to correct the impression if I think its incorrect, or I can accept that my position is terminal and that I have a year or so to get out. I can be applying for jobs and maybe the institution can even help me get out. Most people would rather know what is happening ahead of time because rumours get started so quickly." Wilson was supportive of this sentiment. He said: "You have got to let people know far enough in advance that their job is in danger...that they can start to look and we can start to help as an institution. We need to proactively write letters to other Colleges. We can help to shield the pain a little."

Collingwood put it this way: "We have been operating under a rather crude butcher's model. We don't show that we have a longer range budget, financial projection or model. We need a system that shows, for example, if we keep going the way we are, that we might only have enough money for two more years of X program. Come the fall of 19.. whatever, we will have to discontinue your program. But if you know that, you have the opportunity to influence the future.

Having people participate in shaping the future is better than scrambling around. This might be similar to the grieving process. The frustration and anger will occur, then, some form of acceptance of the notion that change is going to occur."

There was a suggestion, however, that not all who are threatened will respond in the manner described above. Smith felt that: "...this isn't always what happens. Some people start into the old entrenching and back biting and all of the other kinds of things that go on when people get scared. Everybody responds differently." While this position is actually supportive of letting people know where they stand early, it accepts that perhaps not a lot can be done to alter their status. Smith went further to say that: "You are dealing with people on an adult to adult basis. It's saying I want to be helpful to you but ignoring it or you not knowing, isn't going to help."

The other side of this priority ranking scheme was brought out by Saunders in his comment: "If I am seen as being high in the College priority ranking it increases my motivation. You want to continue bettering your position. It works both ways. If I see you are in the top five priorities, I'm going to ask you what you did to get there. If I'm in the bottom, I'm going to look at finding out what I'm doing wrong."

Having examined this issue of open priorities at some length, it is important to stress that even in spite of individuals' good intentions

and hard work to elevate their status in the rankings, there may be nothing that can be done to save their position nor, perhaps, their program. Shortage of funds is an over shadowing reality that might not be able to be reconciled in every case. There might be an actual shortage of money to operate all of the programs we would like to even if they are efficient, effective and in demand. This was made clear in the interviews through comments like: "We are past the point of saving everybody" (Jones) and "I see nothing that indicates we will be able to continue to operate in a manner similar to what we have in the past". (Wilson)

This is a harsh reality that casts a grey cloud over the feelings of optimism that we all must strive to maintain. It is a difficult thing to be creative and innovative while looking over your shoulder to see if your job has been eliminated. "I suspect the instructor's biggest fear is job security. That's where we have to involve them to help them realize that change does not mean they haven't got a job. If they sense there is negativism they can't buy in. It is human nature not to accept something that is going to hurt you. So we have to find ways of presenting this as a challenge, something that can be exciting, an opportunity that we can go forward with." (Wilson)

This fear of change is something administrators at the College will need to be especially sensitive to. People do react to change in different ways. Some will respond as to a challenge, some will rebel, some will pull back and withdraw from the situation. These negative reactions will be especially difficult to deal with during

times when economic pressures compound the need for optimism, forward thinking and motivation. "There will always be people that are going to resist change. We need to tell our new staff coming on that you are going to teach and promote the College...to be an advocate of it. Administration and faculty alike need to recognize and give positive reinforcement to people who are contributing." (Saunders) "Some people accept change and challenge, some are early adaptors and some are blockers. It is very difficult to involve them. We have to work with them to help them feel comfortable enough to become involved and solve problems. They need to buy in. We can help with that by giving them open and honest information. The programs that are healthy and thriving will be those whose faculty are professional and in touch with the trends and can go with the flow. The ones at risk...." (Wilson)

Professionalism

In the interviews conducted of both faculty and administration I found considerable suggestion that both faculty and administrators needed to become more professional and objective in their decision making. "In the past instructors were given the impression that we should carve out our little piece of the pie and teach and you would not have to worry about anything else. That's an old dead attitude. We are going to have to worry about it or we won't have jobs. In one way it's more work, but if you don't change that attitude you won't have a job. It's tough doing things you have never done before but we

are capable of doing these things." (Saunders) "We're trained to teach and the dollars were someone else's responsibility." (Blythe)

