

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

William R. Mucklow for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in Education presented on August 8, 1989.

Title: The Canadian Two-Year College Foundation:
Characteristics of Success

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy

Dr. Robert Rice

This study investigated the relationship between various demographic, structural, organizational, and operational factors and the success of nonprofit foundations affiliated with two-year technical and community colleges in Canada. Three aspects were specifically examined: (1) a descriptive analysis of the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada; (2) Pearson product-moment correlations to determine relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable of success; and (3) stepwise multiple regression analysis designed to create an equation for the prediction of foundation success.

A survey of all public, two-year technical and community colleges in Canada was completed. Of the 143 institutions surveyed, 126 responded (88%) and 45 reported having a nonprofit foundation. Of the 45, 35 usable

surveys were incorporated into the SPSS* computer package for the statistical analyses used in this study.

A profile of the responding two-year technical and community colleges in Canada (88%) indicates that 28% of these institutions are associated with an affiliated, nonprofit foundation. The majority of these foundations are relatively new with 80% having been established within the last six years. The primary location of two-year college foundations was in the Provinces of Alberta (31%), British Columbia (26%), and Ontario (26%). The main type of revenue received was cash (80%) from local business or industry (43%). The calculation of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients identified Demographic Variables as the group most closely related to the dependent criterion of success. Stepwise multiple regression analysis determined that (1) Staff and Faculty Involvement in the Foundation; (2) the Age of the Foundation; and (3) the Size of the Foundation Board were significant factors in establishing the best predictive equation for success.

It is suggested that two-year technical and community colleges in Canada that do not presently have an affiliated foundation actively investigate the potential of creating such a program. It is recommended that institutions considering developing a new foundation or evaluating an existing foundation examine the demographic variables that were determined as significant in this study.

THE CANADIAN TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FOUNDATION:
CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESS

by

William R. Mucklow

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed August 8, 1989

Commencement June 1990

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Assistant Professor of Education in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Chair of Department of Postsecondary Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of College of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented August 8, 1989

Printed by William R. Mucklow

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to the following:

Mrs. Helen Mucklow, my late mother, who always encouraged me to achieve excellence and believed in the pursuance of further education.

Mr. John Henry Mucklow, my father, who unknowingly prepared me well for the challenges and rigors of one's lifetime.

Ishbel, my lovely wife and very special friend, who has endured the many trials and tribulations associated with this endeavor and has been a tireless proof reader.

Liam, my only son, who now has his Dad back for doing all the fun things we have talked about.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The reality of this thesis would not have been possible without the help of many people. I am indebted to my major professor, Dr. Robert Rice, for his guidance, most valuable time, and professional support. He was always available and became a friend who constantly demonstrates the human element of education. Dr. Tom Grigsby provided a most secure and experiential influence for this study. His insight into the preparation of the thesis was very useful and greatly appreciated. Also, I am obliged to Dr. Kathleen Heath, Dr. Jon Root and Dr. Thurston Doler for their professional critiques and contributions throughout the various stages of this thesis.

A special thank-you and appreciation is extended to Dr. Terry Flannigan, Vice President/Executive Director of the Grant MacEwan Community College Foundation. Dr. Flannigan is not only a great friend, but an outstanding individual within postsecondary education in Canada. His understanding, knowledge and direction have been of great value in the preparation of this thesis.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Rationale for the Study	3
	Statement of the Problem	9
	Statement of the Purpose	11
	Limitations	12
	Delimitations	13
	Definition of Terms	14
	Summary and Organization of the Study	14
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	16
	Introduction	16
	The Evolution of the Community College	17
	The Establishment of Higher Education in Canada	21
	The Evolution of the Canadian Community College	23
	The Community College Movement in Canada	24
	Community College Issues	30
	The Nonprofit Foundation as a Financial Solution	36
	The Nonprofit Foundation in the Two-Year College	38
III.	DESIGN OF THE STUDY	44
	Research Design	45
	Statistical Analysis	45
	Population	47
	Methods and Procedures of Data Collection	48
	Dependent Variable: Success	50
	Independent Variables	51
	Independent Variables: Demographic	51
	Independent Variables: Structural	51
	Independent Variables: Operational	52
	Independent Variables: Organizational	53
	Hypotheses	53
	Independent Variables: Demographic	54
	Independent Variables: Structural	55
	Independent Variables: Operational	56
	Independent Variables: Organizational	58
	Summary	58

IV.	PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS	60
	Descriptive Analysis	60
	Geographical Profile	60
	Demographic Profile	65
	Structural Profile	68
	Operational Profile	72
	Organizational Profile	77
	Assets and Expenditures Profile	79
	Correlational Analysis	82
	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation	82
	Multiple Regression Analysis	86
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	90
	Summary	90
	Selected Findings	92
	Conclusions	103
	Recommendations for Action	106
	Recommendations for Further Research	107
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	110
	APPENDICES	116
	APPENDIX A: Example of the English Explanatory Letter	116
	APPENDIX B: Example of the French Explanatory Letter	117
	APPENDIX C: Letter of Support for the Study	118
	APPENDIX D: English Survey Instrument	119
	APPENDIX E: French Survey Instrument	127

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Questionnaire Response Rate	61
2. Distribution of Acceptable Foundations	62
3. Foundations Related to Type of Institution	64
4. Foundations and Institutional Enrollments	64
5. Dollars Raised Based on Institutional Enrollment	65
6. Level of Staff and Faculty Involvement	66
7. Distribution of Foundation Board Influential Power	66
8. Level of Foundation Board Diversity	67
9. Distribution of the Foundation Board Size	67
10. Distributions of the Foundations by Age	68
11. Degree of Time Devoted to Fund-Raising by the Foundation Leader	69
12. Training of the Foundation Leader	70
13. Level of Fund-Raising Related Communication Between the College President and the Foundation Leader	70
14. Level of Fund-Raising Related Communication Between the Foundation Board Chairperson and the Foundation Leader	71
15. Degree of Fund-Raising Planning by the Foundation	72
16. Use of Volunteers by the Foundation	72
17. Frequency of the Statement of Purpose Review	73
18. The Level of Foundation Developmental Activities Designed to Promote the Responsibilities and Roles of Foundation Board Members	74

19.	Level of Developmental Activities to Promote the College Goals and Mission to the Foundation Board	75
20.	Level of Activities to Incorporate the Foundation Board in Overall College Activities	75
21.	Level of Alumni Association Involvement in Foundation Fund-Raising Activities	76
22.	Level of Professional Affiliation of the Foundation	77
23.	Variety of Long and Short Term Foundation Projects	78
24.	Degree of Use of Outside Fund-Raising Professionals	78
25.	Degree of Seed Money Use by the Foundation	78
26.	Number One Source of Gifts, Donations, and Revenue	79
27.	Number Two Source of Gifts, Donations, and Revenue	80
28.	Number One Type of Gift, Donation, or Revenue	81
29.	Number Two Type of Gift, Donation, or Revenue	81
30.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients	83
31.	Calculation of t-Values From r	84
32.	Significant Pearson r Coefficients	85
33.	Multiple Regression Analysis: An Overview	87
34.	Multiple Regression Analysis: A Detailed Review of Step Three	88

THE CANADIAN TWO-YEAR COLLEGE FOUNDATION:
CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The development of the two-year college movement in Canada was a deviation from the traditional British model incorporated within the Canadian educational system. Beginning in 1957 with the formation of Lethbridge Junior College, a new dimension was added to postsecondary education in Canada (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

These new colleges were developed in response to needs that had been building since the end of World War II. By the 1960s, the demand for an alternate form of postsecondary education had become acute. This need was predicated on the impact of scientific and technological change accompanying the end of World War II, an increased demand for education in the 18-to-24 year-old age group, and a growing desire of Canadians to develop more of their own skilled workers. As a result, provincial governments concentrated on developing a system of two-year technical and community colleges which were mandated to deliver various vocational-oriented programs (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

During the 1960s and early 1970s, the two-year technical and community public colleges enjoyed generous governmental support. Funds were readily available for capital projects, new program development, and overall

college operational needs. Beginning in the mid-70s, however, governmental support became more restrictive and did not match the expanding mandate of the two-year technical and community college. Government support was being curbed due, in part, to the developing oil crisis, high levels of inflation, unemployment, and increased international competition in Canadian trade markets. The two-year technical and community colleges continued to grow and develop but with a new caution toward expansion and budget commitments (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

Terms such as restraint, rationalization of programs, budget priorities, zero-based growth, and accountability were quickly added to the two-year college vocabulary, creating a new reality for these institutions.

Wattenbarger and Heck (1983) summarize the funding paradox as follows:

The basic philosophical purpose of community colleges has been to remove barriers to continued education. The financial barrier has been alleviated by low fees and accessibility; the geographical barrier has been affected by establishing new institutions; the motivational barrier has been relieved by developing new courses and new programs. [Yet] a primary concern by legislatures as reflected in fiscal policy and in restricted appropriations has been to increase student fees, to close down small colleges, and to institute controls over the development of new programs. (p. 60)

Despite the many and varied adjustments which the institutions have made, pressing financial concerns still remain. As noted by Harper (1976) circumstances may get

worse before they get better. He (Harper, 1976) further stressed the potential of financial constraint when he stated:

Faced with the first serious threat to the open-door concept since it became the cornerstone of the movement two decades ago, community colleges must now either accept a closing door or find some new ways to prop it open. (p. 48)

Canadian community colleges are presently searching for viable alternatives to compensate for the reality of shrinking budgets and increased programming demands.

Rationale For The Study

One potential strategy designed to offset the financial restraint imposed on the two-year college potentially lies with the formation of an educational foundation. Developmental organizations-- including educational foundations-- are recognized as a means of adding revenue and related resources to an institution of higher education (Curti & Nash, 1965).

Philanthropic support has played a vital role in the development of higher education in North America for many years. Harvard University, 1636; Dalhousie University, 1818; McGill University, 1821; Queen's University, 1841; and McMaster University, 1887 (Duffy, 1979; Woodside, 1958), represent examples of humanitarian support of higher education in North America. Each of these institutions can attest to the benefits and opportunities

that have occurred as a direct result of philanthropic endeavors.

In the United States, the community college has steadily increased the involvement of developmental activities within their framework of operation and progress. Since 1965, the formation of American community college foundations has rapidly expanded (Degerstedt, 1982). At the beginning of this decade, it was estimated that approximately 66% of all community colleges in the United States had an affiliated fund-raising program (Angel & Gares, 1981).

Typical of many Canadian enterprises, a pattern of events which has evolved in the United States provides a profound influence on Canadian growth and progress. The public and technical community college system is no exception to this phenomenon (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). As such, Canada must continue to creatively analyze American activities and ultimately profit from the vast experiences and circumstances occurring in the United States. Bender and Daniel (1986) state: "The new conceptualization of the public two-year college of the year 1990 will find resource development central to every facet of institutional development and operation" (p. 22). The message seems clear that the two-year technical and community colleges must tap other resources if they plan

to continue their status as the public access colleges in Canada.

The American community college foundation has been studied quite extensively since 1965 (Bremer, 1965; Luck & Tolle, 1978; Sneed, 1979; Duffy, 1979; Sharron, 1982; Johnson, 1986). The resulting studies have generated numerous factors necessary for the organization and operation of a successful foundation within the confines of the many community college systems in the United States.

The criteria used to determine the success of the community college foundation has traditionally involved the component of funds raised. Studies conducted by Bremer (1965) and Hargis and Blocker (1974) indicate success as the increase in funds to the college via the foundation. Leslie (1969) defined effectiveness as the degree to which an objective is achieved. Robinson (1982) stated, "the obvious definition is that the effective foundation is the one that brings in the largest amounts of money" (p. 35). Luck and Tolle (1978) concluded that, "one measure of success of a foundation is the number of gifts accumulated. However, the best evaluative measure is reflected in the fiscal assistance provided to the college" (p. 49). Johnson (1986) incorporated a measure of performance based on dollars per full-time equivalent

student that took into account both new revenues and effective fund management.

Unfortunately, the situation is not the same in Canada. The Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation is essentially unstudied. The procedures and principles which have directed the formation of fund-raising agencies in these institutions are not documented and the degree of success of the various philanthropic activities that are undertaken is uncertain. A basic listing of the two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada is not available. As well, there is no formal association or organization of Canadian two-year college foundations.

Only one study has been undertaken that directly addresses philanthropy in the Canadian two-year college. Havard (1975) attempted to ascertain the philanthropic support of public and private community colleges in Canada during the years 1968 to 1973. The results of this study indicate an alumni organization and an alumni fund are significant factors within a development program (Havard, 1975). More recent studies in the United States, however, dispute the role of the alumni organization as a factor related to community college foundation effectiveness (Sneed, 1979; Duffy, 1979; Johnson, 1986).

The variables of foundation age and college age are, however, frequently identified as major contributors to

foundation effectiveness (Sneed, 1979, Duffy 1979). Subsequently, the major expansion of the Canadian public and technical college system occurred in the early 1970s (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The Havard (1975) study was conducted prior to 1975-- essentially too early in the evolution of the two-year technical and community college system to significantly resolve the question of foundation development and success in Canada.

As briefly outlined, a combination of elements have evolved which collectively direct the initiation of this study. These elements can be summarized as:

1. The Canadian two-year technical and community college movement is continuing to develop and grow;
2. The overall percentage of governmental funding being allocated to the Canadian two-year technical and community college is decreasing;
3. The implementation of philanthropic activities within institutions of higher education has been identified as a means of addressing the issue of financial restraint;
4. History has shown that many Canadian activities have been influenced by American affairs;
5. The American community college foundation has undergone various descriptive analysis to determine the organizational and operational

factors of success that are associated with such developmental activities; and

6. The Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation suffers from a paucity of research at all levels.

Due to the increased need for private support in Canadian postsecondary education, the maturation of the Canadian two-year college system and the lack of current data concerning the Canadian two-year college foundation, the necessity and timeliness of such a research project is evident.

Further, the assumption that the adoption of the success factors associated with the American community college foundation will perpetuate successful Canadian two-year college foundations has not been addressed.

The data will also be helpful in establishing the demographic framework of the Canadian two-year college foundation. These data, once analyzed, should provide both an informative and useful perspective of the foundation activity within this segment of Canadian postsecondary education.

The need to establish a current understanding of the Canadian two-year college foundation is clearly required. Undertaking a national study related to community and technical college foundations would constitute a positive step toward the attainment of this goal. In addition,

such a study would become part of the national research agenda purposed by Dennison and Gallagher (1986) and help to promote the overall comprehension of the Canadian two-year college movement.

Statement of the Problem

The Canadian two-year college is fundamentally a provincially organized and administered entity. As such, they have been largely studied and analyzed in a local or regional context (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The Canadian two-year college foundation, as a partner of the affiliated institution, has largely been exempted from the local and regional research agenda. The result is that the Canadian technical and community college foundation cannot be comprehended in any definitive way at the local, provincial, or national level. This is due to a lack of available information and the resulting data analysis necessary to create an understanding of these affiliated two-year college organizations.

The American community college foundation has not suffered from such a lack of descriptive and comparative analysis. Followed closely by the increased development of affiliated community college foundations in the United States, the process of determining specific factors or characteristics necessary for success of these

philanthropic programs occurred (Bremer, 1965; Silvera, 1974; Duffy, 1979; Johnson, 1986).

Although a variety of individual factors have been identified, correlational analysis or multiple regression of such factors has not occurred. A result of the various studies emanating from the United States is a simple compilation of factors associated with philanthropic success. This is in opposition to the examination of relationships between variables. Multiple regression determines not only whether variables are related, but also the degree to which they are related. The result is a predictive equation based on the analysis of all independent variables within the data matrix.

Such a predictive model would become a valuable tool in the development of a new two-year college foundation. The model would also be useful as part of an evaluation process for established two-year college foundations.

The problem of this study was to ascertain the relationship of demographic, structural, organizational and operational factors associated with success in the Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation. A secondary issue was the relevance of utilizing the factors which contribute to successful American community college foundations as the basis for the Canadian technical and community college foundation.

Statement of the Purpose

The purpose of this study was to conduct an investigation designed to determine the factors which are significantly associated with the success of nonprofit foundations affiliated with two-year technical and community colleges in Canada. Specifically, the study is designed:

1. To review the existing research related to the success, the productivity, and the characteristics of two-year college foundations;
2. To identify demographic, structural, operational, and organizational factors which are related to the success of a two-year college foundation;
3. To develop a research methodology, including an appropriate instrument, for determining the characteristics, productivity and success of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada;
4. To administer the instrument to a population of all two-year technical and community colleges in Canada;
5. To provide a descriptive analysis of the philanthropic activities within two-year technical and community colleges in Canada;

6. To utilize the data as a statistical basis for the determination of significant relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable of success using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient procedure; and
7. To utilize the data as a statistical basis for the calculation of a regression equation designed to predict the success of a Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation.

