

ratings for the individual respondents. The "is" and "should be" ratings for the total University Community for each goal area were also computed in the same manner. The degree of importance of each goal area as perceived by the total Community and by each of the five sub-groups was thus indicated by the magnitude of the average ratings. The twenty goal areas could be ranked from most to least important for the total community and for the individual sub-groups according to the magnitude of the average ratings.

Findings

The "is" and "should be" profiles of the total University Community have been presented in Figure 1. These profiles are based on the average ratings of the total sample (N = 424) for the 13 outcome goals and the seven process goals. A comparison of the two profiles enables one to examine visually the extent of discrepancy between the importance of the goal areas as they are perceived to exist by the respondents ("is" profile) and as they would like them to exist ("should be" profile). Some degree of discrepancy between "is" and "should be" profiles would almost exist always unless the members of a university community feel that the importance of the existing objectives at the university are exactly the way they should be. The discrepancy between the two profiles, however, will vary from one university to another. The profiles presented here, are not too difficult from those of the five sub-groups and thus should generally reflect the attitudes of the different segments of the University Community toward the University goals.

The greatest discrepancy between "is" and "should be" is found in the area of Individual and Personal Development. The respondents felt this goal was given a low priority at present while it should be given high priority in any future planning. The discrepancies between "is" and "should be" were similarly high in such areas as Intellectual Orientation, Community and Humanism/Altruism. Discrepancies were also high in Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment, Democratic Governance, Public Service, Innovation, Vocational Preparation and Meeting Local Needs in the order they are listed here. On the other hand, discrepancies were very low for Traditional Religiousness and Accountability/Efficiency.

Photo by G. Coffin



**Discussion On The Complete Report
Tuesday March 25 8:00 P.M. Duffy**

iciency. Traditional Religiousness was felt to be of no importance at the University at present and the respondents thought it should be of low importance in the future. Accountability/Efficiency is felt to be of medium importance in the future. Accountability/Efficiency is felt to be of medium importance both at present and in the future.

Academic Development, Research, and Advanced Training the three major goals of universities - showed relatively small discrepancies between "is" and "should be" ratings in the present survey. Academic Development was perceived to be of medium importance both in terms of "is" and should be. Both Research and Academic Development were perceived to be of low importance at present and of medium importance as a future goal. It is surprising that the respondents in general put relatively low emphasis on these three major goals.

Figure 2 provides a

comparison of the "should be" profiles for the faculty and the fulltime students in which the differences between the two groups comes into focus. Compared to the faculty the fulltime students wanted somewhat less emphasis on Intellectual Orientation, and Cultural and Aesthetic Awareness but more emphasis on almost everything else. The fulltime students put a slightly greater emphasis on research than the faculty.

Table 1 shows the ranking of the 20 goal areas according to perceived importance and priority by the total community and by the five sub-groups. The figures in parentheses show the ranks of the goal-areas when all 20 goals are considered together. The rank of each goal-area was based on its average "should be" rating plus the discrepancy between "is" and "should be" ratings. In other words, the ranking of the goal areas in this manner reflects both what the respondents want the

University to accomplish (the "should be" ratings) and how far the University has to go to get there (the "should be is" discrepancy).

INTERPRETATION

The objectives of this survey was to provide information regarding how the members of the University Community as well as the five sub-groups perceive the importance and priorities of the 20 goal areas. There is more than enough material in the findings to provide a basis for further deliberations and discussions to plan for the future of the University. The challenge that the members of the Objectives Committee as well as the members of the University Community now face is that of operationalizing these goals so that they can be put into action.

Research Sub-Committee
Satadal Dasgupta Chairman
Harry Love
Richard St. Jean

Table 1

RANKING OF GOAL AREAS IN TERMS OF IMPORTANCE BY TOTAL UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AND THE 5 SUB-GROUPS

OUTCOME GOALS	TOTAL UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY	ADMINISTRATION	FACULTY	FULLTIME STUDENTS	PARTTIME STUDENTS	ALUMNI
Individual Personal Development	1 (1)*	2 (3)	2 (4)	1 (1)	1 (1)	1 (1)
Intellectual Orientation	2 (2)	1 (2)	1 (1)	4 (6)	4 (5)	2 (2)
Humanism/Altruism	3 (4)	3 (4)	3 (5)	2 (3)	2 (2)	3 (3.5)
Public Service	4 (7)	4 (7)	7 (12)	6 (9)	6 (8)	4 (6)
Vocational Preparation	5 (9)	7 (11)	12 (18)	3 (4.5)	3 (3)	7 (10)
Meeting Local Needs	6 (10)	5 (8)	8 (13)	7 (11)	7 (9)	6 (9)
Advanced Training	7 (11)	8 (13)	10 (15)	5 (8)	5 (7)	5 (7.5)
Social Criticism/Activism	8 (12)	9 (14)	6 (10)	8 (12)	9 (13)	8 (12)
Academic Development	9 (13)	6 (9)	4 (6)	11 (17)	11 (16)	11 (16)
Social Egalitarianism	10 (14)	10 (15)	11 (17)	9 (13.5)	8 (11)	9 (13)
Research	11 (17)	12 (19)	9 (14)	10 (16)	10 (15)	10 (14)
Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness	12 (18)	11 (16)	5 (9)	12 (19)	12 (18)	12 (19)
Traditional Religiousness	13 (20)	13 (20)	13 (20)	13 (20)	13 (20)	13 (20)
PROCESS GOALS						
Community	1 (3)	1 (1)	2 (3)	1 (2)	1 (4)	1 (3.5)
Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment	2 (5)	2 (5)	1 (2)	3 (7)	2 (6)	3 (7.5)
Democratic Governance	3 (6)	3 (6)	4 (8)	2 (4.5)	4 (12)	2 (5)
Innovation	4 (8)	4 (10)	3 (7)	4 (10)	3 (10)	4 (11)
Freedom	5 (15)	6 (17)	5 (11)	6 (15)	7 (19)	6 (17)
Off-Campus Learning	6 (16)	7 (18)	6 (16)	5 (13.5)	5 (14)	5 (15)
Accountability/Efficiency	7 (19)	5 (12)	7 (19)	7 (18)	6 (17)	7 (18)

COEFFICIENT OF RANK ORDER CORRELATION (FOR GOAL AREAS RANKED 1 TO 20) BETWEEN TOTAL UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY AND

ADMINISTRATION	FACULTY	FULLTIME STUDENTS	PARTTIME STUDENTS	ALUMNI
.92	.76	.93	.88	.96

* OUTCOME GOALS AND PROCESS GOALS HAVE BEEN COMBINED AND THE RANK ORDER FROM 1 TO 20 OF THESE GOALS AREAS IS ENCLOSED IN PARENTHESES.

photo by G. Pierce