As priority setting comes closer to affecting an individual personally, it becomes increasingly difficult to make objective decisions. To put the institution's best interests before yours requires a special kind of person and perhaps after a point it is unrealistic to expect this to happen. Blythe admitted to this when she said: "...we made a list of priorities for departments which included several things that we felt were important. Each division then rated the list from one to whatever. It was done by people in the division and there was a lot of self interest. I was part of the process and I know I had some self interest. I wanted to get a reasonable list but my number one objective was to maintain our program. I was not completely honest from my point of view." A similar perspective suggests: "We could be more pro-active. I can be more responsive at my level. I can identify inefficiencies in my area and do something about it. There are other ways of doing things that might be more cost effective. There are elements in our College where there is very little ... questioning of the way and the why they do things. The way things are set up and the way we do things have gotten a lot of people employed. And we have come to accept this: 'It's always been this way...'. I think individual instructors question the way they teach a particular course, but there is a lot of lip service given to things like program evaluation. Many go through the process but don't take any ownership. If they don't want to make

changes they don't. Many times it is seen as a meaningless task that has no rewards or impact." (West)

The above passage exposes a dimension of faculty conduct that needs to be addressed. We, of course, must not make the mistake of generalizing any single concern across all faculty members. Some, however, have been allowed to become very "comfortable in the job. It has become difficult to get them to look closely and critically at their situation." (West) Faculty must be encouraged to take the initiative to move ahead. This requires management's recognition and support. "I don't think we are living in an era where the academic administration can cause faculty to be motivated or revitalized. Faculty are competent and are driven by their own self motivation towards professional ideals. Our admin people need to recognize and respect that. If faculty are being viewed as a group which has to be controlled, then I think that is the wrong view. Faculty must let the past go and produce some ideas. Administration must treat these ideas responsibly even if they don't fit the notions of administration to the letter, that is, even if they don't think of them first." (Collingwood)

A well thought out system of institutional evaluation that is linked to individual evaluation is needed. We must begin to hold individuals, at all organizational levels, more accountable for what their area has actually contributed towards institutional goals and objectives. "We need institutional effectiveness types of evaluation rather than some of the things we have done in the past. Faculty and

support staff evaluation have to be integrated into where we are going as an institution. Once the big picture of where the institution is heading is in place, individual evaluation falls out of that. We have never really stated what the hell we wanted to do and so everyone was going off and doing what they wanted." (Smith)

The idea that professionalism will need to become a more visible quality of faculty has implications for the operation of the faculty professional association. "There will be major implications for collective agreements. We've got to find a new way of doing business. We won't be successful if we get into tighter and tighter union type contracts with work to rule kinds of things and everything black and white. We have got to have some room to move. (Wilson) "Take for example the faculty code of ethics. They will develop one, but it won't be easy. How can faculty develop a system of monitoring teacher performance. Have we got the guts to do that? All of this rests upon the notion that we cease viewing the faculty association as a union and view them primarily as an association which has the professional interests of faculty members at heart. One of which is compensation and fair treatment, other elements include competent instruction, quality instruction, pride in leadership..." (Collingwood)

The College administration needs to recognize and support those within the faculty association who feel this approach is more appropriate for the nineties than that of the union methods. In order for an association of this nature to emerge, administration must

ensure the faculty member is fairly treated in terms of wages and in the event that termination of positions is necessary. It is clear that an adversarial approach is not appropriate for the association, but it must be recognized that it is equally inappropriate for administration. It is clear that management and faculty must join forces and work together in harmony to meet the challenges that we face. "Faculty have to be part of helping us to solve the problem. I would like to think we are all heading in the same direction." (Wilson) "There may have been more of a feudal system set up here than we might see elsewhere. People were operating with a certain amount of independence. If the model changes in order to respond to the government's new demands for control and input, it makes it more necessary to speak with a common institutional voice. It takes a certain amount of jockeying around in an institution to learn how to do that, to decide that someone in the institution can be the spokesperson for all. I don't think we have been accustomed to that. Management has to become more professional in their approach. We need to see a more sophisticated type of leadership. A participatory type of leadership. Identifying some targets in the future and showing how those targets can be achieved. Being able to demonstrate results. When things get talked about then nothing happens, cynicism results. Administration must begin doing things to enable faculty to become more successful." (Collingwood)