Limitations

1. This study is limited to the public and technical community colleges in Canada as determined by the Association of Canadian Community Colleges and the Canadian Education Association.
2. The definition of a Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) is not standard throughout each of the Canadian provinces and territories. The basis of this anomaly is couched in the jurisdiction of educational matters in Canada. The education process in Canada is assigned by Section 93 of the Constitution Act, 1867, to the provinces. The FTE counts are provided each year by Statistics Canada. This governmental agency indicates that the counts are provided by each of the surveyed institutions and not based on any common, national

criteria (Statistics Canada, 1988).

Delimitations

1. There are many ways to determine the success of an organization. In this study, success is a factor of the average total new assets accumulated within two operational years of the foundation divided by the average FTE (full-time equivalent) count for the college over the same two years.

$$\text{SUCCESS} = \frac{\text{Average total new yearly assets (1986/87 + 1987/88)}}{\text{Average FTE Count (1986/87 + 1987/88)}}$$

This measure takes into account both new revenues and institutional size. It ignores, however, such items as community or district wealth.

2. The period of financial reporting will be delimited to the two academic years of 1986/87 and 1987/88. This delimitation will have the effect of providing both current and comparable financial data for the study.
3. The independent variables for this study will be delimited to the major success factors associated with nonprofit foundations in two-year colleges, as identified in the review of literature.

Definition Of Terms

American Community College: Any institution accredited to award the associate in arts or science as its highest degree (Cohen & Brawer, 1982).

Community College Foundation: A nonprofit charitable organization, created for the exclusive purpose of benefitting a particular community college within the Association of Canadian Community Colleges or the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges.

New Assets: Contributions (cash, property, equipment, securities, endowments) made to the foundation for a specific year excluding interest and income from any previous year (Johnson, 1986).

Success: Success within the community college foundation will be determined by dividing the annual new assets by the average annual FTE (full-time equivalent) for the years 1986 and 1987.

Two-Year Canadian Technical or Community College: A two-year institution affiliated with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.

Summary and Organization of the Study

This study appears to be both timely and appropriate. The financial restraint being imposed on Canadian higher

education requires the continued development and endorsement of solutions designed to address this dilemma. The potential use of affiliated two-year technical and community college foundations as a means of addressing financial concerns, therefore, must be analyzed and assessed. The key to the success of these educational foundations ultimately relates to the significant factors that can be associated with these fund-raising programs.

In addition to determining significant relationships and developing a predictive model for success of Canadian two-year technical and community college foundations, this study will also provide new and important descriptive data concerning these fund-raising organizations. This data can potentially form the groundwork for continued review and study of two-year technical and community college foundations within the Canadian higher education system.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

To become familiar with the two-year technical and community college movement and its related fund-raising foundations, a comprehensive review of literature and related research was conducted. The Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation is identified as being one potential mechanism for achieving financial stability in times of declining resources.

With the purpose of providing a clear picture of the two-year technical and community college foundation, the following topics were reviewed and are presented in this chapter:

1. The evolution of the community college;
2. The establishment of higher education in Canada;
3. The evolution of the Canadian community college;
4. The community college movement in Canada;
5. Community college issues;
6. The nonprofit foundation as a financial solution;
and
7. The nonprofit foundation in the two-year college.

The Evolution of the Community College

The community college, although potentially associated with the concept of extended secondary education in Europe (McDowell, 1919), has not been derived from a clear historical model. The origin of these two-year educational institutions can be traced to alterations and reforms within the American system of education. Diener (1986) reports that:

In 1859, William Mitchell proposed that the University of Georgia: Establish an Institute, combining all the instruction given in a well regulated village Academy and the Freshman and Sophomore Classes in College...hence, the scheme submitted, contemplates the abolishing of the Freshman and Sophomore classes, having them instructed in the Institute herein contemplated and there to remain until fully prepared for the Junior Class. (p. 30)

Ratcliff (1987) noted that "Along with the advent of the state university, the two-year college represents an American innovation in the reform of the structure of higher education" (p. 20).

In 1871, Henry Barnard-- the first U.S. Commissioner of Education-- presented a "recommendation for a new design for schools which might embrace the first two years of collegiate general education and vocational or professional training" (Diener, 1986. p. 35).

The foundation of the Barnard proposal emanated, in part, from writings in the middle 1800s of Henry Tappan (Diener, 1986). Tappan is recognized as an educator who

greatly admired the German system of education. As such, he distinguished the university as the highest order of scholarship and the college as a lower, more practical system of education.

William Rainey Harper, also drawing on the ideas of Tappan, plus the work of William Fowell of the University of Minnesota, is credited with establishing the two-year public college movement in North America (Vaughan, 1985; Deegan & Tillery, 1985). As President of the University of Chicago, Harper advocated that struggling four-year colleges re-organize into two-year junior colleges. He also established a junior college at the University of Chicago. Harper was also instrumental in the formation of Joliet Junior College, in Joliet, Illinois. In 1901, two years were added to the high school program in Joliet signifying the beginning of the public junior college movement in the United States (Vaughan, 1983).

The concepts incorporated at Joliet Junior College quickly spread westward. In 1907, state Senator Anthony Caminetti was successful in obtaining passage of the California Act that authorized local junior colleges. Further legislation, passed in 1921, authorized independent junior college districts with their own governing boards, budgets, and operating procedures (Vaughan, 1985).

As this legislation was unfolding, Alexis Lange-- referred to by Vaughan (1983) as the "philosopher" of the

early two-year public college movement--was adding support for these emerging institutions. His support, however, was qualified with the premise that the junior college occupied the highest order within secondary education. Lange also believed that the greatest contribution of these colleges was in vocational training (Diener, 1986).

Leonard Koos--recognized by Vaughan (1983) as the early "scholar" of the two-year public college--led the movement in the 1920s. As noted by Diener (1986):

Koos' studies indicated that the junior college fulfilled a variety of needs in our society. Not only would it provide college-level general or liberal education, it could offer the beginnings of professional education. It should stand for outstanding teaching and individual care for students. It fostered the reorganization of secondary and collegiate education. It was efficient, avoided waste and duplication in American education, and promoted the economy. (p. 93)

Beginning in 1931, Eells examined the 6-4-4 divisional plan for education. He presented extensive arguments in favor of the junior college as a separate two-year institution, distinct from secondary education (Diener, 1986).

Vaughan (1983) summarizes the two-year public college movement as it had progressed to the 1950s:

With its founding fathers, its historical documents, and a mission greater than its parts, the junior college needed an organizational framework. The organization began in 1921 with the founding of the American Association of Junior Colleges (AAJC). The association was to serve as national spokesman for the growing junior college movement. Indeed, the junior college was primed to take advantage of the

unprecedented opportunities that were to come its way at the end of World War II. (p. 5)

The primary force in the popularization of the junior college-- and in fact all of higher education-- was the passage of the G. I. Bill in 1944. This Bill stipulated that "returning veterans had the financial support available to attend college, and their education was seen as an entitlement" (Vaughan, 1983, p. 7).

Another stimulus that helped propel the two-year public college movement toward a boom era was the 1947 Truman Commission on Higher Education. This commission became the foundation for action taken by President Truman in the early 1950s. In a letter referencing the Budget Message for 1951, Truman (1950) indicated that:

I am recommending that the Congress authorize a limited Federal program to assist capable youth...I request that you make, in the course of the next six months, a comprehensive study of the community college and report to me your findings and recommendations. (Truman, Accession No. 63-A-23, Box 169)

This action, coupled with Volume III of the 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education, firmly demonstrated recognition at the federal level of the community college within the realm of higher education.

Collectively, the early space-race with the Soviet Union, the perceived need for increased technical education, the increased demands of productivity and competition within industry, and the enormous increases in enrollment within the four-year colleges and universities

all served the development of the American community college well (Vaughan, 1983).

The Establishment of Higher Education in Canada

Canada became an independent country in 1867 when the government of Great Britain passed the British North America (BNA) Act. This Act united the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick into the Dominion of Canada. In 1931, Canada became a sovereign state--no longer a colony of Great Britain--but not a republic either (McWhitney, 1982).

Britain was asked by the Canadian federal government to retain control of its central government until the Canadian provincial and federal governments could agree on an amending procedure that would protect provincial rights. Finally in 1982, under the guidance of Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Canada received its own Constitution and Charter of Freedoms and Rights. This was accomplished with the agreement of all the provinces except Quebec. In response to the separate requests of Quebec, a compromise was struck that allows a province to opt out of certain provisions within the Constitution. If the provincial governments specifically pass their own laws contrary to the federal Constitution and renew the laws every five years, they can, in effect, operate independently of the Canadian Constitution (McWhitney, 1982).

The inclusion of Quebec within Canada has continued to be a volatile relationship. In the 1967 provincial election, the Parti Quebecois obtained a majority mandate. The political philosophy of the Parti Quebecois advocated the separation of Quebec from Canada. Pressure by the federal government plus a variety of other forces within the province avoided an official referendum on the separation of Quebec from Canada. The nationalist theme has been somewhat rejuvenated in Quebec and today the government leaders admit the necessity of the inclusion of Quebec within Canada. It is within this bi-cultural, bi-national, massive geographical expanse that Canadian postsecondary education has developed and progressed.

The College de Quebec, founded by the Jesuits in 1635, is considered to be the first institution of higher learning in Canada. The first English-language institution of higher learning in Canada was King's College, established in 1789 at Windsor, Nova Scotia (Campbell, 1971). This was followed by the establishment of Dalhousie University in 1818 and McGill University in 1821 (Woodside, 1958).

The Evolution of the Canadian Community College

Soles (1968) has equated the progress of the Canadian community college both historically and philosophically:

For reasons which are essentially historical, Canadian education has remained predominantly under the influence of the British school system with its sharp cleavage first between the elementary and secondary schools, and even more sharply between the secondary schools and the universities. Over the years Canadian educators have tended to reject the German concept of the gymnasium, as an intermediate step between the high school and university, and for the most part they have been downright contemptuous of any idea of 'open door colleges'. (p. 21)

The Canadian junior college was apparent at the turn of the twentieth century (Campbell, 1971). In 1934, Fox reported that there were eleven such junior colleges in Canada-- mostly church sponsored institutions (Campbell, 1971). In the early 1950s, the first community college, patterned after the American community college model, was conceived and developed in Canada (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

Beyond the influence of the American community college movement, there were a number of other important events that played major roles in the development of the present Canadian community college.

After World War II, a Canadian Vocational Training Centre, designed specifically to train returning soldiers, was established in every province (Prokopec, 1979). The original mandate of these institutions was to prepare

individuals for entry into Canadian industry. Many of these institutions were later retained as adult trade and vocational centres to develop programs of postsecondary technical training. The emergence of these new postsecondary institutions was founded on the need and desire for more Canadian technicians and technologists in the late 1950s and early 1960s (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

In 1960, the Canadian government introduced a technical and vocational training act which provided over one billion dollars for the development of vocational facilities. The act also provided for the contribution of 50 percent of the operating costs for a variety of programs at the postsecondary level- including two-year vocational programs (Prokopec, 1979).

The Community College Movement In Canada

In 1957, the Canadian public community college movement was established in Lethbridge, Alberta. The groundwork for this college was based on a 1951 report generated by the City of Lethbridge. The result of this report was the awarding of a feasibility and development contract to S.V. Martorana of Washington State College (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

As stated by Dennison and Gallagher (1986):

Martorana noted the narrow scope of curricular

offerings in Alberta's institutions of agriculture, technology and art, but particularly the limited opportunities for postsecondary education in the Lethbridge region. (p. 18)

Martorana's development proposal was based upon a comprehensive style curriculum incorporating university transfer programs, occupational, remedial, and community education courses. The recommendations of Martorana included the suggestion that the college begin its operation through the addition of a thirteenth year to the local secondary school (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

Initially, Lethbridge Junior College was directly affiliated with the University of Alberta which established the conditions of affiliation on the advice of the University General Faculty Council. The terms set down by the University involved: (1) the minimum number of college faculty that must be full-time; (2) library and laboratory standards; the examination procedure; and (3) the conditions of entrance to the Junior College (University of Alberta, 1950).

Today, Alberta operates 14 two-year technical and community colleges affiliated with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Annual Report: ACCC, 1987).

The establishment of the first community college in Alberta did not, however, establish the groundwork for the beginning of a nation-wide community college system. Each of the remaining nine provinces and two territories

developed their own specific two-year public and technical college system. It is clear, however, that there are many elements and issues of mutual concern in each of the provincial and territorial systems.

Until 1965, British Columbia contained one public university in Vancouver, one university satellite college in Victoria, and the church affiliated Notre Dame University in the interior town of Nelson (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986).

The community college movement in British Columbia can be traced to a 1931 thesis written by W. W. Knott while he was a student at Stanford University (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). He modelled his structure after the developing California system and provided relevant statistics for the establishment of such colleges in British Columbia. He also noted appropriate geographical locations for these institution in the province. As stated by Dennison and Gallagher (1986):

Although remaining just an idea, unappreciated and largely forgotten, in virtually every case, the centres he proposed in 1932 became realities some thirty-five years later. (p. 24)

The first community colleges in British Columbia were local products developing out of ammendments to the Public Education Act. The colleges were designed around local control and represented the educational expression of the

district or region they served. Beinder (1983) concludes that:

The community college in British Columbia represents the crystallization of a dream of service to people. It is something more than and different from the old community of scholars concept of higher education. It represents an idea of dynamic involvement of the total community. It was seen as an entity subservient to no other institution. It was not to be an extension of the public school, nor a mini-university. It was a social invention, whole and legitimate in its own right, designed to solve a particular kind of problem created by a highly complex society. (p. 65)

Today, the Province of British Columbia maintains 18 two-year institutions affiliated with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Annual Report - ACCC, 1987).

The development of the two-year institution in Ontario was held in close check by the universities and their highly articulate lobbying activities. The result was a system, established in 1965, that grew out of vocational-technical education. The end-product was the formation of Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology designed to provide alternatives for the large industrial oriented population of Ontario (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). They further state that:

From the beginning the general mandate of the colleges was clear: the preparation of individuals to enter the workforce, with training of both quality and relevance, to contribute to the economic progress of the province. (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 95)

The Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology in Ontario still emphasize vocational training and do not offer any university transfer programming.

Today, Ontario operates some 75 campuses associated with 22 Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology and 3 specialized technical institutes that are affiliated with the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Annual Report - ACCC, 1987).

The first college in Quebec was established in 1635 by the Roman Catholic church (Parent, 1963). For over 300 years the church has played a very large part in the educational system of Quebec. Today, the church still plays a major role in the Catholic school system in Quebec. The church also operates many private colleges at both the secondary and postsecondary levels.

Beginning in the 1950s, various Royal Commissions were established to study the system of education in Quebec. They outlined potential systems of education for all groups within the Province; however, they met with little initial success. Common ground was finally established by the Parent Report of 1965 and subsequent legislation established the College d'Enseignement General et Professionel (CEGEP) system within Quebec. By 1967, twelve French CEGEP's were operational, largely created by combining various existing institutions (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The CEGEP consists of two streams of students: (1) the pre-university stream designed as a two-year postsecondary program for admittance to University; and (2) the occupational training stream

designed as two or three-year terminal programs. CEGEP's are characterized by local involvement but the majority of financing is through provincial interests (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The initial CEGEP structure included 'free-tuition' programs which was a first in Canada. The CEGEP system has subsequently established a modest fee schedule. It should also be noted that students intending to study at a Quebec university must attend the CEGEP for two years prior to enrolling in a university.

At present, there are approximately 45 campuses associated with 37 French CEGEP's, 3 English CEGEP's and 25 private colleges in the province of Quebec (Ki-es-Ki Handbook, 1988).

The development of the remaining provinces can be characterized as progressing from a Royal Commission of Education within each province to the creation of recommendations for the establishment of a community college system. The systems are provincially controlled and deliver a curriculum that represents the specific vocational needs of the particular college region.

The provinces of Saskatchewan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and the Yukon and Northwest Territories collectively represent 32 two-year technical and community colleges (Ki-es-Ki Handbook, 1988).

Community College Issues

The American community college has received much praise and support since the early 1900s, but the movement also has been challenged on various fronts. Clark (1960) contested many of the claims of the two-year public college--focusing on the cooling-out function of these institutions.

The latent terminal student is allowed into transfer curricula but encounters counselling and testing that invite him to consider alternatives, subtle pressures to hedge his bet by taking courses that serve a terminal destiny, tough talk in orientation classes about realistic occupational choice, probationary status perhaps, and finally grades that will not allow transferring. (Clark, 1960, p. 163)

Karabel (1972) and Goodwin (1973) discuss further social concerns and support the cooling-out function portrayed by Clark (1960).