"I think the faculty has to politic more with government. We expect the College to get the money but we need to be more politically active and become advocates. The attitude of the faculty as to what

they perceive their role is has to change. We are not only educators now we are advocates. Administration has also to cooperate and put more emphasis on defining the kind of role they expect us to play." (Saunders) "The faculty association should not be hassling me as an administrator for making tough decisions. If we are going to survive as an institution some jobs will have to go. If we are going to be dynamic as an institution we have got to refine our offerings." (Jones)

This is a tough position offered by Jones, yet one that has been echoed in a variety of fashions throughout this paper. There will be changes, there will be cut backs, some employees will lose their jobs. It becomes obvious and vital for faculty. And, accordingly, for the faculty association to put their collective energies into helping to shape the future that the College is going to take. If faculty begin digging in their heels, they will simply force administration to dig in their heels. In any contest of this nature, the worker is bound to lose. It has become clear that it is inevitable that some jobs are going to be lost. What is not clear is how many jobs might be saved through innovative thinking, up front professional honesty, and faculty/management teamwork.

The management group at L.C.C. is relatively new for the most part. This presents both advantages and disadvantages. There was a great deal of distrust between the previous administration and faculty. Some of the negative feelings associated with previous administrators might be carried over to the new regime. Each time a

management error is made, faculty will feel a tendency to associate the new with those who have gone before, and may be tempted to reach hasty and often negative conclusions. A manager in these tough economic times faces great challenges indeed. There is a necessity to make tough decisions, (many of them tougher than have ever needed to be made before at this College), while at the same time enlisting the support of those whose livelihoods are affected by those very changes.

"The manager that does this will need to be able to facilitate people. They will need to be able to manage in such a way that the people will be able to take ownership of the outcomes. You have to be very visionary. The people who will be impacted have to have the opportunity to have input. This will be different from the old days. It will get worse from now on, at least for the foreseeable future. Senior management has made some tough decisions and we have all had to live with that. There have been some problems in the facilitation and in everybody feeling good about the decisions but we will just have to live with that. They need to come up with a strategy now that allows tough decisions to be made, but allows people to understand it. They will need some help doing that."(Logan)

Likely, the answer to this concern lies in the process which is undertaken and ultimately in the instrument that is employed to allow for faculty input and understanding. The problems associated with people working together are not new to this or any other institution. What we have now, that might have been missing in

prior years is a sense of urgency or perhaps a sense of reality: that something is indeed going to happen.

A system must be created that allows for input from those who wish to pursue this institutional direction in a positive way. There are some who were not satisfied that the system allowed for their early influence of the budgeting process as it was undertaken in 1990. There was a feeling that something went wrong, that the opportunity for ongoing input, throughout the process, right to the bitter end, was in fact not provided for by the system in place. "[Requests for input] are handled differently depending on each person in the management group. The way I interpret it, is that I take it back to my management staff. We discuss it so I can take their ideas back. Now that doesn't happen in all cases. In some areas people don't know what is going on. Part of the job we as management have to do is to help other people find mechanisms so that people do have an opportunity for input." (Smith)

"Communication within the institution was poor. The method of communicating they chose, like more newsletters, is not going to improve communications. Administrators must be available, sharing information, and getting open feedback and input from the ground floor upwards. Tomorrow we are going for a coffee session with the President. We don't get enough of those types of opportunities. It's an attitude between faculty and administration that needs to be worked on as much as the need for more staff. That was the old way of solving a problem: throw more money on it. We are being asked to

play the game, but we don't know the rules and they seem to be writing the rules as they go along." (Saunders) Comments like this are well intended. Some individuals in administration appear sincere in their desire to achieve open communication but the system itself may not be able to accommodate that kind of communication for all. To further confound the situation: "Some faculty either don't want to have input or don't have the time to have input, or they have been so turned off by the process in the past that they think it's futile. Or a combination of all three." (Smith)