The issue of credibility and excellence is also of concern in the American community college system. Fryer (1986) points to the ambiguity of an educational institution that is both secondary and postsecondary in character resulting in the absence of a clear, conceptual framework for the community college.

Cross (1981) suggests that the community college has topped-out and that the comprehensive mission is in jeopardy. She predicts:

If colleges go their own way, the community college will probably lose the cohesiveness and zeal that was apparent among the founders of community colleges...

community colleges would blend into the network of postsecondary institutions, probably maintaining some missions common to community college, but responding largely to local goals. (Cross, 1981, p. 123)

Comparatively, the community college in Canada also enjoyed a period of tremendous support and rapid expansion beginning in the 1960s. This was followed by a period of stability in the 1970s. The 1980s have--as is also evident in the American community college system--brought new and critical challenges to all facets of the Canadian two-year college system.

The continued question of credibility is identified by Dennison (1984) as a major issue for the Canadian two-year college. He notes that "community colleges embody a philosophy of tertiary education that is largely foreign to Canadian tradition" (p. 142). The concepts of democracy and the egalitarian approach to postsecondary education, consistent with the goals of the community college movement in the United States, directly oppose the more conservative and elitist philosophy that characterizes the educational system of the United Kingdom (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986). The challenge of overcoming educational tradition presents a most difficult task for the Canadian two-year college. This is a task that is essential toward the acceptance of the Canadian two-year technical and community colleges as a creditable educational alternative in Canada. Credibility also is a necessary ingredient for

creating and promoting a defensible rationale for the future development and progress of two-year institutions within the postsecondary schema of Canada.

The issue of postsecondary funding is becoming a major North American concern embracing many common elements. The reality of increasing capital and operating costs, plus higher faculty and staff salaries, is amplified by little or no change in the level of instructional productivity (Cohen & Brawer, 1982). Coombs (1968) had foreseen this anomaly creating an impending worldwide crisis which would result in a dramatic increase in the costs per student.

The purported egalitarian nature of the two-year college has resulted in a variety of increased costs not associated with traditional postsecondary institutions. The comprehensive mission of the two-year college provides: (1) an alternative or second-chance for a wide spectrum of students; (2) programs for non-traditional students; (3) programs for minority students; and (4) programs for disadvantaged students. The result of such programming is that two-year colleges require additional financial support to respond to these diverse needs (Cohen & Brawer, 1982).

The two-year college has traditionally operated on the basis of only modest tuition fees (Cohen & Brawer, 1982). In Canada, the Quebec CEGEP system originally did not collect tuition fees for full-time, resident students. No tuition fees for resident students has also occurred in a

number of two-year technical and community colleges in the Maritime Provinces. In cases where institutions do levy a tuition fee, the amounts have increased but well below the Canadian rate of inflation (Survey, 1984).

The promotion of part-time learning has been a major component of the two-year technical and community college mandate in Canada. Although a most noble undertaking, the total costs associated with the part-time learner are comparable with the total costs of a full-time learner (Cohen & Brawer, 1986). This becomes a critical financial factor when funding formulas are based on full-time-equivalents.

Collectively, the combination of an expanding mandate and increased capital and operating costs burdened by unchanging instructional productivity equates to a massive administrative challenge--a challenge that is perceived as critical to the future success and advancement of the community college (Campbell, 1985). Richardson and Leslie (1980) indicate that:

The emerging conflict between institutional aspirations for continuing mission development and the restraints imposed by financing arrangements designed to promote stability or even phased decline has not been confronted squarely. (p. 44)

They (Richardson & Leslie, 1980) have further emphasized that to prevent the community college goal of educational equality for all from becoming the impossible dream, both

policy makers and educators must work together to narrow the gap between missions and resources.

In Canada, the late 1970s and the early 1980s were the beginning years of financial crisis for the two-year college. Dennison and Gallagher (1986) have noted several national factors that contributed to the deteriorating financial situation at this time. The overall downturn in the Canadian economy, the decline in government revenues, the rising unemployment situation, and the mounting regional political dissatisfaction--particularly in Quebec and the West--were major influences in altering federal involvement in postsecondary education.

Prior to this time, the federal government provided direct transfer of funds to the various postsecondary institutions in Canada. The basis of this program was formulated from recommendations presented by the 1951 Massey Royal Commission (Greenberg, 1988). In 1967, federal support for postsecondary education was changed in two significant ways: (1) funds were channelled through the provinces; and (2) the federal government agreed to provide 50 percent of all eligible operating costs for postsecondary institutions. The provinces, supplemented by student fees, were to provide the remainder of the financial support to the institutions.

It was within this 50-50 federal-provincial funding mechanism that the majority of Canadian two-year technical

and community colleges developed and progressed. In 1977 all was changed.

The federal government passed the Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements and Established Programs Financing Act (EPF) (Watts, 1986). The EPF Act created postsecondary funding allocations according to provincial populations. The allocations were made up of a combination of cash and tax-point transfers, the combined entitlement being related to increases in population and Gross National Product as opposed to the previous system of sharing postsecondary education operating costs.

The result of the 1977 EPF Act has been tremendous conflict and confrontation. As noted by Greensberg (1988); Dennison and Gallagher (1986); and Watts (1986), this restructuring has led to charges and counter-charges of provincial government diversion of federal postsecondary transfer funds. Visibly, the entire Canadian post-secondary educational system has been required to cut its operating and capital budget (Watts, 1986).

The potential of a major financial crisis in Canadian postsecondary education is clearly indicated by an analysis of the 1985 federal budget. The budget indicated that changes to federal transfer funds would result in a \$2 billion saving in the 1990-91 academic year. These changes were to be initiated in 1986 and continue until 1991. This has been translated as a 32% cutback in block federal

transfers to postsecondary education in Canada (Johnson, 1985).

As noted by Dennison (1984):

For almost 30 years Ottawa has borne an increasing responsibility for the funding of postsecondary education with neither the visibility nor the direct control of the dispersal of money. However, political factors aside, the next few years will require provincial governments and tertiary institutions to respond in new ways if the current level of funding is to be maintained. (p. 148)

The Nonprofit Foundation as a Financial Solution

In most discussions on the establishing of community colleges, it is argued that enthusiastic local support is essential to the success of a college. Local support is then usually translated as local financing. Municipalities, however, should be exempted from major financial contributions, to the community colleges. Local businesses should be encouraged, though, to contribute to special project funds. Many smaller corporations and individuals may choose to contribute to a local college whereas they would not be especially interested in a more remote university. (Stager, 1966, p. 98)

Stager's (1966) words predicate the need for local involvement in the funding of two-year technical and community colleges in Canada.

The affiliated two-year college foundation is a nonprofit, charitable organization created at the local level for the exclusive purpose of benefiting a particular community college. The foundation purports itself as one mechanism designed to assist its affiliated institution in confronting financial restraint.

The concept of foundations, fundraising or philanthropy is not new to postsecondary education in North America. Harvard College, founded on October 28, 1636, had a humble beginning with the donation of 300 volumes and a small amount of money from John Harvard in 1638. Today, Harvard University has a foundation totally over \$1.5 billion dollars (Duffy, 1980). Yale University established the first alumni fund in 1890. The Kansas University Endowment Association, incorporated in 1893, is the oldest independent but affiliated foundation in the United States (Curti, 1965).

In Canada, Dalhousie University, 1818, McGill University, 1821, Queen's University, 1841, and McMaster University, 1887 are all examples of postsecondary institutions which were founded or expanded as a direct result of philanthropic support (Woodside, 1958).

American community college fund-raising activities have been identified as early as 1906 (Duffy, 1980) but did not flourish until the boom era of the 1960s (Robison, 1982). Foundation activities within the Canadian community college have received little academic attention and as such relatively little is known about their origins, history or present level of operation and organization.

As indicated, the establishment of a nonprofit foundation is advocated as one approach to addressing financial constraint. Establishment of a foundation in

itself does not automatically equate to financial freedom. The various organizational and operational factors that are incorporated within the educational, nonprofit foundation are the elements associated with financial success. Taking this concept one step further--based on the established uniqueness of the two-year college--what are the necessary organizational and operational factors that directly relate to successful philanthropic activities in Canadian two-year technical and community colleges?

The Nonprofit Foundation in the Two-Year College

The majority of research projects relating to the community college foundation have been undertaken in the United States.

The history of community college foundations offers conflicting views as to when the first foundation was established. Duffy (1980) indicates the first program of annual giving at a community college was established in 1906. Robison (1982) identified a foundation being established at Long Beach City College in 1922. A survey conducted by Degerstedt (1982) indicates that the earliest reported foundation was established in 1950. Sims (1976) attests that Highlands Community College Foundation, established in 1962, is the oldest college-related foundation in the United States.

Regardless of their origin, the development of the foundation as a fund-raising tool, within the American community college, has been an increasing phenomenon. The increased foundation development is closely associated with the creation of large numbers of community colleges in the late 1960s (Robison, 1982). Degerstedt (1982) recounts that the ten-year period of 1968-1978 was one of dramatic growth in foundation development, with 65% of all foundations existing in the early 1980s developed during that decade. He also reports that during 1978, more nonprofit foundations were formed than during the entire time span of 1950 to 1965. A later national study, conducted by Angel and Gares (1980), indicated that 62% of the 592 institutions that responded to the survey had established a foundation.

While it is clear that community colleges are rapidly moving towards the establishment of nonprofit foundations, a limited number of studies have been conducted to determine the essential elements necessary for the success of the community college foundation.

In one of the earliest studies concerning a successful development program, Bremer (1965), developed six criteria which he considered essential for such an operation. These include: (1) administrative officers assigned developmental duties; (2) volunteer groups; (3) alumni organizations; (4) alumni funds; (5) membership in the

American Alumni Council; and (6) membership in the American College Public Relations Association. Bremer found that when these six criteria were present, the college received more money than when these criteria were not present.

Silvera (1974) and Luck (1974) show that the amount of money raised is the major criteria to indicate the success of the foundation. Sharron (1978), supported by Duffy (1980) felt that strong public relations within the community was an important characteristic of fund-raising success. Duffy (1980) also found that organized and defined planning was a key to foundation success. This element is further supported by Sims (1973), Luck (1974), Silvera (1974) and Struckoff (1977). Duffy (1980), further attests that within the parameters of foundation planning, it appears essential that the process involve both input from the local community and the president of the institution. The inclusion of the president and the community within the planning process is further supported by Sims (1973), Luck (1974) and Silvera (1974).

Luck and Tolle (1978) state that:

One measure of success for a foundation is the number of gifts accumulated. However, the best evaluative measure is reflected by the fiscal assistance provided the college. (p. 49)

Robison (1982) supports the statement by Luck and Tolle (1978) by indicating that the success of a foundation is determined not only by the income but also by the

expenditures made on behalf of the college. Cortada and Hollingsworth (1983) indicate the following entities are necessary for developing a successful community college foundation: (1) legalization; (2) diagnosis; (3) a developmental plan; (4) donor involvement; and (5) objective oriented campaign methods.

Crowson (1985) indicates that a key to any foundation is the special characteristics and position within the community of the community college foundation board of directors. Johnson (1986) found that only one variable, "operation under organizational documents that include a constitution" (p. 111) was significant. She further relates that community college foundation success may be contingent on "community support and certain intangible characteristics" (Johnson, 1986, p. 111).

In 1987, Hall, Ryan, and Smith contacted the top 10 public, two-year colleges in giving as reported to the Council for Financial Aid to Education. They determined that: (1) the college president's involvement is necessary for success; (2) success does not come immediately; (3) success requires financial investment; and (4) success is dependent upon the existence of a full-time development person (Hall, Ryan & Smith, 1987).

The Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation clearly suffers from a paucity of research. Only 1 two-year college foundation study has been

undertaken in Canada. Havard (1975)--in a study to ascertain the philanthropic support of public and private community colleges in Canada--indicated that two criteria were essential for securing support: (1) the presence of an alumni organization; and (2) an alumni fund. This study occurred at a time when the majority of two-year technical and community colleges in Canada were still in their developmental stages. However, recent studies undertaken by Duffy (1980), Sneed (1979), Sharron (1982), and Johnson (1986) indicate many other significant factors not implied in the Havard (1975) study.

Specific researchers (Bremer, 1965; Silvera, 1974; Sneed, 1979) have attempted to measure foundation effectiveness using an instrument based on criteria developed from a literature review and dollars given per FTE student. These studies suggest that this comparison is a reasonable methodology to determine the factors of success related to a community college foundation.

Other studies have expanded on the "success factor-FTE count" technique. Duffy (1979) used such a criterion to define an active foundation. Johnson (1986) investigated foundation success on the basis of management of funds, especially the management of funds invested.

Bremer (1965), Silvera (1974), Sneed (1979), Duffy (1979) and Johnson (1986) all suggest that as a result of the continued interest in community college foundations and

the limited research that has been conducted relating to these organizations, additional studies should be conducted. Specifically, new studies must make efforts to determine the degree of effect that each of the various components contribute to the success of a two-year college foundation.

The competition for the philanthropic dollar is extremely fierce from many community avenues. It seems evident that not all agencies can be winners in the development business. Clearly, much more needs to be done in determining the effectiveness of the Canadian two-year college foundation. As part of the overall two-year college research agenda, studying the affiliated foundations will help in answering many necessary questions about their success.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The central purpose of this study was to determine the demographic, structural, organizational and operational characteristics associated with the success of a non-profit foundation affiliated with a two-year public or technical college in Canada. Secondly, the data that were obtained will be used to develop a descriptive analysis of the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada.

This chapter reviews the specific methodology used to address the purposes of the study. It details the research design used in the study, the population of the study, the specific procedures for collecting the data, as well as provide the details of the data collection instrument. In addition, information on the null hypotheses to be tested and the statistical methods for analyzing the data are included.

Research Design

Descriptive and correlational statistics were selected as the research methodologies for this study. Descriptive research involves collecting data in order to answer questions concerning the current status of the subject of the study. Best (1970) explained descriptive research as:

That which describes and interprets what is. It is concerned with conditions or relationships that exist; beliefs...attitudes that are held...or trends that are developing. (p. 116)

Correlational research can be used to describe a relationship between events or to make a prediction about an event based on the presence of specific factors. As stated by Gay (1987), "correlational research attempts to determine whether, and to what degree, a relationship exists between two or more quantifiable variables" (p. 11).

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis is a process or a collection of processes that is designed to present or interpret information (Coldeway, 1989).

Tukey (1977) developed the concept of what he calls exploratory statistics or exploratory data analysis (EDA). He has shown the necessity of paying close attention to the obtained data and examining them in detail before invoking more technically involved procedures. Howell (1987) states that "... a collection of numbers is just a collection of

numbers. They must be put into some sort of logical organization if they are to be interpretable" (p. 18). One of the simplest way to organize the data is to create frequency distributions. In this study, the frequency distributions include not only the number of responses but a valid percentage result and a cumulative percentage result. The result is a modal assessment of the data utilizing the most common score.

Correlational analysis allows for the measurement of the strength of various relationships. Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient (r) will be used to determine the extent of the relationship between two variables. More specifically:

The Pearson product-moment coefficient of correlation may be thought of essentially as that ratio which expresses the extent to which changes in one variable are accompanied by--or dependent upon--changes in a second variable (Garrett, 1966, p. 125)

Multiple regression analysis was selected as the procedure to create an equation designed to predict Y (Success) on the basis of P predictors ($X_1, X_2, X_3 \dots X_P$) in the Canadian two-year technical or community college foundation. As noted by Gay (1987) "... a combination of variables usually results in a more accurate prediction than any one variable (p. 396) The following model represents this statistical procedure (Howell, 1987):

$$Y_{\text{SUCCESS}} = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \dots + B_PX_P + e$$

B_0 : represents the intercept

$B_1, B_2 \dots B_P$: are the regression coefficients for the predictors

$X_1, X_2 \dots X_P$: are the predictors

e : is the error

How well or how accurately predictions can be made depends on how strong the relationships are between the variables. However, as pointed out by Coldeway (1989) "... correlation does not infer causation" (p. 260). A correlation, no matter how strong, only indicates that the involved variables tend to vary together. They do not indicate why the variables react in such a manner.

For this study, statistical significance was set at the .05 level for both Pearson product-moment correlation analysis and stepwise multiple regression analysis.

Population

The population of this study consisted of all the 143 two-year technical and community colleges in Canada that are members of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Annual Report - ACCC, 1987) and recognized by the Canadian Education Association (Ki-Es-Ki Handbook, 1989). The 143 colleges selected included only the central campus of any multi-campus institution.