Instructional Program Rating Systems

Several of those interviewed for this paper have raised the need for more effective institutional communication and have identified that innovative thinking might be the only way some programs and services might be maintained. It is clear that there needs to be a system which serves to outline the College priorities for all to see and react to. Such a system must serve to translate the established objectives and "rules of the game" of the provincial government and College administration into something that faculty can interact with. "We need more contact, sharing time with administration. We need to see some of the new ideas actually being implemented. We need to be told what direction the College is heading so when we put effort into a new idea or suggested project that is in line with priorities that it will be implemented." (Saunders) To facilitate this an instrument needs to be developed that objectively rates a variety of key components of the Colleges' programs in relation to

the overall goals of the institution. We need to be able to examine this rating system to determine areas of perceived strength and weakness of each program. We can use this information in varying ways. We can tell, for instance, if there is a particular weakness in a program, how faculty might work to improve that particular area. We can also be informed of misperceptions. If a program is rated low in any give area yet the perception of faculty is to the contrary, there should be an opportunity to deal with the issue and, if possible, to provide the clarifying information. Faculty can tell from the overall rankings where their program might fall in the institutional priorities. As previously noted, it is important to know if a program is highly regarded or in fact at risk. Without such as system it is impossible for an instructor to know a program's position within the institution and, therefore, whether the faculty member should be making minor modifications or sweeping changes, or making personal preparations to relocate.

Such a system is not altogether foreign to L.C.C.. There is a method of rating and ranking currently in place which might serve as the foundation for this enhanced system. The system as it exists now is felt to be inadequate in terms of criteria as well as accuracy of data. "We didn't like [the previous Vice President Academic's] format a couple of years ago, but that was basically because it was not legitimized within the system, it didn't allow for trends, and it didn't allow the institution to force accountability..." (Jones) There is now a need to re-examine and refine this system in order to present a critique of our programs both internally and to

government. Part of the process of accountability is close examination of what we are doing according to established and accepted criteria. "There will be examinations of the quality of our programs against other like programs in the province. We have not had to defend our programs against anyone else's, we have only had to rationalize that we needed one. The notions of quality, standards, and similarity will affect us. We will be pressed to show that we convert applicants into graduates. We will have to be accountable. What's the cost per graduate? Are taxpayers getting value for the dollar spent?" (Collingwood) "We have got to look at all of the programs we've got. I suspect there are programs where we put out 80 to 100 grads a year and none of them get a job in a related career. We need to look at what we are calling a job. Does part time and seasonal really count? Are we training a lot of people in this country for the sake of training? If people aren't getting jobs then we need to change what we are teaching." (Wright) "We treat seasonal employment the same as full time and that's garbage!" (Blythe) "In some areas there are plenty of jobs, but the wages are like four fifty an hour and you can't call that earning a living." (Wright) "We need to try to maintain things in some cases even though there may be a temporary down swing. Sometimes we react too quickly. Rather than chopping something, it might be better to put it on hold. We can then bring it back if the trends indicate the need." (Saunders)

There will be a large variation in opinion as to which criteria should legitimately make up a ranking system that could effectively

legitimize programs. In interviews conducted for this paper several criteria were suggested as important by one interviewee and in a subsequent interview were attacked as being invalid. For example, the issue of uniqueness of program offerings solicits varying responses. "Five years ago the Department could have cared less if we were running a course the same as Fairview and Olds, but today they are looking at dollars and are saying we need to rationalize this stuff and see what each institution can do." (Smith) "As far as I'm concerned, that's bull shit. Just because something is unique does not make it any more valuable. It's only unique because there are not enough students for it to be in every college in Alberta."(Blythe)

These perceptions are likely based largely upon how the criteria in question will affect the individual's own program. One thing is for certain, if we are going to use these types of factors as criteria for maintaining or discontinuing programs, we need to allow for open, honest discussion of the validity of each factor prior to its adoption into the instrument. Establishing this system might not be a pleasant task. However, it is absolutely essential. We must create a meaningful and reliable system for examining our services that is open for all to see and work with. "The need to provide good information about one's operation will become increasingly important. In the past management and staff developed their own information system and used that for decision making or sending reports off to government. Instructional staff, closer to the action, developed their own information systems. Both of these sets of information systems were highly intuitive and fairly subjective.

Likely if we had a system that was understood by all of the staff it would be able to generate information that would help assess if we were getting what we were paying for. As we start to share this information it will result in less paranoia and better quality decision making." (Collingwood)

Fiscal Management

The subject of how we manage our money on an institutional basis requires close examination. Funds are in short supply at the present time and some of the fundamental ways of operating need to be looked at carefully. Some of these have already been discussed in this paper and nothing further needs to be said about them except in the context of allowing adequate time for their refinement and implementation. Changing the way faculty, support staff, and administration approach their jobs requires time for adjustment. The question is: how do we buy that time? The projected financial shortfall for the College in 1991/92 is roughly 1.5 million dollars. According to Donna Allen, the current President, every department has already been subject to close financial scrutiny and cut backs. How can we approach these broader issues rationally while simultaneously experiencing the strangulation of further budget cuts?

It is quite probable that we can expect some fairly massive cuts at the same time we are trying to re-align our programs and services

in accordance with the new priorities. It was the sentiment of those interviewed that we are beyond the point where programs and services can endure the generic type of cutback where everyone gives up the same amount, say 10% of their budget. Some programs and services have been cut to the bone, while others remain with quite ample funding. Those who were fortunate enough to have a larger financial cushion at the outset of budget cuts are in a more favorable financial position than those who didn't start with much or who, perhaps, cut their budgets more willingly. This section of the paper will attempt to relate some of the perceptions of where cutting might continue to occur, without greatly affecting the quality of service the College is able to offer.

Early retirement and natural attrition will provide some cushioning of our financial position over the next few years. The College has acknowledged that it has what is termed a greying work force. That is, there is a significant number of faculty as well as support staff who are of an age where retirement is being contemplated. Early retirement at fifty-five to sixty years of age seems to be increasingly commonplace and may well prove attractive to a number of the Colleges' employees. When individuals who have been with the organization for a number of years retire they are normally replaced by younger, less experienced individuals at a lower salary. The College of course saves money, at least in the short run, in the process. Early retirement cash incentives are not uncommon in this regard and can serve to hasten the decision to leave the institution. These can be made available to anyone interested, or can be directed

more towards areas of the operation which are perceived to be over staffed or less essential in nature. Such an approach may well save money in the short term and also allow time for those larger changes to be implemented that will be indicative of the College's new way of doing business.

Natural attrition, in a like manner, can serve to reduce costs in at least the short run and might allow for close examination of the need for certain positions. When someone resigns from a position, it is possible that some of the duties of that position can be eliminated and that others currently on staff can absorb the remaining functions on a permanent basis. It is relatively easy to change position descriptions or abolish positions when they are vacant as compared to when they are occupied by an individual whose abilities, training, and emotions must be taken into account.

Becoming revenue conscious is another piece of the solution that can be implemented over the long term but, at the same time, might be easily included in our more immediate operations. Each department and program within the College could be asked to determine where revenues could be generated in their respective operations. This might be in the form of charging more for services already rendered, or perhaps charging what a service is perceived to be worth instead of on the basis of its actual cost. Such an approach might also have the benefit of reducing waste and curbing abuse of services which are free or inexpensive at the present time.

It seems strange that we who are in an economy founded upon the principle of free enterprise should be having to suggest that we must **begin** to start thinking about merchandising what we do. It is true, however, that our institutions are operated in a "socialist" manner. This is likely due to the notion that we don't want to exclude anyone from the opportunity of an education for financial reasons. It is perhaps also true, that in the past the ready availability of government funding has caused us to forget the need for and desire to generate money where the opportunity presents itself.

As an example of innovative capitalistic thinking, Saunders suggested that we: "...should be spending Alberta tax dollars on Albertans first. We can sell education to those outside the province and country. We need to make money. We are losing jobs to under developed countries and are told we must develop and sell technology as a primary source of income in the future. So it follows that we should sell education to people other than Albertans. Out of country students are capable of paying, usually they are children of very wealthy families. If we buy a product from another country, we pay for it. We need the money now at home and we should therefore be selling education as a product we have to offer." Wilson expressed similar sentiments in his comment: "There seems to be a perception that we should have out of province students. What is out of province? Out of country? What about foreign student fees? We have never talked about this, but if foreign students go back to their country, we are robbed of them in

our labour market. What about the free trade policy? We are a global economy and we cannot ignore what is happening in other countries and how that is impacting on us. They predict third world status for the U.S.A., these are very scary times and we have got to get on top of it. Maybe we can sell our education. If we don't do something we are going to be in trouble. We have got to look at where we can make a change. Instead of looking at other people to solve our problems we have got to start to work on them ourselves."