Methods and Procedures of Data Collection

The survey procedures in this study were conducted using Dillman's (1978) recommendations for the total design method (TDM) of descriptive research. The survey instrument-- including characteristics associated with the success of a non-profit foundation affiliated with a Canadian two-year public or technical college-- was developed using a variety of survey instruments involved in previous studies (Duffy, 1979; Sneed, 1979; Johnson, 1986), conducting a review of the literature, and seeking the recommendations of a select group of foundation officers within the Province of Alberta community college system.

It is important to note:

The kinds of questions that lead to surveys are often of great importance to educational decisions or to planning further research of a different type (Cook, 1965, p. 42).

The survey instrument was pretested with the following three individuals: (1) a community college faculty member who was a member of a community college foundation board of governors; (2) a president of a community college; and (3) an executive director of a community college foundation. The evaluators were asked to record their concerns and difficulties in interpreting and understanding the survey instrument. The investigator used the evaluator's information to correct and to modify the survey instrument.

A second phase of pretesting involved administering the survey instrument to a small sample of foundation directors in the Province of Alberta. The individuals were asked to complete the questions and record their concerns and misinterpretations. This information generated a further modification of the survey instrument and provided sample data to compile, assess and interpret. The finalized instrument was constructed and prepared for mailing according to the Dillman (1978) total design method.

The specific procedures utilized in this study were as follows:

1. The sample was selected from the membership of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges and cross-referenced with the Canadian Education Association (Ki-Es-Ki Handbook, 1989).
This sample equated to all the public, two-year technical and community colleges in Canada. By sampling all the appropriate colleges in Canada, the study attempted to maximize randomization and thus promote validity.
2. Mailing labels were created from the information provided in the Ki-Es-Ki Handbook (Ki-Es-Ki Handbook, 1989).
3. A package--containing a letter of introduction and a survey--was mailed to the presidents,

principals, or directeur generals of each of the identified colleges. A letter of support from the President of Grant MacEwan Community College in Edmonton, Alberta was also enclosed as part of the package. Each package also contained a stamped, self-addressed envelope (see Appendices).

4. Subsequent FAX or telephone contact was made with each president, principal, or directeur general within a five week period.
5. As necessary, additional packages were sent via FAX to the requesting colleges.
6. Computer files were developed to facilitate the analysis of data and the testing of the hypotheses for strength of relationships.

Dependent Variable: Success

The dependent variable of success was measured by determining the average total new assets accumulated within two operational years of the particular foundation divided by the average FTE (full-time equivalent) enrollment for that college over the same two years. This procedure is consistent with similar American studies (Bremer, 1965; Duffy, 1979; Johnson, 1986).

Independent Variables

The independent variables for this study were selected on the basis of: (1) a comprehensive review of the literature; (2) a series of recommendations from a select group of foundation officers within the Province of Alberta community college system; and (3) a review of survey instruments used in similar studies. The resulting variables have been grouped into four specific areas: (1) demographic; (2) structural; (3) operational; and (4) organizational.

Independent Variables: Demographic

1. The foundation governing board includes a degree diversity of community leaders.
2. The foundation governing board includes a level of influential community members.
3. The foundation involves community college staff and faculty in all levels of foundation activities.
4. The number of members that compose the foundation governing board.
5. The chronological age of the foundation.

Independent Variables: Structural

6. The percentage of time devoted to the foundation by the college employee designated as the fund-

raising leader.

7. The number of years of formal fund-raising training associated with the foundation leader.
8. The degree of communication related to fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the college president.
9. The degree of communication related to fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the chair of the foundation board of governors.
10. The level of a planned agenda for fund-raising that involves the president of the college.
11. The level use of volunteer groups for fund-raising.

Independent Variables: Operational

12. The existence of a clear statement of purpose for the foundation.
13. The frequency of review of a clear statement of purpose for the foundation.
14. The degree of opportunity available to the members of the foundation governing board to become aware of their roles and responsibilities.
15. The degree of opportunity available to the members of the foundation governing board to become aware of the institutional goals and mission statement.
16. The level of attempt to involve the foundation

governing board in the various activities of the institution.

17. The presence of a college alumni association.
18. The level of involvement of a college alumni association in the fund-raising activities of the foundation.
19. The number of affiliations with professional organizations relating to public relations and fund-raising.

Independent Variables: Organizational

20. The degree that the programs and activities established allow for various types of fund-raising activities: including both short term and long term projects.
21. The frequency of obtaining the services of a professional fund-raising organization for special project management.
22. The frequency of the allocation of funds for the specific purpose of generating more funds.

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis of this study was that there are factors that significantly contribute to the predictive success of a two-year technical or community college foundation in Canada.

The factors, to be tested in this study, that contribute to this general hypothesis have been categorized into four areas and have been analyzed.

Independent Variables: Demographic

- H0₁: There is no significant relationship between the degree of diversity of community membership of the foundation board of governors and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- H0₂: There is no significant relationship between the level of influential community membership of the foundation board of governors and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- H0₃: There is no significant relationship between the frequency of college staff and faculty involvement in all levels of foundation activities and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- H0₄: There is no significant relationship between the number of members that compose the foundation governing board and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- H0₅: There is no significant relationship between the chronological age of the foundation and

the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

Independent Variables: Structural

H0₆: There is no significant relationship between the percentage of time devoted to the foundation by the college employee designated as the fund-raising leader and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₇: There is no significant relationship between the number of years of formal fund-raising training associated with the foundation leader and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₈: There is no significant relationship between the degree of communication associated with fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the college president and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₉: There is no significant relationship between the degree of communication associated with fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the chair of the foundation board of governors and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

HO₁₀: There is no significant relationship between the level of a planned agenda for fund-raising involving the college president and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

HO₁₁: There is no significant relationship between the level of volunteer groups for fund-raising and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

Independent Variables: Operational

HO₁₂: There is no significant relationship between the existence of a clear statement purpose of the foundation and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

HO₁₃: There is no significant relationship between frequency of review of a clear statement of purpose for the foundation and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

HO₁₄: There is no significant relationship between the degree of opportunity available for the foundation board members to become aware of their roles and responsibilities and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

- HO₁₅: There is no significant relationship between the degree of opportunity available for the foundation board members to become aware of the institutional goals and mission statement and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- HO₁₆: There is no significant relationship between the level of attempt to involve the members of the foundation board in the various activities of the institution and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- HO₁₇: There is no significant relationship between the presence of a college alumni association and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- HO₁₈: There is no significant relationship between the level of involvement of a college alumni association in the foundation fund-raising activities and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.
- HO₁₉: There is no significant relationship between the number of affiliations with professional organizations relating to public relations and fund-raising and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

Independent Variables: Organizational

H0₂₀: There is no significant relationship between the degree that the programs and activities established by the foundation allow for various fund-raising projects and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₂₁: There is no significant relationship between the frequency of obtaining the services of a professional fund-raising organization for special project management and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₂₂: There is no significant relationship between the frequency of the allocation of funds for the specific purpose of generating more funds and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

Summary

This chapter described the research procedures and methods which were incorporated to analyze the data. The design involved administering the survey to all the public two-year technical and community colleges in Canada. The data were used to develop a descriptive profile of the public two-year technical and community college foundation

in Canada. As well, the hypotheses were tested with Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients and multiple regression analysis was used to develop an equation designed to predict success based on significant foundation characteristics.

Chapter IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of this study will be presented in two sections: (1) descriptive analysis relating to the population of acceptable foundations; and (2) correlational analysis utilizing Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients and stepwise multiple regression to predict the relationship of the dependent variable of success with the independent variables of the study.

Descriptive Analysis

Geographical Profile

The population of this study consisted of all the 143 two-year technical and community colleges in Canada that are members of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (Annual Report - ACCC, 1987) and cross-referenced with the Canadian Education Association (Ki-Es-Ki Handbook, 1989). The 143 colleges surveyed represented only the central campus of any multi-campus institution. A total of 126 two-year technical or community colleges responded to the questionnaire which equated to an 88% response rate. Of this total, 45 institutions were identified as having a foundation. From the initial 45 foundations, 35 met the stipulated criteria and became the population for this study. The results (see Table 1) also indicate that 21 of

the 35 acceptable foundations (60%) are from the three Western Canadian Provinces of Saskatchewan (N=1), Alberta (N=11) and British Columbia (N=9).

Table 1

Questionnaire Response Rate

Province/ Territory	Number Surveyed	Number of Responses	Identified Foundations	Acceptable Foundations
British Columbia	19	19	9	9
Alberta	14	14	11	11
Saskatchewan	12	12	1	1
Manitoba	4	4	0	0
Ontario	25	22	14	9
Quebec	44	32	7	3
New Brunswick	9	8	0	0
Nova Scotia	4	4	1	1
Prince Edward Island	1	1	1	1
Newfoundland	9	8	0	0
Northwest Territories	1	1	0	0
Yukon	1	1	1	0
TOTAL	143	126	45	35

The discrepancy between the Identified Foundations and the Acceptable Foundations categories is reflected in the fact that four institutions provided insufficient analytical data, while six did not meet the stipulated criteria- specifically operating for the two academic years of 1986/87 and 1987/88.

The 12 percent of the institutions that did not respond to the initial questionnaire were contacted a minimum of two additional times. This involved a telephone

or FAX communication message, a second follow-up mail-out, and in certain cases a further telephone or FAX communication. The lowest response rate (73%) was from the Province of Quebec.

On the basis of operating more than one institution, Alberta had the highest percentage (79%) of acceptable foundations (see Table 2). British Columbia had the second highest percentage (47%) followed by Ontario (41%).

Table 2

Distribution of Acceptable Foundations

Province/ Territory	Institutions Responding	Acceptable Foundations	Percentage of Acceptable Foundations
British Columbia	19	9	47
Alberta	14	11	79
Saskatchewan	12	1	8
Manitoba	4	0	0
Ontario	22	9	41
Quebec	32	3	9
New Brunswick	8	0	0
Nova Scotia	4	1	25
Prince Edward Island	1	1	100
Newfoundland	8	0	0
Northwest Territories	1	0	0
Yukon	1	0	0
TOTAL	126	35	28

Based on the information presented in Table 2, 28% of two-year technical and community colleges in Canada have an associated, non-profit foundation that has been operating for a minimum of the two academic years 1986/87 and

1987/88. The most recent national study indicates that 62% of American community colleges have formed nonprofit foundations (Angel & Gare, 1981).

The classification of institutions associated with a non-profit foundation are presented in Table 3. The results indicate a bimodal effect involving Vocational/Technical Institutions (38%) and English Comprehensive Community Colleges (31%).

Table 4 illustrates that of the 126 institutions responding, 97 (77%) have an enrollment of less than 4000 full-time equivalent students. Only 10 (8%) of the responding institutions indicated an full-time equivalent enrollment greater than 6000 students. Of the acceptable foundations in this study, 66% are associated with institutions having enrollments less than 4000 full-time equivalent students.

An analysis of the data illustrating dollars raised per full-time equivalent student indicates that the highest overall success ratio involved an institution with an enrollment under 2000 FTE students. Institutions with an enrollment between 4000 and 5999 FTE students had the highest average success ratio. Institutions with enrollments between 2000 and 3999 FTE students had the lowest overall success ratio (see Table 5).

Table 3

Foundations Related to Type of Institution

Type of Institution	Number of Respondents	Acceptable Foundations	Percentage With Foundations
Liberal Arts	0	0	0
Vocational/ Technical	34	13	38
Comprehensive Community College (English)	58	18	31
Comprehensive Community College (French)	32	3	9
Specialized Colleges	2	1	50
Totals	126	35	

Table 4

Foundations and Institutional Enrollments

Enrollment Range (FTE)	Institutions Responding	Acceptable Foundations	Percentage By Enrollment
below 2000	45	11	31.4
2000 - 3999	52	12	34.3
4000 - 5999	19	8	22.9
6000 and above	10	4	11.4
Total:	126	35	

Table 5

Dollars Raised Based on Institutional Enrollment

Enrollment Range (FTE)	Number of Foundations	Highest Success Ratio	Lowest Success Ratio	Average Success Ratio
below 2000	11	\$365	\$45	\$182
2000 - 3999	12	\$297	\$33	\$98
4000 - 5999	8	\$318	\$119	\$226
6000 +	4	\$112	\$35	\$63
Total:	35			

Demographic Profile

Five survey questions were designed to ascertain the demographic characteristics of the two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada. Results indicate that 57% of the institutions, with acceptable foundations, have at least Some involvement of the college staff and faculty in foundation activities. Cumulatively, 43% of the sample foundations indicate a Moderate (29%) to High (14%) involvement of college staff and faculty in foundation activities (see Table 6).

The concept of influential community members comprising the foundation board of directors refers to the presence of individuals who have the power to produce an effect by indirect means. Of the institutions with a board of directors (see Table 7), 90% felt that the overall level of influential community power within their foundation board was either Moderate (55%) or High (35%).

Table 6

Level of Staff and Faculty Involvement

Involvement Level	Response Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	0	0.0	0.0
Some	20	57.1	57.1
Moderate	10	28.6	85.7
High	5	14.3	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 7

Distribution of Foundation Board Influential Power

Influential Power Level	Response Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	0	0.0	0.0
Some	3	10.3	10.3
Moderate	16	55.2	65.5
High	10	34.5	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Diversity of community members within the foundation board refers to the overall composition of the board in terms of how representative it is of the socio-economic, gender, and ethnic components of the college district. Eighty-six percent of the sample foundations, with a board of directors, indicated that they had a Moderate (62%) or High (24%) level of community diversity within the membership structure of the board (see Table 8).

Table 8

Level of Foundation Board Diversity

Diversity Level	Response Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	0	0.0	0.0
Some	4	13.8	13.8
Moderate	18	62.1	75.9
High	7	24.1	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

The most common size of a two-year technical or community college foundation board in Canada (see Table 9) is 13-15 members (38%). The second most common size of foundation board is 10-12 members (24%). Only one foundation (3%) had a board of directors that exceeded 18 members.

Table 9

Distribution of the Foundation Board Size

Size of Board	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Under 10	5	17.2	17.2
10-12	7	24.1	41.4
13-15	11	37.9	79.9
16-18	5	17.2	96.9
Over 18	1	3.4	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Based on the results of this study, no foundation in Canada has been established for 10 or more years (see Table

10). However, 80% of the identified foundations have been established within the last six years. This supports the conclusions of American researchers that foundations in two-year colleges are a recent phenomenon (Sharron, 1982, Degerstedt, 1979, Johnson, 1986).

Table 10

Distribution of Foundations by Age

Foundation Age	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Developmental	0	0.0	0.0
1-3 years	15	42.9	42.9
4-6 years	13	37.1	80.0
7-9 years	7	20.0	100.0
10+ years	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Structural Profile

The results obtained indicate that 86% of the foundations have a college employee who is designated as the fund-raising leader within his or her institution. This compares favorably with the results of a 1986 American study by Johnson (75.8%). Of the foundations with a college employee as the designated leader (N=30), 9 (30%) indicated that the individual devotes at least 80% of their professional college responsibilities to fund-raising activities (see Table 11). Fifty-seven percent of the foundations had a designated leader who spends less than 60% of his or her college time in fund-raising activities.

Johnson (1986) reported that only 12.4% of the foundation directors in her study devote full-time to foundation activities.

Table 11

Degree of Time Devoted to Fund-Raising by the Foundation

Leader

Time to Fund-Raising	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
0 - 20%	4	13.3	13.3
21 - 40%	6	20.0	33.3
41 - 60%	7	23.3	56.7
61 - 80%	4	13.3	70.0
81 - 100%	9	30.0	100.0
No College Leader	5		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

The data indicate that 17% of the foundations were led by an individual with No specific training in the area of fund-raising (see Table 12). Comparatively, 17% of the foundations were led by an individual with a High degree of training in fund-raising activities. Sixty-one percent of the foundations indicated that their leader had Some (27%) to a Moderate (34%) degree of training in the area of fund-raising.

Eighty-three percent of the foundations in this study indicated a Moderate (30%) to High (53%) level of fund-raising communication between the foundation leader and the college president (see Table 13).

The level of fund-raising related communication between the foundation leader and the chair of the foundation board was indicated as High in 68% of the foundations in this study (see Table 14). Two of the foundations in this study, with boards of directors, indicated that they did not have an individual acting as an official chairperson (see Table 14).

Table 12

Training of the Foundation Leader

Level of Training	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	5	16.7	16.7
Some	8	26.7	43.3
Moderate	12	34.3	83.3
High	5	16.7	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
No College Leader	5		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 13

Level of Fund-Raising Related Communication Between the College President and the Foundation Leader

Level of Communication	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	0	0.0	0.0
Some	2	6.7	6.7
Moderate	9	30.0	36.7
High	16	53.3	90.0
Extreme	3	8.6	100.0
No College Leader	5		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 14

Level of Fund-Raising Related Communication Between the
Foundation Board Chairperson and the Foundation

Leader

Level of Communication	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	0	0.0	0.0
Some	1	3.6	3.6
Moderate	5	17.9	21.5
High	19	67.8	89.3
Extreme	3	10.7	100.0
No College Leader	5		
No Chairperson	2		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

An agenda of planned fund-raising implies that the foundation has a systematic method for selecting its program of activities. This process would include the involvement of the college president and chairperson of the foundation board. Moreover, such a system would include a program that is responsive to the college mission and goal statements. The results indicate that 43% of the foundations have a Moderate level of program planning, while 40% indicated a High level of program planning (see Table 15).

The use of volunteers for foundation fund-raising activities references individuals offering their services freely and without pay; therefore, these people need not come from within the college. The results indicate a comparatively balanced distribution of volunteer use

between the Some (34%), Moderate (26%), and High (31%) levels (see Table 16).

Table 15

Degree of Fund-Raising Planning by the Foundation

Level of Planning	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	1	2.9	2.9
Some	5	14.3	17.1
Moderate	15	42.9	60.0
High	14	40.0	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 16

Use of Volunteers by the Foundation

Level of Volunteer Use	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	2	5.7	5.7
Some	12	34.3	40.0
Moderate	9	25.7	65.7
High	11	31.4	97.1
Extreme	1	2.9	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Operational Profile

Ten questions and subquestions were designed to determine the operational characteristics of the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada.

A clear statement of foundation purpose represented an open and regularly reviewed expression of what the

foundation is attempting to achieve, in relation to the mission and goals of the institution. Of the institutions responding to the survey instrument, 83% of the acceptable respondents (N=29) indicated that they had such a statement of purpose (see Table 17). This result is similar to the results of American studies (Degerstedt, 1979; Johnson, 1986). Of the foundations in Canada with such a statement of purpose, 28% of the respondents indicated that they reviewed the document every year. Cumulatively, 72% of all the respondents with a foundation would have reviewed their statement of purpose at least once over a three year span.

Table 17

Frequency of the Statement of Purpose Review

Frequency Of Review	Number of Institutions	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Every year	8	27.6	27.6
Every 2 years	3	10.3	37.9
Every 3 years	10	34.5	72.4
Every 4 years	3	10.3	82.7
Every 5 years	5	17.3	100.0
No statement	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Developmental activities specifically designed for foundation board members are very diverse in the two-year Canadian technical and community college foundation. Of the foundations in this study, 97% provided at least Some developmental activities to promote the awareness of the

responsibilities and roles of the foundation board members (see Table 18). In addition, 38% of the foundations provided a Moderate and 31% provided a High level of developmental activities to promote the awareness of college goals and mission statement for the foundation board members (see Table 19). Twenty-eight percent of the acceptable respondents indicated that a High level of attempt is made to encourage and promote the inclusion of foundation board members in the multitude of activities within the college. Fifty-one percent indicated that Some (48%) to No (3%) attempt was made to involve the foundation board in college activities (see Table 20). A recent national study in the United States (Johnson, 1986) indicated more than one-half of the foundations (53.6%) conducted developmental sessions for their board members.

Table 18

The Level of Foundation Developmental Activities Designed to Promote the Responsibilities and Roles of Foundation Board Members

Level of Promotion	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	1	3.4	2.9
Some	14	48.4	51.8
Moderate	13	44.8	96.6
High	1	53.3	90.0
Extreme	0	3.4	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 19

Level of Developmental Activities to Promote the CollegeGoals and Mission to the Foundation Board

Level of Promotion	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	1	3.4	3.4
Some	8	27.5	30.9
Moderate	11	38.0	68.9
High	9	31.1	100.0
Extreme	0	0.0	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 20

Level of Activities to Incorporate the Foundation Boardin Overall College Activities

Level of Incorporation	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	1	3.4	3.4
Some	14	48.3	51.7
Moderate	5	17.4	69.1
High	8	27.5	96.6
Extreme	1	3.4	100.0
No Board	6		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Of the 35 acceptable respondents in this study, 74% indicated that their institution had an active alumni association. The involvement of the alumni association in the various fund-raising activities was, however, minimal. Ten acceptable respondents (37%) indicated that the alumni association had No part in fund-raising (see Table 21),

while 14 (52%) indicated that the alumni association had only Some involvement in fund-raising activities. Further, 9% of the respondents indicated that the alumni association played only a Moderate (3%), High (3%), or Extreme (3%), role in fund-raising activities. This result opposes the Canadian study completed by Havard (1975) that concluded that the alumni association was a significant factor in two-year college fund-raising.

Table 21

Level of Alumni Association Involvement in Foundation
Fund-Raising Activities

Level of Involvement	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	10	37.0	37.0
Some	14	51.9	88.9
Moderate	1	2.9	92.9
High	1	2.9	96.3
Extreme	1	2.9	100.0
No Association	8		
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Eighty-six percent of the acceptable foundations in this study were associated with at least one professional fund-raising or public relations organization. Sixty percent of the foundations belonged to either 2 or 3 organizations, while only 3% belonged to more than 3 such organizations. Only 14% of the acceptable foundations did not belong to any such professional organizations (see Table 22).

Table 22

Level of Professional Affiliation of the Foundation

Level of Affiliation	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
None	5	14.3	14.3
1 Group	8	22.9	37.1
2 Groups	13	37.1	74.3
3 Groups	8	22.9	97.1
3+ Groups	1	2.9	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Organizational Profile

Three questions were asked to determine the organizational characteristics of the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada.

The data indicated that 54% of the foundations are equally balanced between short term and long term activities (see Table 23). Short term projects are those that usually conclude in one academic year or less.

Of the 35 acceptable respondents in this study, 80% indicated that they Never use the services of outside, professional fund-raising organizations (see Table 24). This result is consistent with similar results in the United States (Luck & Tolle, 1978; Johnson, 1986). The degree of the allocation of foundation funds for "seed" or "up-front" money is indicated in Table 25. Seventy-four percent of the respondents indicated that they Somewhat (40%) or Often (34%) allocate this type of money.

Table 23

Variety of Long and Short Term Foundation Projects

Variety of Projects	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
All Short	8	22.9	22.9
High Short/Low Long	6	17.1	40.0
Equal Balance	19	54.3	94.3
High Long/Low Long	2	5.7	100.0
All Long	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 24

Degree of Use of Outside Fund-Raising Professionals

Degree of Outside Use	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	28	80.0	80.0
Somewhat	6	17.1	97.1
Often	1	2.9	100.0
Usually	0	0.0	100.0
Always	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 25

Degree of Seed Money Use by the Foundation

Seed Money Use	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Never	3	8.6	8.6
Somewhat	14	40.0	48.6
Often	12	34.2	82.9
Usually	4	11.4	94.3
Always	2	5.7	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Assets and Expenditures Profile

Based on the top two origins of gifts, donations, and revenue received by an acceptable foundation, 74% indicated that local business and industry were either their number one (43%) or number two (31%) source of assets. Fifty-one percent indicated that national corporations were either their number one (26%) or number two (26%) source of assets. College sources are indicated as the major origin of foundation assets in 12% of the acceptable cases, including 6% that rely on the college staff as the number one resource (see Tables 26 and 27). These results are consistent with similar studies undertaken in the United States (Silvera, 1974; Degerstedt, 1979; Johnson, 1986).

Table 26

Number One Source of Gifts, Donations, and Revenue

Source	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
College Alumni	1	2.9	2.9
College Board	0	0.0	2.9
College Faculty	1	2.9	5.7
College Staff	2	5.7	11.4
Foundation Board	0	0.0	11.4
Foundation Staff	1	2.9	14.3
Local Business/Industry	15	42.9	57.1
National Corporations	9	25.7	82.9
Non-College Individuals	2	5.7	88.6
Other Foundations	0	0.0	88.6
Service Clubs	2	5.7	94.3
Other	2	5.7	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

The Other sources of assets, in Table 26, were specified as provincial government contributions in the form of endowments and cash. It was indicated that these were not regular yearly contributions but one-time special situations.

Table 27

Number Two Source of Gifts, Donations, and Revenue

Source	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
College Alumni	1	2.9	2.9
College Board	0	0.0	2.9
College Faculty	3	8.6	11.4
College Staff	2	5.7	17.1
Foundation Board	0	0.0	17.1
Foundation Staff	1	2.9	20.0
Local Business/Industry	11	31.4	51.4
National Corporations	9	25.7	77.1
Non-College Individuals	3	8.6	85.7
Other Foundations	3	8.6	94.3
Service Clubs	2	5.7	100.0
Other	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Based on the two most frequent types of gifts, donations, and revenue, 91% of the useable cases indicated that Cash was either their number one (80%) or number two (11%) type of accumulation (see Tables 28 29). Eighty percent indicated that Equipment was either their number one (14%) or number two (66%) type of gift, donation, or revenue. Excluding the categories of cash and equipment, only Bequests was indicated as both a number one (6%) and number two (11%) type of gift, donation, or revenue. Land

was indicated as the number two source of gifts, donations, and revenue in one institution. These results are similar to the findings of Bremer and Elkins (1965), but Sharron (1982) reported that 8 out of 12 major gifts to higher education were deferred.

Table 28

Number One Type of Gift, Donation, or Revenue

Type	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cash	28	80.0	80.0
Land	0	0.0	80.0
Trusts	0	0.0	80.0
Buildings	0	0.0	80.0
Equipment	5	14.3	94.3
Bequests	2	5.7	100.0
Stocks	0	0.0	100.0
Other	0	0.0	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Table 29

Number Two Type of Gift, Donation, or Revenue

Type	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Cash	4	11.4	11.4
Land	1	2.9	14.3
Trusts	0	0.0	14.3
Buildings	0	0.0	14.3
Equipment	23	65.7	80.0
Bequests	4	11.4	91.4
Stocks	0	0.0	91.4
Other	3	8.6	100.0
Total:	35	100.0	100.0

Correlational Analysis

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was selected to measure the relationship between the dependent variable of success and the identified independent variables as it is one of the most reliable estimates of correlation (Gay, 1987). As well, the data obtained were in a ratio or interval format further justifying the use of the Pearson r procedure (Gay, 1987).

Using the statistical tool SPSS^x Informational Analysis System (Version 3.1) individual Pearson r coefficients were created for each of the independent variables as related to the dependent variable of Success. SPSS^x calculated the r value for each of correlations. The r value was then converted to a standard score or t-Score (see Table 30). This conversion was done by subtracting the hypothesized parameter (p) from the sample statistic (r) and dividing the difference by the standard error (S_r) of the sampling distribution of the statistic (see Table 31). The resulting t-values were then assessed for significance at the .05 level based on the Table of the Distribution of t Probability (McCall, 1975). The results appear in Table 30.

Table 30

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients

Note: * = Significance at the .05 level	r Value	t-Value

Demographic Variables:		
Staff/Faculty Involvement	.4767	3.11 *
Foundation Board Community Influence	.1601	0.92
Diversity of the Foundation Board	.2364	1.41
Age of the Foundation	.4600	2.95 *
Size of the Foundation Board	.3893	2.41 *

Structural Variables:		
Presence of a Full-Time Leader	.1416	0.81
Percent of Foundation Leaders Time In Fund-Raising Activities	.2245	1.29
Training of the Foundation Leader	.1584	0.92
Communication Between the Foundation Leader and the College President	.1925	1.11
Communication Between the Foundation Leader and the Foundation Chairperson	.1647	0.92
Presence of a Planned Agenda of Fund-Raising Activities	.0643	0.34
Use of Volunteers by the Foundation	.1897	1.11

Operational Variables:		
Presence of a Statement of Purpose	-.1203	0.69
Review of the Statement of Purpose	.2527	1.47
Activities to Promote the Roles Of Foundation Board Members	.1723	0.99
Activities to Promote the Goals and Mission Statement of the College To the Foundation Board Members	.2622	1.56
Interaction of the Foundation Board in College Activities	.3164	1.92
Presence of an Alumni Association	-.1614	0.92
Alumni Involvement in the Foundation	.0674	0.35
Foundation Professional Affiliations	.4282	2.69 *

Organizational Variables:		
Ratio of Long and Short Term Projects by the Foundation	.1942	1.11
Degree of Outside Professional Help Used by the Foundation	-.1834	1.10
Use of Seed Money by the Foundation	.0651	0.34
=====		

Table 31

Calculation of t-Values From r

$$t = \frac{r - p}{S_r} \qquad S_r = \sqrt{\frac{1 - r^2}{n-2}}$$

$$df = (N - 2) = 33$$

$$\text{Critical } t\text{-Value } (p = .05) = 2.02$$

Based on the results illustrated in Table 30, the following null hypotheses are rejected:

Demographic Hypotheses:

H0₃: There is no significant relationship between the frequency of college staff and faculty involvement in all levels of foundation activities and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

H0₄: There is no significant relationship between the chronological age of the foundation and the success of the two-year college foundation.

H0₅: There is no significant relationship between the size of the foundation governing board and the success of the two-year college foundation.

Operational Hypotheses:

H₀₁₉: There is no significant relationship between the number of affiliations with professional organizations relating to public relations and fund-raising and the success of the affiliated two-year college foundation.

Table 32 indicates both the factors that demonstrated a significant relationship with success and the specific values that were established for each of these variables using the Pearson r procedure.

Table 32

Significant Pearson r Coefficients

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	r Value
Staff/Faculty Involvement	Success	.4767
Age of the Foundation	Success	.4600
Professional Affiliations Of the Foundations	Success	.4282
Size of the Foundation Board of Governors	Success	.3893

From the results presented in Table 32, Staff and Faculty Involvement in the various fund-raising activities of the foundation has the highest correlation with the success of the foundation. This is followed by the Age of the Foundation, the number of Professional Affiliations of

the Foundation, and the Size of the Foundation Board of Governors.

Pearson product-moment statistical analysis has not been undertaken by previous researchers, thus there is little potential for comparison. Using chi square analysis, Havard (1975) and Johnson (1986) obtained different results from this study as well as from each other. The results of Duffy (1979) were oriented more to intangible results, although involvement of college personnel was determined to be a necessary component for foundation success.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Pearson product-moment correlation determines individual effects of the various independent variables with dependent variable of success. This study was also concerned with the interactive or multiple effects of these variables with success. To determine the "best" support predictors, stepwise multiple regression within the SPSS^x Information Analysis System was used.

Stepwise multiple regression is a method of determining the effects of more than one independent variable on one dependent variable using the principles of correlation and regression. Specifically, multiple regression is the process of finding a regression equation to predict a dependent variable (Y) on the basis of p

predictors ($X_1, X_2, X_3, \dots, X_p$). The stepwise technique was selected because:

It considers all variables within the data matrix and extracts the variable with the largest probability of F . The equation is then repeated without the removed variable, and the evaluation process is repeated until no more independent variables can be removed. Then, the independent variable that has the smallest probability of F and is not in the equation is entered. Next, all variables are again examined for removal. This process continues until no variables in the equation need to be removed and no variables not in the equation are eligible for entry (SPSS^x, 1986, p. 666).

The results of this statistical analysis are shown in Table 33. The Adjusted R_2 (Multiple Correlation Coefficient) is the most important value as it can be used to directly interpret accountable variation in terms of percentage (Howell, 1987).

Table 33

Multiple Regression Analysis: An Overview

Step Number	Independent Variable	Adjusted R^2	p-Value
1	Staff/Faculty Involvement	.20	.0038
2	Staff/Faculty Involvement Professional Affiliations of the Foundation	.31	.0072 .0192
3	Staff/Faculty Involvement Professional Affiliations of the Foundation Age of the Foundation	.39	.0224 .0257 .0277

The complete data output for the final step of the multiple regression analysis is outlined in Table 34.

The multiple regression equation that has been established using the obtained data (see Table 34) would account for 39% of the success factor in a Canadian two-year technical or community college foundation. This figure is based on the Adjusted R Square value.

Table 34

Multiple Regression Analysis: A Detailed Review of Step Three

Multiple R	.66793
R Square	.44613
Adjusted R Square	.39253
Standard Error	81.35363

Analysis of Variance

	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square
Regression	3	165260.73204	55086.91068
Residual	31	205170.81082	6618.41325

F = 8.32328 Significant F = .0003

Variables in the Equation

Variable	B	SE B	Beta	t	Sig t
SFI	47.497300	19.763617	.336308	2.403	.0224
AFFD	31.662674	13.451331	.321413	2.354	.0251
AGE	39.103635	16.930574	.322159	2.310	.0277
(Constant)	-166.139477	64.981168		-2.557	.0157

End Block Number PIN = .050 Limits Reached

=====

As previously outlined, the model for a multiple regression equation is:

$$Y_{\text{SUCCESS}} = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \dots + B_PX_P + e$$

Based on this model, the resulting multiple regression equation designed to predict the success of a two-year technical or community college foundation in Canada is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SUCCESS} = & -166 + 47.5 \text{ (Staff/Faculty Involvement) } + \\ & 31.7 \text{ (Professional Affiliations) } + \\ & 39.1 \text{ (Age of the Foundation) } \pm 81.4 \end{aligned}$$

Multiple regression has not been used as a research technique by any of the researchers in the two-year college foundation area. As such, little supportive or confirmational data is available. The results do, however, provide the potential for further study and assessment.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter of the study is presented in the following format:

1. Summary of the research.
2. Selected findings and conclusions of the study.
3. Recommendations for further action and research.