The L.C.C. Foundation, as a fundraising body needs to be given increased attention. As budgets continue to fall short of required levels, it becomes more and more commonplace to see organizations taking a more serious and organized approach to fundraising. Wilson suggested that: "we don't give the Foundation a lot of credit. We might have to put more into it to get more back in the way of endowments. The U. of C. is embarking on a 40 million dollar campaign that isn't earmarked for any one particular thing, but the interest off of the fund will be used for various capital projects."

Should the situation be such that these and other related fund raising efforts be unsuccessful, or at least generate less funds than are required to operate in the short range, the College must again commence the unpleasant task of cutting back. In reference to that subject, I will re-state some of the more pointed comments that were made to me in interviews because of the severity of the situation we may be facing and the perception of respondents that

there is an urgent need to address issues in an open and more honest fashion.

The programs or services identified here are obviously not the only ones in need of examination. All academic programs are and will continue to be scrutinized through the performance rating instrument discussed earlier, as well as through annual budget review procedures. It must also be clearly stated that the perceptions given here might very well be inaccurate; that is to say, what are offered here are only perceptions. They may be false. They may be based upon inaccurate information and they are certainly based upon the bias of those who were interviewed. Again, those who did contribute were faculty and administration only.

"In the past, budget cuts have been almost equal between administration and academic programs. This I see as a problem. I know if you cut administrative services, that it creates a bigger workload for faculty, yet I don't think that this is something that faculty can not handle. Administration seems to look at their budgets incrementally at opposed to zero based and there is a big difference. We can't possibly justify all of these administrative services as essential." (Blythe) Saunders suggested: "We are not going to be getting more money and we are going to have to be more accountable. There are areas in the past that were 'cream', and we got a lot of positive things from them. But these middle and upper management things where there have been increases have nothing to do with the actual educational mandate of the College. It seems like

students and instruction are second place over the running of the institution itself. The priorities really need to be looked at carefully and shifted. Areas like personnel, research, finance, support staff, secretarial, that sort of thing...there is a lot that could be eliminated or cut back. There needs to be more streamlining." "We have made some moves in the last year to realign programs to cut back on administrative costs, but we need to look a little closer at the administrative services we provide. I think we have the deluxe right now. The cadillac of operations. A LOT of support! There have been some things happen in other provinces that we can look at and learn from. They do not have the same kinds of support services that we do. The academic side of the institution is very important. To me, we should be allowing that part of the operation to be the cadillac of operations as long as we can. Keeping that in mind, do we really need grounds as beautiful as we have? I think we could look at some cost savings in how we approach the outside of our institution. Our security has to be deluxe. You can't park outside for one minute without getting a ticket. To me, that's not so critical. I don't think we need so much security at night either. Let's get people comfortable with coming here, not pissed off because they got a parking ticket. Janitorial is excellent, maybe too good. There are things that can be done in the library which would save cost yet not affect service in a significant way. If its affecting the student we have to be careful, but let's be realistic about it. If a student is going to be expected to perform in the classroom, he is going to do what is necessary to get the information he needs. We have it pretty good as administrators. We

enjoy excellent support services. The kind that we need to provide excellent service to the student. I don't think there is a better computer service anywhere, I don't know how it could get any better. I think we could get along without it, or at least with a lot less. We can cut down on the amount of paper we use and become far more efficient. If we cut out some printing we could save money. If people are not willing to identify areas where cuts can be made internal to their area, they are going to be looking around and wondering which one of my peers is not going to be here next week, because that is the only other option." (Logan) "This is an incredible campus. It starts outside when you drive in and when you hit the front door. It is meticulously clean, and well maintained, but how long will we be able to do that? We will have to take some serious looks at these things. Can we afford to pay A.U.P.E. salaries for maintenance and cafeteria staff. We are way above what is happening in the marketplace." (Wilson) "When you come from industry and look at the paper work that has to be done here, it gets a little aggravating. Look at the bureaucracy of it. It takes three months to do some things that could be done in a week. Even simple things like purchasing and they won't listen to suggestions aimed at making it simpler." (Wright)