Summary

One potential strategy designed to offset the financial restraint imposed on the Canadian two-year technical or community college lies with the formation of an educational foundation.

A review of related literature revealed numerous studies of developmental programs and foundation activities associated with American junior and community colleges. Only one previous study (Havard, 1975) has been undertaken that addresses the Canadian two-year college foundation. Based on these factors, this study appeared to be particularly appropriate and timely considering the major growth and development of the Canadian two-year college system since the early 1970s.

This study was designed to contribute data on foundations affiliated with Canadian two-year technical and community colleges through assessing earlier work in the

field, updating base-line data with a current appraisal, and providing statistically significant recommendations concerning factors that contribute to the success of the foundation. A national study of Canadian two-year technical and community college foundations was conducted to address this problem.

Specifically, the study had as its purpose: (1) to review the existing research related to the success, the productivity, and the characteristics of two-year college foundations; (2) to identify demographic, structural, operational, and organizational factors which are related to the success of a Canadian two-year college foundation; (3) to develop a research methodology, including an appropriate instrument, for determining the characteristics, productivity and success of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada; (4) to administer the instrument to a population of all two-year technical and community colleges in Canada; (5) to provide a descriptive analysis of the philanthropic activities within two-year technical and community colleges in Canada; (6) to utilize the data as a statistical basis for the determination of significant relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable of success using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient procedure; and (7) to utilize the data as a statistical basis for the calculation of a regression

equation designed to predict the success of a Canadian two-year technical or community college foundation.

Selected Findings

Objective 1:

To review the existing research related to the success, the productivity, and the characteristics of two-year college foundations.

The review of related literature was conducted in the areas of the evolution of the community college; the establishment of higher education in Canada; the evolution of the Canadian community college; the community college movement in Canada; community college issues; nonprofit foundations as a financial solution; and the nonprofit foundation in the two-year college. Among the major issues that were revealed in this review were:

1. The origin of the community college movement can be traced to alterations and reforms within the American system of education. William Rainey Harper is credited with establishing the two-year college movement with the creation of Joliet Junior College, Joliet, Illinois, in 1901.
2. The College de Quebec, founded by the Jesuits in 1635, is considered to be the first institution of higher learning in Canada. The first English-language institution of higher learning was King's

College established in 1799 at Windsor, Nova Scotia.

3. In 1934, there were 11 junior colleges in Canada. The influence of the American community college movement provided a pattern for the evolution of the first Canadian community college. The need and desire to train more Canadian technicians and a variety of federal governmental incentives also provided the impetus for the development of the community college movement.
4. In 1957, the Canadian public community college movement was established with the formation of Lethbridge Junior College in Lethbridge, Alberta. Today, the Association of Canadian Community Colleges includes over 140 institutions.
5. A major concern within today's community college is the issue of credibility and excellence. The issue of funding is fast becoming a major North American concern embracing all postsecondary education. The issue of alternative funding is complicated by an expanding community college mandate.
6. The establishment of a nonprofit foundation affiliated with an educational institution is advocated as one approach to financial constraint.
7. Only one study has been conducted in Canada that assessed the two-year college development programs.

The majority of research concerning two-year college foundations has been conducted in the United States. From the literature reviewed, 22 independent variables were identified as having a potential relationship with the dependent variable of success of the community college foundation.

Objective 2:

To identify demographic, structural, operational, and organizational factors which are related to the success of a two-year college foundation;

Independent Variables: Demographic

1. The foundation governing board includes a degree of diversity of community leaders.
2. The foundation governing board includes a level of influential community members.
3. The foundation involves community college staff and faculty in all levels of foundation activities.
4. The number of members that compose the foundation governing board.
5. The chronological age of the foundation.

Independent Variables: Structural

6. The percentage of time devoted to the foundation

by the college employee designated as the fund-raising leader.

7. The number of years of formal fund-raising training associated with the foundation leader.
8. The degree of communication related to fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the college president.
9. The degree of communication related to fund-raising planning between the foundation leader and the chair of the foundation board of governors.
10. The level of a planned agenda for fund-raising that involves the president of the college.
11. The level use of volunteer groups for fund-raising.

Independent Variables: Operational

12. The existence of a clear statement of purpose for the foundation.
13. The frequency of review of a clear statement of purpose for the foundation.
14. The degree of opportunity available to the members of the foundation governing board to become aware of its roles and responsibilities.
15. The degree of opportunity available to the members of the foundation governing board to become aware of the institutional goals and mission statement.

16. The level of attempt to involve the foundation governing board in the various activities of the institution.
17. The presence of a college alumni association.
18. The level of involvement of a college alumni association in the fund-raising activities of the foundation.
19. The number of affiliations with professional organizations relating to public relations and fund-raising.

Independent Variables: Organizational

20. The degree that the programs and activities established allow for various types of fund-raising activities: including both short term and long term projects.
21. The frequency of obtaining the services of a professional fund-raising organization for special project management.
22. The frequency of the allocation of funds for the specific purpose of generating more funds.

Objective 3:

To develop a research methodology, including an appropriate instrument, for determining the characteristics,

productivity and success of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada;

The survey instrument--including characteristics associated with the success of a non-profit foundation affiliated with a Canadian two-year public or technical college--was developed using a variety of survey instruments involved in previous studies, conducting a review of the literature, and seeking the recommendations of a select group of foundation officers within the Province of Alberta community college system. The survey procedures were conducted using Dillman's recommendations for the total design method of descriptive research. The population of this study involved all the two-year technical and community colleges that are members of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges and appear in the Canadian Education Association Handbook.

Objective 4:

To administer the instrument to a population of all two-year technical and community colleges in Canada;

The questionnaire was sent to 143 two-year technical or community colleges in Canada. The population represented only the central campus of any multi-campus institution.

Objective 5:

To provide a descriptive analysis of the philanthropic activities within two-year technical and community colleges in Canada;

Based on the modal values of the frequency distributions associated with the independent variables of this study, the following results portray the typical two-year technical or community college foundation in Canada.

A two-year technical or community college foundation in Canada most frequently:

1. Is associated with 28% of the two-year technical or community colleges in Canada;
2. Is located in the Western Provinces of Canada (60%), particularly in the Province of Alberta (31%);
3. Is associated with either a Vocational/Technical institution (38%) or an English Comprehensive Community College (31%);
4. Is associated with an institution with a population of less than 4000 FTE enrollment (66%);
6. Has the highest overall average success ratio related to dollars per full-time equivalent in an institution with 4000-5999 FTE students;
7. Has been established within the last 6 years (80%);

8. Has Some involvement by the Faculty and Staff of the associated institution (57%);

9. Has a foundation board of governors (83%);

10. Has a Moderate (55%) to High (35%) degree of influence among the membership of the foundation board of governors;

11. Has a Moderate (62%) degree of diversity among the members of the foundation board of governors;

12. Has a foundation board of governors with between 13 and 17 members;

13. Has a full-time college employee designated as the fund-raising leader within the institution (86%);

14. Has a full-time college employee who leads the foundation and devotes over 60% of his or her time to fund-raising activities (43%);

15. Has a full-time college employee as the foundation leader with a Moderate degree of training in fund-raising (34%).

16. Has a High degree of communication between the foundation leader and the president of the college (53%);

17. Has a High degree of communication between the foundation leader and the chairperson of foundation board of directors (68%);

18. Has a statement of purpose (83%) that is reviewed at least every 3 years (72%);

19. Has an agenda of fund-raising activities that is Moderately (43%) to Highly (40%) planned;

20. Has some developmental activities (48%) to the roles and responsibilities of the foundation board members;

21. Has a Moderate level of developmental activities (38%) designed to promote the college goals and mission to the foundation board members;

22. Has Some activities (48%) designed to involve the foundation board members in the overall schema of college activities;

23. Has an alumni association (74%) with Some (52%) involvement in fund-raising activities;

24. Being affiliated with 2 (37%) or 3 (23%) fund-raising or public relations associations;

25. Being involved in an equal balance of both short and long term projects (54%);

26. Has never used the services of external, professional fund-raising organizations (80%);

27. Has Sometimes (40%) provided seed money for new fund-raising projects;

28. Has received the majority of gifts, donations, and revenue from local business and industry (43%); and

29. Has received cash as the major type of gift, donation, or revenue (80%).

Objective 6:

To utilize the data as a statistical basis for the determination of significant relationships between the independent variables and the dependent variable of success using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient procedure; and

Using the statistical tool SPSS^x Informational Analysis System (Version 3.1) individual Pearson r coefficients were created for each of the independent variables as they related to the dependent variable of success. SPSS^x calculated the r value for each of correlations. The individual correlations were then assessed for statistical significance at the 0.05 level.

Pearson r Significant Correlations

Independent Variable	Dependent Variable	r Value
Staff/Faculty Involvement	Success	.4767
Age of the Foundation	Success	.4600
Professional Affiliations of the Foundations	Success	.4282
Size of the Foundation Board of Governors	Success	.3893

The results indicate that four independent variables have a significant relationship with the success of a Canadian two-year technical or community college

foundation. These variables are: (1) Staff/Faculty Involvement; (2) Age of the Foundation; (3) Professional Affiliations of the Foundation; and (4) Size of the Foundation Board.

Objective 7:

To utilize the data as a statistical basis for the creation of a regression equation designed to predict the success of a Canadian two-year technical or community college foundation.

To determine the regression equation, stepwise multiple regression within the SPSS^x Information Analysis System was used.

Stepwise Multiple Regression Results

Step Number	Independent Variable	Adjusted R ²	p-Value
1	Staff/Faculty Involvement	.20	.0038
2	Staff/Faculty Involvement Professional Affiliations of the Foundation	.31	.0192
3	Staff/Faculty Involvement Professional Affiliations of the Foundation Age of the Foundation	.39	.0224 .0257 .0277

The results of this statistical analysis indicate that three independent variables interact to give the best

prediction of success in the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada.

The multiple regression equation that has been established using the obtained data would account for 39% of the success factor in a Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation.

The model used for multiple regression analysis is:

$$Y_{\text{success}} = B_0 + B_1X_1 + B_2X_2 + \dots + B_PX_P + e$$

The resulting predictive equation for foundation success was determined to be:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SUCCESS} = & -166 + 47.5 \text{ (Staff/Faculty Involvement)} + \\ & 31.7 \text{ (Professional Affiliations)} + \\ & 39.1 \text{ (Age of the Foundation)} \pm 81.4 \end{aligned}$$

Conclusions

The following conclusions may be formulated on the basis of information obtained in this investigation:

1. The majority (80%) of the Canadian two-year technical and community foundations are a relatively new phenomenon that has been established within the last six years.

This conclusion supports and reinforces the results of other researchers (Sharron 1978; Degerstedt, 1982; Johnson, 1986)

2. A two-year technical or community college non-profit foundation is associated with approximately one quarter of all such institutions in Canada.

This conclusion is in contrast with the result obtained in a national study of public, community college foundations in the United States (Angel & Gare, 1981) which concluded that 62% of the responding institutions had an established foundation.

3. There is a definite interest among Canadian two-year technical and community colleges without affiliated foundations to begin the process of developing and establishing such organizations.

This conclusion is supported by the findings of this study and various researchers in the United States who have indicated a continual increase in the development of non-profit foundations as community colleges become more established (Luck & Tolle, 1976; Sharron, 1978; Degerstedt, 1982; Angel & Gare, 1981).

4. The majority of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada are found in the Provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario respectively.

This conclusion may initially be deduced on the basis of numbers of institutions but is also based on institutional evolution. The Provinces of Alberta and British Columbia have specifically adopted the American community college model and as such would be expected to lead in the formation of affiliated foundations.

5. The Canadian two-year technical and community college foundation can expect to receive Cash as the primary gift, donation, or type of revenue with the source being Local Business and Industry.

This conclusion supports and reinforces the conclusions of other researchers (Bremer, 1965; Havard, 1975; Johnson, 1986).

6. Success--as defined by this study--of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada is most closely associated with Demographic Variables.

Specifically, the demographic variable of Staff and Faculty Involvement in the Foundation generated the highest Pearson r correlation coefficient based on the dependent criterion of success. This independent variable also demonstrated the greatest accountable variation in terms of the total variability associated with the dependent criterion of success as determined by stepwise multiple regression analysis.

7. Beyond the independent characteristics analyzed in this study, certain intangible measures appear to be involved in the success of the affiliated foundation.

This conclusion is supported by the findings of studies undertaken by Duffy (1979), Degerstedt (1982) and Johnson (1986).

Recommendations for Action

1. The success, in varying degrees, of the two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada suggests that institutions that do not presently have an affiliated foundation actively investigate the potential of creating such a program.
2. The four variables which have contributed to the success of the foundations in this study, particularly the demographic characteristic of Staff and Faculty Involvement in the Foundation, are recommended for special consideration by those college administrators considering establishing new foundations or examining the success of existing foundations.
3. Both new, developing, and established two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada are recommended to focus its fund-raising attention on Local Business and Industry.
4. The foundation leaders who are unable to provide complete reports concerning the sources of gifts, types of gifts, and designated purpose of the gifts received are recommended to make provisions for improving their information management system to better understand the strengths and weaknesses of the foundation.

Recommendations for Further Research

The status of two-year technical and community college foundations in Canada is expanding and changing as evidenced by various differences in the findings of this study, the previous Canadian study undertaken by Havard (1975), and the studies undertaken by Bremer (1965), Degerstedt (1982), Sharron (1978), Silvera (1974), Johnson (1986) and Duffy (1979).

The need for continuing research is readily apparent. Specifically:

1. Further studies designed to investigate more specifically the significance of faculty and staff involvement in foundation activities.
2. Further studies designed to compare the types of professional associations that a foundation is a member of and the effect of this membership on the success of the foundation.
3. Comparative investigations based on high- and low-performing foundations in two-year technical and community colleges in Canada.
4. Further investigations designed to add to the descriptive data of two-year technical and community colleges in Canada.

5. In-depth investigations of foundation leaders and boards of governors including their characteristics, roles, and levels of success.
6. Analytical investigations assessing the effect of new technology and information management on the effectiveness of the two-year technical and community college foundation.
7. The development of a methodology and design for the investigation of intangible factors that contribute to the success of nonprofit foundations.

If the climate of the 1980s continues, two-year technical and community colleges will become more dependent on alternative financial resources. In Canada, indications are that future provincial tax resources and federal funding will not be sufficient to maintain the present level of student access and seriously jeopardizing new student growth. As such, two-year technical and community colleges are turning to philanthropic sources of support to offset this crisis. In order to attract and maintain such support, two-year institutions are establishing affiliated educational foundations to help meet the goals and mission of their institution.

As reflected in the findings of this study, certain factors have been identified as significantly related to the dependent criterion of success within the two-year technical and community college foundation in Canada. As a

result, these factors should constitute an important part of the development process in establishing a new educational foundation. Equally as important, these factors should constitute a major area for review in the evaluation of an existing foundation.

As more agencies, associations, community groups, and other non-profit alliances become more aggressive in their fund-raising, effectiveness becomes critical. It is crucial that two-year technical and community college foundations be established on a solid base involving demographic, structural, organizational, and operational factors to facilitate the overall success of the organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Annual Report - Association of Canadian Community Colleges (1987). Toronto, Ontario: ACCC [Association of Canadian Community Colleges].
- Angel, D., & Gares, D. (1981). A bull market for foundations. Community and Junior College Journal, 52(3), 5-6.
- Beinder, F. (1983). The community college in British Columbia: The emphasis is on community. Nanaimo: Quadra Graphics.
- Bender, L. & Daniel, D. (1986). Rethinking funding strategies. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 57(1), 22-26.
- Best, J. W. (1970). Research in education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bremer, F.H. (1965). Philanthropic support for public junior colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1965). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1965, 26, 811. (University Microfilm Inc., 65-8029)
- Campbell, D. (1985). Strengthening financial management. New Directions for Community Colleges No. 50. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Campbell, G. (1971). Community colleges in Canada. Toronto: Ryerson Press, McGraw-Hill
- Clark, B. (1960). The open door college. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Cohen, A.M., & Brawer, F.B. (1982). The American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Coldeway, A. E. (1989). Using basic statistics in the behavioral sciences. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Cook, D. R. (1965). A guide to educational research. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

- Coombs, P. H. (1968). The world educational crisis: A systems analysis. New York: University Press.
- Cortada, R. & Hollingsworth, P. (1983). An investigation of characteristics of successful community college foundations. Pepperdine, CA: Pepperdine University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 233 756)
- Cross, P. K. (1981). Community college on the plateau. Journal of Higher Education, 52, 113-123.
- Crowson, J. C. (1985). Boards of directors of community college foundations: Characteristics, roles, and success. (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi). Dissertation Abstracts International. 46, 05A.
- Curti, M. E., & Nash, R. (1965). Philanthropy in the shaping of American higher education. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Deegan, W.L., Tillery, D. & Associates. (1985). Renewing the American community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Degerstedt, L. M. (1982). The strategies and perceptions of community colleges and the foundation: A national perspective. In W. H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), The community college foundation. Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Dennison, J. D. (1983). The Canadian community college in the 1980s: Strategies for survival. Canadian Journal of Education, 9(2), 139-153.
- Dennison, J. D., & Gallagher, P. (1986). Canada's community college. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Diener, T. (1986). Growth of an American invention. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (1978). Mail and telephone surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Duffy, E. (1979). Evaluative criteria for community college foundations. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1979). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1980, 40, 4371A. (University Microfilm No. 80-02, 851)

- Duffy, E. (1980). Characteristics and conditions of a successful community college foundation: A national perspective. Resource paper no. 23. Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 203 918)
- Fryer, T. W. (1986). Some tough questions about community colleges. Community, Technical, and Junior College Journal, 56(6), 18-21.
- Garrett, H. E. (1966). Statistics in psychology and education. New York: David McKay Company, Inc.
- Gay, L. R. (1987). Educational research: Competencies for analysis and application. Toronto: Merrill Publishing Company.
- Goodwin, G.L. (1973). A social panacea: A history of the community-junior college ideology. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 093 427)
- Greenberg, J. (1988). The scholar dollar war. Policy Options Politiques, 9(7), 7-10.
- Hall, J., Ryan, G. J., & Smith, N. (1987). Characteristics of excellence in community college fund raising. Paper presented at the AACJC National Convention, Dallas, Texas, April 22.
- Hargis, W. D. & Blocker, C. E. (1974). Philanthropy to junior colleges: A comparative study: 1960-63 and 1968-71. (Report No. 14). Bethesda, Maryland: Leasco Information Products, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 081 418)
- Harper, W. A. (1976). College foundations bring in the money. Change, 8(7), 48-49.
- Havard, R. J. (1975). The philanthropic support of community colleges in Canada. (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University). Dissertation Abstracts International. 36, 09A.
- Howell, D. C. (1987). Statistical methods in psychology. Boston: Duxbury Press.
- Johnson, A. W. (1985). Giving greater point and purpose to the federal financing of post-secondary education and research in Canada. Ottawa: Secretary of State.

- Johnson, J. J. (1986). A profile of selected high- and low-performing nonprofit foundations in public community, technical, and junior colleges in the United States, (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnical University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 47, 08A.
- Karabel, J. (1972). Community colleges and social stratification. Harvard Educational Review, 42, 521-562.
- Ki-es-Ki Handbook (1989). Toronto, Ontario: Canadian Education Association.
- Leslie, J. W. (1969). Focus on understanding and support: A study in college management. Washington DC: American College Public Relation's Association.
- Luck, M. F. (1974). The characteristics of foundations and fund raising in the public comprehensive two-year colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern Illinois, 1974). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 7685 A. (University Microfilm No. 75-13248).
- Luck, M. F., & Tolle, D. J. (1978). Community college development: Alternate fund-raising strategies. Indianapolis: R and R Newkirk.
- McCall, R. (1975). Fundamental statistics for psychology New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- McDowell, F.M. (1919). The junior college. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- McWhitney, E. (1982) Canada and the Constitution: 1979-1982. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Parent, A.E. (1963). Royal commission of inquiry on education in the Province of Quebec. Quebec: Government of Quebec.
- Prokopec, D. (1979). The community college: Historical roots purpose. Canadian Vocational Journal, 15(1), 12-15
- Ratcliff, J. L. (1987). "First" public junior colleges in an age of reform. Journal of Higher Education, 58(2), 151-180

- Richardson, R.C. Jr., & Leslie, L. (1980). The impossible dream: Financing community college's evolving mission. Horizon's Monograph Series, Washington DC: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 197 783)
- Robison, S. (1982). The development of the two-year college foundation and techniques of success. In W.H. Sharron, Jr. (Ed.), The community college foundation. Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Sharron, W. H., Jr. (1978). The development and organization of the community college foundation. (N.C.R.D. Resource Paper No. 18). Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Sharron, W. H., Jr. (1982). Planning and implementing the foundation. In W.H. Sharron, Jr. (ed.), The community college foundation. Washington, DC: National Council for Resource Development.
- Silvera, A. L. (1974). The design and utilization of non-profit foundations affiliated with California community colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1974, 35, 2017 A. (Univeristy Microfilm No. 74-21509).
- Sims, L. M. (1973). The college related foundation as a viable concept for resource development in Alabama. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1973). Dissertation Abstracts International, 35, 6998 A. (University Microfilm No. 75-09942).
- Sims, H. D. (1976). Private support through public support. Community and Junior College Journal, 47(2), 30-31, 51.
- Sneed, J.J. (1979). Variables associated with the effectiveness of nonprofit foundations affiliated with selected Florida public community junior colleges. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University). Dissertation Abstracts International, 1979, 40, 3075-3076A.
- Soles, A.E. (1970). Role of two-year colleges in creating a new design for post-secondary education in British Columbia. Journal of Education, 16, 21-31.
- SPSS* users guide (1986). Chicago: Marketing Department, SPSS, Inc.

- Stager, D. A. (1966). The financing of community colleges in Canada. Community colleges 1966: A national seminar on the community college in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Association of Adult Education.
- Survey of federal government expenditures in support of training and education, (1984). Ottawa, Ontario: Statistics Canada.
- Struckhoff, E. C. (1977). The handbook for community foundations: Their formation, development, and operation. New York: Council on Foundations.
- Truman, President H. (1950). Letter written by, Accession No. 63-A-23, Box 169, Record Group 12, U.S. Federal Records Center, Alexandria, VA.
- Tukey, J. W. (1977). Exploratory data analysis. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- The University of Alberta calendar: Forty third session 1950-51, (1950). Edmonton, Alberta: University of Alberta.
- U.S. President's Commission on Higher Education. (1947). Higher education for American democracy. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Vaughan, G. (1983). Issues for community college leaders in a new era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Vaughan, G. (1985). The community college in American: A short history. Alexandria, VA: The Community College Press.
- Wattenbarger, J. L., & Heck, J. (1983). Financing community colleges 1983. Institute of Higher Education, Gainesville, FL: University of Florida.
- Watts, R.L. (1986). Financing post-secondary education and research. In P. M. Leslie (Ed.), Canada: The state of the federation: 1986. Kingston, Ontario: Queen's University Institute of Intergovernmental Relations
- Woodside, W., (1958). The university question. Toronto: The Ryerson Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Example of the English Explanatory Letter


**Grant MacEwan
Community College**

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 1796 Edmonton
Alberta Canada T5J 2P2

February 1988

To: Bryan Dunleavy, Principal
Mistikwa Community College

From: Bill Mucklow
Grant MacEwan Community College

Re: Canadian Two-Year College Foundations

As a former member of the Foundation Board of Directors of Grant MacEwan Community College and a Canadian doctoral student at Oregon State University, I am currently engaged in a research project attempting to formulate a perspective of the Canadian two-year college foundation.

The specific problem is to provide a national view of the success of the two-year college foundation in Canada. It is anticipated that this data will be useful in determining trends and characteristics in Canadian community college philanthropic activities. The data will also be helpful in establishing a demographic basis for further investigation of fund-raising in Canadian two-year colleges. Please be assured that this data is strictly confidential and will only be used as part of a cumulative regression analysis.

I would be most grateful if you would complete PAGE 1 and then:

1. If you have a foundation, DIRECT the questionnaire to the appropriate individual for completion and return, or...
2. If you do not have a foundation, please return PAGE 1 in the stamped, self-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the results of this study, please include your address specifics and I will be most happy to send them to you.

Your valuable time and consideration of this request is most appreciated.

Bill Mucklow, Head
Sciences Department

Jasper Place Campus
10045 - 156 Street
T5P 2P7
(403) 483-4411

Cromdale Campus
8020 - 118 Avenue
T5B 0P8
(403) 474-8521

Mill Woods Campus
7319 - 29 Avenue
T6K 2P1
(403) 482-5501

Seventh Street Plaza Campus
10030 - 107 Street
T5J 3E4
(403) 441-4600

APPENDIX B

Example of the French Explanatory Letter



**Grant MacEwan
Community College**

Mailing Address
P.O. Box 1796, Edmonton
Alberta, Canada T5J 2P2

Fevrier, 1989

a: Clément Bernier, Dir. Général
CEGEP De Victoriaville

de: Bill Mucklow
Collège Communautaire Grant MacEwan

au sujet de: Fondation Collégial Canadien de deux ans

En étant un ancien membre du conseil d'administration des fondations du Collège Communautaire Grant MacEwan et un étudiant doctoral canadien à l'université de l'état d'Oregon, je suis couramment engagé avec un projet de recherche qui a pour but de formuler une perspective du fondation collégial canadien de deux ans.

Le problème spécifique est de fournir une vue national du succès du fondation Canadien de deux ans. Il est anticipé que ces données seront utiles pour constater les directions et caractéristiques des activités philanthropiques des collèges communautaire Canadiens. Ces données seront aussi utiles pour établir une base démographique dans le cas d'investigation futur des fonds réunis pour les collège canadien de deux ans. Soyez assuré que ces données sont strictements confidentiels et seront seulement utilisées dans l'analyse regressive totale.

Je vous serais très reconnaissant si vous compléteriez la PREMIÈRE page et ensuite:

1. Si vous avez un fonds, diriger le questionnaire à l'individuel approprié compléter et retourner.
2. Si vous n'avez pas un fonds retourner le questionnaire dans l'enveloppe fourni le plus tôt possible.

Si vous êtes intéressés à recevoir une copie des résultats de cette étude, veuillez inclure votre adresse, et se sera avec plaisir que je vous enverrais les détails.

Votre temps et considération de cette demande est apprécié.

Redacted for Privacy _____

Bill Mucklow,
Chefs du departement des sciences

Jasper Place Campus
10045 - 156 Street
T5P 2P7
(403) 483-4411

Cromdale Campus
8020 - 118 Avenue
T5B 0R8
(403) 474-8521

Mill Woods Campus
7319 - 29 Avenue
T8K 2P1
(403) 462-5501

Seventh Street Plaza Campus
10030 - 107 Street
T5J 2E4
(403) 441-4800

APPENDIX C

Letter of Support for the Study

Grant MacEwan Community College

GERALD O. KELLY PhD
President

February 15, 1989

TO: Canadian Community College Presidents

SUBJECT: The Canadian Community College Foundation: A National Study

Non profit foundations or development offices, once relatively rare in public community colleges, are being chartered at a rapidly increasing rate. Despite their growth in numbers, there is a serious lack of data on a national level about these organizations and how they operate. For example, neither the ACCC nor the Canadian Association of University and College Development Offices maintain a list of Community College Foundations.

A Grant MacEwan faculty member, who is also a doctoral candidate in the Community College Education program at Oregon State University, is attempting to collect baseline data about the Canadian Community College Foundation, specifically how they are organized and operate. This data, once analyzed, should prove both informative and useful in creating a national perspective of foundation activity in Canada.

I encourage you to direct the enclosed questionnaire to the appropriate individual at your institution requesting a prompt response to this most important issue. If your institution is not involved in this type of activity, please complete Part I and return the information as soon as possible.

When completed, the conclusions of this study will be available to your institution.

In advance, I thank you for your involvement and cooperation in this most interesting endeavor.

Yours sincerely,
Redacted for Privacy

Gerald O. Kelly /
President

APPENDIX D

English Survey Instrument

CANADIAN PUBLIC AND TECHNICAL TWO-YEAR COLLEGES
NONPROFIT FOUNDATIONS

In Canada, a community or technical two-year college foundation is defined as a nonprofit, charitable organization created for the exclusive purpose of benefitting an institution within the Association of Canadian Community Colleges.

A community or technical two-year college foundation may exist in a variety of formats, but the basic premise remains clear. An associated, nonprofit college entity has been organized and developed to perform the task of fund-raising for that particular institution.

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

1. How would you classify your institution?
(You may check more than one if appropriate)

Liberal Arts College (only) _____
 Vocational-Technical College (only) _____
 Comprehensive Community College _____
 Specialized Community College _____

2. In what year was your institution founded..... _____
3. The student F.T.E. (Full Time Equivalent) enrollment for your institution over the last two years would be?
- Fall 1986 _____ Fall 1987 _____

4. Is your institution involved in some form of a fund-raising program as outlined above ?

YES _____ NO _____

If YES.....How would you classify the fund-raising program...
(you may check more than one classification)

Developmental Office _____
 Foundation Office _____
 Alumni Office _____

IF YOU ANSWERED "YES" TO QUESTION 4, PLEASE CONTINUE THE SURVEY...

IF YOU ANSWERED "NO" PLEASE RETURN THE SURVEY AS SOON AS POSSIBLE
IN THE STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE....and THANK-YOU

PART II: FACTORS RELATED TO FOUNDATION SUCCESS

NOTE: the term "foundation", in all forthcoming questions, refers to all the "fund-raising" programs identified in PART I.

(Please, CIRCLE the appropriate response to the following)

A. DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS

1. STAFF AND FACULTY INVOLVEMENT:

Estimate the level of involvement of your college staff and faculty in foundation activities?

none some moderate high extreme

2. INFLUENTIAL POWER OF FOUNDATION BOARD MEMBERS:

"Influential community members" denotes individuals who have the "power to produce an effect by indirect means".

In your estimation, what is the overall level of "influential community power" within your foundation board?

none some moderate high extreme

3. DIVERSITY OF FOUNDATION BOARD MEMBERS:

"Diversity of community members" denotes the overall composition of foundation board in terms of how representative they are of the socio-economic, gender and ethnic components within the community.

In your estimation what is the level of "diversity of community membership" within your foundation board.

none some moderate high extreme

4. AGE OF THE FOUNDATION:

Approximately how long has your foundation been in operation?

developmental 1-3 yrs 4-6 yrs 7-9 yrs 10+ yrs

5. SIZE OF THE FOUNDATION BOARD:

How many members are currently serving on your foundation board?

under 10 10-12 13-15 16-18 over 18

B. STRUCTURAL FACTORS6. FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL LEADER

- a. Does your foundation have a college employee who is the designated fund-raising leader:

YES _____ NO _____

....If you indicated NO-----> continue to Question 7

....If you indicated YES-----> please continue with Question 6

- b. In your estimation, what percentage of the foundation leaders' professional responsibilities are devoted solely to fund-raising activities?

(0-20%) (21-40%) (41-60%) (61-80%) (81-100%)

- c. In your estimation, what is the level of formal training, as a professional fund-raiser, of your foundation leader.

none some moderate high extreme

- d. In your estimation, what is the level of communication, concerning fund-raising activities, between the foundation leader and the college president.

none some moderate high extreme

- e. In your estimation, what is the level of communication, relating to fund-raising activities, between the foundation leader and the chairman of the foundation board.

none some moderate high extreme

7. PLANNED AGENDA OF FUND-RAISING:

An agenda of "planned fund-raising activities" implies that the foundation has a systematic design for selecting its program of events. This includes the involvement of the college president and chairman of the foundation board. It also includes an agenda of fund-raising activities that is responsive to the college mission and goal statements.

In your estimation, what is the level of "planning" that occurs in the process of establishing the ongoing agenda of foundation fund-raising activities.

none some moderate high extreme

8. USE OF FUND-RAISING VOLUNTEERS:

The use of "volunteers" for foundation fund-raising activities refers to "individuals offering their services freely and without pay". These groups need not necessarily come from within the college.

In your estimation, at what level does your foundation involve "volunteers" for foundation fund-raising activities?

none some moderate high extreme

C. OPERATIONAL FACTORS

9. CLEAR STATEMENT OF PURPOSE:

A "clear" statement of foundation purpose represents an "open and regularly reviewed expression" of what the foundation is attempting to achieve, in relation to the mission and goals of the institution.

- a. Does your foundation have such a "statement of purpose"?

YES _____ NO _____

....If you indicated NO-----> continue to Question 10

....If you indicated YES-----> please continue with Question 9

- b. In your estimation, to what degree is your "statement of purpose" regularly reviewed and appropriately revised?

every 5 years	every 4 years	every 3 years	every 2 years	every year
------------------	------------------	------------------	------------------	---------------

10. DEVELOPMENT OF FOUNDATION BOARD MEMBERS:

A foundation governing board "that is aware of its roles and responsibilities" would be typified by the presence of an orientation program for new board members, ongoing programs that communicate changing goals and priorities within the college and regular attempts to incorporate board members in the multitude of activities within the institution.