"The College has done some [unwise] things, like for example hiring people at the Ph.D level to do service work. Curriculum development is fine, but it's the faculty member who does it! The question is: in times of restraint, is that position really needed? The question is, what kinds of services should we be continuing to provide? The

decision has to be one based on relevance to the student. Decisions have to be realistic and student centered. Some of the decisions made have been administration centered, not student centered. That's a problem in this place. Budgets have been prepared and argued from the view of trying to maintain positions. I know that's a concern but you can't approach it that way. For example, student services. You have to decide on the services that are of absolute importance to the student and do a good job of those. If it's not, it should go. Student services of all types are important, but if it comes to a decision between students and student services, as far as I'm concerned there's no question at all. There should be minimum support...minimum. You can't be everything to all students." (Blythe)

I am sure if it were possible to interview everyone at the College, it would only be a question of time before every academic program, administrative service, and support function was identified as being suspect. It is apparent, however, that administrative operations from the Board of Governors, through senior administration, to support services and ancillaries need to be examined in a new light. There are undoubtedly areas where service could be cut back or eliminated. These areas will not be volunteered as financial targets by those who work within them. An objective and thorough review needs to be conducted of all areas with swift and decisive action to follow. This is where the operational funds of the College can be generated to cope with the next few years while adjustment is being made to the new role the institution will play in the future. These will be permanent cuts. Services, once recognized as highly

desirable, if not necessary, may be found, in reality, to be quite expendable when measured against the basic task the College is intended to perform. Support services can and should be reduced. Faculty can and should do more to compensate for these changes and must be held accountable for their response or lack of it.

Academic programs are not to be overlooked in this discussion of what is essential and where inefficiencies lie. Earlier, I made reference to a system for evaluating the overall viability of academic programs based upon such factors as applicants, employment after graduation, capital and operational costs and so on. We have yet to give more than cursory mention to the idea that faculty can become more efficient in what they do. Increasingly, factors such as student numbers in the classroom and the level of instructor qualification necessary will have to be scrutinized.

But what seems to be missing from this drive for efficiency is equity. We find, upon closer examination, that some instructors are teaching classes of forty to sixty students while sections of other comparable courses are being taught to twenty and twenty-five students. This has major implications to the student as well as the instructor. The standard teaching load is eighteen hours of lecture per week. What is not apparently acknowledged is the nature of the course or courses being taught.

There is strong sentiment to suggest that an "instructional hour" may not necessarily be an instructional hour. There is a difference

between teaching six different subjects in six courses and teaching one subject six times. There is also a significant difference between the marking involved in an English writing course, for example, and a course where the examinations are all multiple choice and graded by machine. There are situations where two instructors share an office, and one is barely able to cope with the workload, while the other reads a novel between classes. It would be grossly unfair to ask instructors who teach eighteen hours per week of mixed subjects with essay assignments and exams to teach more hours. It may be equally unfair not to require those who teach small classes or who teach the same material over and over and who utilize machine scored exams not to teach more.

The above examples reflect inefficiencies within the academic system that must be dealt with. As well, they relate to the larger question of equity. Equal and fair treatment must become a priority of the institution as never before. It is perilously easy to make cutbacks or moves to create efficiency in one area while overlooking another. If an instructor who is already coping with a full assignment is asked to do more, he or she must be able to believe that all others are pulling their fair share of the load as well. There is no such perception in the institution at the present time. In fact there is considerable sentiment to the contrary. "I'll be damned if I'm going to cut deeper when there are faculty in the [name of building] that are teaching small classes and getting full credit for their labs.... Administration found out in budget discussions that some were and some were not.... There will be a lot more questions

asked of certain divisions in the future. There is not consistency."
(Jones)