- a. In your estimation, what level of developmental activity occurs to promote the "awareness of responsibilities and roles" of the foundation board members.

none	some	moderate	high	extreme
------	------	----------	------	---------

- b. To what degree do the foundation board members have the opportunity to develop their awareness and knowledge of the goals and mission statement of the institution.

none	some	moderate	high	extreme
------	------	----------	------	---------

- c. In your estimation, what level of attempt is made to incorporate the college foundation board in the multitude of activities within the institution.

none	some	moderate	high	extreme
------	------	----------	------	---------

11. ALUMNI INVOLVEMENT IN FUND-RAISING:

- a. Does your college have an "alumni association"

YES _____ NO _____

....If you indicated NO-----> continue to Question 12

....If you indicated YES-----> please continue with Question 11

How would you categorize the involvement of your alumni association in the various foundation fund-raising activities?

none some moderate high extreme

12. PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATION OF THE FOUNDATION:

To what degree does your foundation maintain affiliation in professional organizations involved with fund-raising or public relations; e.g. Canadian Center For Philanthropy, Council for the Advancement and Support of Education (CASE).

none some moderate high extreme
(1 group) (2 groups) (3 groups) (3+ groups)

D. ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS

13. VARIETY OF LONG AND SHORT TERM FOUNDATION PROJECTS:

"Short Term" projects are concluded in less than 1 year while "Long Term" projects will usually carry over from year to year.

In your opinion, what is the balance of "short" and "long" term projects within your foundation fund-raising agenda.

All High Short Equal High Low All
Short Low High Balance Low Short High

14. USE OF OUTSIDE FUND-RAISING SERVICES:

In the normal operating year, to what degree does the foundation employ the services of an outside, professional fund-raising organization.

never somewhat often usually always

15. FUNDS ALLOCATED SPECIFICALLY FOR FUND-RAISING:

In the foundation operating year, to what degree are foundation funds allocated for the specific purpose of generating more funds? This would include funds for advertising an activity, "seed" money or "up-front" money.

never somewhat often usually always

PART III: FOUNDATION ASSETS and EXPENDITURES

1. MAJOR SOURCES OF GIFTS, DONATIONS and REVENUE:

Please rank the TOP FIVE sources of gifts, donations and revenue received by your foundation over the past two years.

- College Alumni _____
- College Board Members _____
- College Faculty _____
- College Staff _____
- Foundations Board Members _____
- Foundation Staff _____
- Local Business/Industry _____
- National Corporations _____
- Non-college affiliated individuals _____
- Other Foundations/Societies _____
- Service Organizations/Clubs _____
- Other _____

** If OTHER please specify and Rank _____

2. TYPES OF GIFTS, DONATIONS AND REVENUE:

Please rank the TOP FIVE types of gifts, donations and revenue received by your foundation over the past two years.

- | | | | |
|-----------|-------|-----------|-------|
| Cash | _____ | Equipment | _____ |
| Land | _____ | Bequests | _____ |
| Trusts | _____ | Stocks | _____ |
| Buildings | _____ | Other | _____ |

** If OTHER please specify and Rank _____

3. TOTAL DOLLAR ASSETS OF THE FOUNDATION:

What were the NEW ASSETS in total dollar amounts for your nonprofit foundation (cash, property, securities, equipment, endowments, etc), excluding interest income, for the following fiscal years?

1986 _____

1987 _____

4. TOTAL DOLLAR EXPENDITURES OF THE FOUNDATION:

a. Including salaries, what was the total amount of expenditures for the following fiscal years?

1986 _____ .

1987 _____ .

b. Including salaries, please indicate the three largest foundation expenditure areas for the following years:

EXPENDITURE	1986	AMOUNT	1986
=====			
1.	_____		_____
2.	_____		_____
3.	_____		_____

1.	_____		_____
2.	_____		_____
3.	_____		_____

EXPENDITURE	1987	AMOUNT	1987
=====			

1.	_____		_____
2.	_____		_____
3.	_____		_____

AGAIN...THANK-YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND MOST APPRECIATED PARTICIPATION

As previously mentioned, you can be assured that the information included within this questionnaire will remain confidential and nameless.

The data will be assessed and incorporated as part of a statistical analysis involving a regression equation. Specific amounts will not be associated with individual institutions, analyzed individually or released in any such identifiable format.

PLEASE REMEMBER, if you would like to receive the results of this study...kindly provide the necessary address information and the outcomes will be forwarded to you when available.

APPENDIX E

French Survey Instrument

COLLÈGES et CEGEPS CANADIENS OÙ IL Y A DES PROGRAMMES DE DEUX ANS
FOUNDATIONS À BUT NON LUCRATIF

Au Canada, une fondation pour un collège communautaire ou un CEGEP où il y a des programmes de deux ans, est une organisation charitable, sans profit ayant comme but de profiter un institution parmi l'Association des collèges communautaires du Canada.

Une fondation pour un collège communautaire ou un CEGEP ou il y a des programmes de deux ans, peut avoir différentes formes, mais la prémisses de base demeure claire. Une entité pour un collège uni, à but non lucratif fût organisée et développée pour représenter la tâche de pour une certaine institution.

PARTIE I: INFORMATION GÉNÉRALE

1. Comment classifierez-vous votre institution?
(Si approprié, cochez plus qu'un)

Collège des arts libéraux (seulement) _____
 CEGEP (seulement) _____
 Collège Communautaire (comprehensif) _____
 Collège Communautaire (specialise) _____

2. Durant les deux dernières années, quel était l'enregistrement (P.T.E.) des étudiants?

Automne 1986 _____ Automne 1987 _____

3. Est-ce que votre institution a un programme quelconque de réunir des fonds par subscription comme indiqué ci-dessus?

Oui _____ Non _____

Si oui.....comment classifierez-vous votre programme...

Comme (plus qu'un peut être cocher)

Bureau du développement _____
 Bureau de la fondation _____
 Bureau des anciens étudiants _____

SI VOUS AVEZ RÉPONDU "OUI" À LA QUESTION 3, S'IL VOUS PLAÎT REMPLIR...

SI VOUS AVEZ RÉPONDU "NON", S'IL VOUS PLAÎT RETOURNER CET ÉTUDE LE PLUS TÔT POSSIBLE DANS L'ENVELOPE À MON NOM ET ADRESSE...MERCI

PARTIE II: FACTEURS QUI ONT RAPPORT AU SUCCÈS DE LA FONDATION

NOT!: Le terme "fondation" dans les prochaines questions, réfère aux programmes de reunir des fonds par suscription indentifier dans la PARTIE I.

{Encercler la bonne réponse dans ce qui suit s'il vous plaît}

A. FACTEURS DÉMOGRAPHIQUES

1. PARTICIPATION DU PERSONNEL ENSEIGNANT ET DE LA FACULTÉ:

Donner une évaluation du niveau de participation du personnel enseignant et de la faculté de votre college vis-à-vis les activités de la fondation?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

2. INFLUENCE DES MEMBRES DU COMITÉ DE LA FONDATION:

"Influence des membres de la communauté" indique les individus qui ont "le pouvoir de produire un effet a l'aide de manières indirectes".

Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau du "pouvoir de l'influence de la communauté" parmi le comité de la fondation?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

3. DIVERSITÉ DES MEMBRES DU COMITÉ DE LA FONDATION:

"Diversité des membres de la communauté" indique la composition du comité de la fondation c'est-à-dire comment ils sont représentatifs au point de vue des composants socio-économique, éthique et genre parmi la communauté.

Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau de "diversité des membres de la communauté" parmi le comité de la fondation?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

4. AGE DE LA FONDATION:

Votre fondation existe depuis combien d'années?

Stage de développement 1-3 ans 4-6 ans 7-9 ans 10+ ans

5. GRANDEUR DU COMITÉ DE LA FONDATION:

Combien de membres participe au comité de la fondation?

10 ou moins 10-12 13-15 16-18 18 et plus

B. FACTEURS STRUCTURALS

6. CHEF PROFESSIONNEL À PLEIN TEMPS:

- a. Est-ce que votre fondation à un employé du collège nommé chef de reunir des fonds par suscription:

OUI _____ NON _____

...Si NON ----> répondez à la question 7

...Si OUI ----> s'il vous plait, continue à repondre question 6

- b. Dans votre évaluation, quel pourcentage des responsabilités des chefs professionnels de la fondation est totalement dévoué aux activités de reunir des fonds par suscription?

(0-20%) (21-40%) (41-60%) (61-80%) (81-100%)

- c. Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau d'entrâvnement, comme de reunir des fonds par suscription professionnel, est-ce que le chef de votre fondation possède-t-il?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

- d. Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau de communication entre le chef de la fondation et le président du collège, concernant les activités de reunir des fonds par suscription?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

- e. Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau de communication entre le chef de a fondation et le président du comite de la fondation, concernant les activités de reunir des fonds par suscription?

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

7. L'ORDRE DU JOUR POUR LES ACTIVITÉS DE REUNIR DES FONDS PAR SUSCRPTION:

L'ordre du jour pour "les activités de reunir des fonds par suscription" implique la fondation a un plan méthodique pour choisir le programme d'évènements. Ceci indus la participation du président du collège et du chef du comité de la fondation. Aussi inclus est l'ordre du jour pour les activités de reunir des fonds par suscription qui est en response à la mission du collège et des déclaration de but.

Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau "d'organisation" pour établir l'ordre du jour des activités de reunir des fonds par suscription pour la fondation.

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

8. PARTICIPATION DES VOLONTAIRES:

La participation des "volontaires" vis-à-vis les activités de reunir des fonds par suscription pour la fondation veut dire "des individus offrant leurs services sans frais". Les groupes ne sont pas nécessairement du collège.

Dans votre évaluation, à quel niveau est-ce que les volontaires participent aux activités de reunir des fonds par suscription pour la fondation.

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional

C. FACTEURS OPÉRATIONNELS

9. DÉCLARATION PRÉCISE DU BUT:

Une déclaration "précise" du but de la fondation indique "une expression que est ouverte et revue régulièrement" de ce que la fondation aimerait obtenir, par rapport à la mission et aux buts de l'institution.

- a. Est-ce qu'il existe une "déclaration du but" dans votre fondation ?

Oui _____ Non _____

..... Si non, repondez à la question #10.

..... Si oui, continuez à répondre la question #9.

- b. Dans votre évaluation, à quel point est-ce que votre déclaration du but "est révisé régulièrement"?

A tout les 5 ans	A tout les 4 ans	A tout les 3 ans	A tout les 2 ans	A tout les ans
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	-------------------

10. DÉVELOPPEMENT DES MEMBRES DU COMITÉ DE LA FONDATION:

Le comité d'administration de la fondation "qui se rend compte de son rôle et de ses responsabilités" serait caractérisé comme ayant un programme d'orientation pour les nouveaux membres du comité, les programmes en cours expliquant les modifications des buts et des priorités à l'intérieur du collège et les essais d'incorporer les membres du comité dans la multitude d'activités à l'intérieur de l'institution.

- a. Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau du développement des activités afin que les membres du comité de la fondation "prennent conscience de leurs rôles et leurs responsabilités".

aucun	peu	moyenne	beaucoup	exceptional
-------	-----	---------	----------	-------------

- b. A quel point est-ce que les membres du comité de la fondation ont l'occasion de développer leur connaissance et prendre conscience des buts et de la mission de l'institution.

aucun	peu	moyenne	beaucoup	exceptional
-------	-----	---------	----------	-------------

- c. Dans votre évaluation, quel est le niveau des essais afin d'incorporer le comité de la fondation du collège dans la multitude d'activités à l'intérieur de l'institution.

aucun	peu	moyenne	beaucoup	exceptional
-------	-----	---------	----------	-------------

11. PARTICIPATION DES ANCIENS ÉTUDIANTS:

- a. Est-ce qu'il existe une "association" dans votre collège?

Si non -----> Répondez à la question #12....

Si oui -----> Continuez à répondre la question #11....

- b. Comment est-ce que la participation de votre association _____ pourrait-elle être caractérisée parmi les activités de réunir des fonds par suscription pour la fondation.

12. AFFILIATION PROFESSIONNELLE DE LA FONDATION:

- a. Jusqu'à quel point est-ce que votre fondation maintient une affiliation avec les organisations professionnelles qui sont impliquées dans réunir des fonds par suscription ou des relations publiques; par exemple, Le Centre Canadien de la Philanthropie, Le Conseil Pour Le Progres et Le Soutien de L'education.

aucun peu moyenne beaucoup exceptional
 (1 groupe) (2 groupes) (3 groupes) (3 groupes plus)

D. FACTEURS DE L'ORGANISATION

13. VARIÉTÉ DES PROJECTS DE LA FONDATION, À LONG ET COURT TERME:

Les projects à court terme sont terminés dans l'espace d'un an
 Les projects à long terme se prolongent d'année en année

D'après vous, quel est l'équilibre des projects à "court" et "long" terme a l'intérieur de l'ordre du jour de réunir des fonds par suscription de la fondation.

All Mostly Short Equal Mostly Long All
 Short Few Long Balance Few Short Long

14. SERVICES DE REUNIR DES FONDS PAR SUSCRPTION A L'EXTERIEUR:

Dans l'année opérationnelle, à quel point est-ce que la fondation utilise les services d'une organisation professionnelle a l'extérieur pour de réunir des fonds par suscription?

jamais un peu souvent généralement toujours

15. FONDS ALLOUÉS EXPLICITEMENT POUR DE REUNIR DES FONDS PAR SUSCRPTION:

Dans l'année opérationnelle de la fondation, à quel point est-ce que les fonds de la fondation sont-ils alloués pour produire plus de fonds? Ceci inclus les fonds pour la publicité d'une activité, argent "avance", etc.

jamais un peu souvent généralement toujours

PARTIE III: BIENS ET DÉPENSES DE LA FONDATION

1. SOURCES MAJEURES DES PRÉSENTS, DONNÉS ET REVENUS:

Indiquez, s'il vous plaît, les cinq meilleures sources de présents, dons et revenus recus pendant les dernières deux années par votre fondation.

Collège des anciens étudiants	_____
Collège des membres du comité	_____
Collège de la faculté	_____
Collège du personnel enseignant	_____
Membres du comité de la fondation	_____
Le personnel enseignant de la fondation	_____
Commerce local/industrie	_____
Companies commerciales à l'échelon national	_____
Individus qui ne sont pas affiliés avec le collège	_____
Autres fondations/sociétés	_____
Organisations de service/clubs	_____
Autres	_____

** S'il y en a d'autres, spécifiez s'il vous plaît

2. GENRES DE PRÉSENTS, DONNÉS ET REVENUS:

Indiquez, s'il vous plaît, les cinq meilleurs genres de présents, dons et revenus recus pendant les dernières deux années par votre fondation.

Argent	_____	Équipement	_____
Terrain	_____	(Bequests)??	_____
Fonds	_____	Fonds Publiques	_____
Édifices	_____	Autres	_____

** S'il y en a d'autres, spécifiez s'il vous plaît

3. SOMME DES BIENS DE LA FONDATION:

Quelle était la somme des nouveaux biens pour votre fondation à but non-lucratif (argent, propriété, titres, équipement, etc) excluant revenu d'intérêt, pour les années budgétaires qui suivent?

1986 _____

1987 _____

4. SOMME DES DÉPENSES DE LA FONDATION:

- a. Quelle était la somme totale des dépenses pour les années budgétaires qui suivent, salaires inclus?

1986 _____

1987 _____

- b. Indiquez, s'il vous plaît, les trois plus grandes dépenses de la fondation pour les années qui suivent, salaires inclus:

DÉPENSES POUR L'ANNÉE 1986	MONTANT POUR L'ANNÉE 1986
=====	

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

DÉPENSES POUR L'ANNÉE 1987	MONTANT POUR L'ANNÉE 1987
=====	

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

MERCI BEAUCOUP POUR VOTRE PARTICIPATION ET VOTRE TEMPS. J'EN SUIS TRÈS RECONNAISSANT

Tel que déjà mentionné, je vous assure que l'information inclus dans ce questionnaire demeurera inconnu et confidentiel.

L'information sera évaluée et incorporée dans une analyse de statistique comprenant une equation de régression. Des montants spécifiques ne seront pas associés avec des institutions individuelles, analysés individuellement ou faire paraître dans un format indentifiable.

S'il vous plaît, n'oubliez pas, si vous aimeriez recevoir les résultats de cette étude...veuillez me fournir votre adresse et les résultats vous seront parvenus lorsqu'ils seront disponibles.