Concluding Statement

There are some difficult and painful times ahead as the we try to cope with the changing financial reality. The College will survive. The question is: in what form? At the start of this paper, I suggested that the concept of management and/or leadership at L.C.C. must come to be seen as a responsibility shared by all who work in the institution. Employees at every level must be alert to better ways of doing things and accept the challenge of improving service while at the same time reducing net costs. I hope I have been able to adequately describe the challenge that faces us and to show how necessary the approach I propose is for the institution to ensure not only survival, but to create an ongoing service which is valued. We must work towards creating an educational service which is efficient as well as effective in responding to the needs of its clientele, however they might ultimately be defined.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous contributors have been assigned the following fictitious names which bear no resemblance to their genuine identity. References to the gender of contributors throughout the document have been randomly assigned to further protect the identity. Smith, Jones, Weston, Brown, Saunders, Collingwood, Blythe, West, Logan, Wright.
2. Bazik, M. (1984) Non-Credit Education's Response to the Challenges of the 80's Palos Hills, Illinois: Moraine Valley Community College (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 243505)
3. Budig, G. and Rives, S. (1973) Academic Quicksand Lincoln, Nebraska. Professional Educators Publications, Inc.
4. California State Postsecondary Education Commission (1981) The Challenges Ahead: Issues in Planning for California Postsecondary Education Sacramento, California: California Postsecondary Education Commission (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 213335)
5. California State Postsecondary Education Commission (1979) Post Commission Final Draft: Recommendations of Interest to Commission Sacramento, California: California Postsecondary Education Commission (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 222138)
6. Farquhar, H. (1967) The Role of the College in the System of Higher Education in Alberta Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Alberta
7. Lethbridge Community College (1991) Institutional Development Plan Lethbridge, Alberta: Lethbridge Community College

8. Macomb County Community College (1990) The Top Ten Issues Facing America's Community Colleges Macomb, Georgia: Macomb County Community College Institute for Future Studies (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 317234)
9. Myers, H. (1983) Critical Research Issues in Postsecondary Education in the 1980's Harrisonburg, Virginia: James Madison University (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 242252)
10. The Regents' Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education in New York State (1984) Critical Issues in Postsecondary Education in New York State Albany, New York: New York State Education Department (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 258327)
11. Rossman, J. (1979) Personal Changes: Issues in Postsecondary Education Washington, D.C.: Johnson and Associates Inc. (Eric Document Reproduction Services No. ED 227798)
12. Roueche, J. Baker, G. and Rose, R. The Community College President as Transformational Leader. AACJC Journal. April/May 1988 p. 48 - 52
13. Small, J. (1972) College Coordination in Alberta: System Development and Appraisal: Michigan State University
14. Vaughan, G. (1988) The Community College Mission. AACJC Journal Feb/Mar 1988 P. 25 - 27

APPENDICES

Statement of Mission

The mission of Lethbridge Community College is to meet educational needs of adults throughout their lives by providing excellent learning opportunities through high quality programs and services.

Statement of Mandate

Lethbridge Community College is a public, board governed, comprehensive community college serving the career education and training needs of students and employers from southern Alberta and beyond. As the oldest Canadian community college, it fulfils a community expectation to complement career development training by responding to personal and community development needs through an extensive offering of general interest courses and public service outreach activities.

Lethbridge Community College's principal focus is to offer programs and courses leading to career entry and career advancement. To this end, the College offers a diversity of certificate and diploma programs in the areas of business, agriculture, human services and health sciences, environmental science, engineering and industrial technologies, and apprenticeship training for the trades of carpentry, electrician, motor mechanics, heavy duty mechanics, partsman, and welding. These career development programs are complemented by preparatory upgrading courses which enable under-prepared learners to enter and complete career-related programs. In addition, credit courses are offered to supplement options available to certificate and diploma students and to facilitate access to college for learners undecided as to a career choice. An array of non-credit courses are provided in areas of interest to southern Albertans.

Lethbridge Community College serves adult learners of all ages and from a variety of socio-economic and educational backgrounds, reflecting the diversity of southern Alberta's multi-cultural and multi-ethnic heritage. Services are provided to address the career and personal development needs of this heterogeneous group, in such areas as assessment, counselling, placement, and health services, as well as a learning resources centre and developmental learning centre.

Lethbridge Community College serves a "community" much broader than the City of Lethbridge. The College is the southern Alberta centre for distance education and provides distance education across western Canada. Further, the College provides services to the regional, national, and international community through such initiatives as conferences, consultations and research.

Lethbridge Community College is accountable to all publics for funds spent and results achieved. The College develops and maintains cooperative relationships with business and industry, including financial and educational partnerships designed to address the needs of the business community, the agriculture community, and the region.