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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Overview

The educational spotlight focuses no longer on yesterday's accomplishments but rather on today's social ills, which are attributable, in part at least, to inadequacies and weaknesses; to failings within our educational system. Our society is experiencing increase in crime, the perennial problem of hard core unemployment, school dropouts and a growing social frustration. These problems, coupled with a multiplication of costly social problem programs, lend credence to the argument that many of our most pressing social problems have a link with the quality and availability of adequate educational experiences. Sputnik of the late 1950s and the national unrest of the early 1960s were taken as an indication by society that education was not doing all it could to enhance the welfare of the nation and its people. As a result, massive fiscal efforts embodied in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 and the Vocational Education Amendments of
1968, were introduced to stimulate and assist educators and others in improving educational programs so that educational and vocational opportunities could be equalized across all ethnic and social groups.

Early in these massive attempts at improving education through federal aid, it became apparent that the educational arena lacked the qualities and quantities of manpower required to provide leadership and staffing needs to programs and projects relating to educational improvement.

Consequently, societal dissatisfaction with the educational institutions, scarce funds at local and state levels, a growing concern over centralization and decentralization and intervention of federal aid ignited a spark which created a response in educational leaders to seek out new arrangements for designing, developing, and implementing innovative training models in American schools.

Recently the United States Office of Education has required that the consortium model be used in planning and implementing new programs which train personnel for educational leadership roles. In recent years three major research efforts have been undertaken for the purpose of gaining data relating to consortia efforts in the United States. The first effort in 1965-1966 was designed to identify consortia efforts or cooperatives in education. This study resulted in the identification of approximately 1,300 operable consortia in education.

Larry Hughes, Professor, University of Tennessee, was contracted
by the Office of Education in 1970 to conduct a descriptive study of consortia in public education. The Kansas City Regional Council publishes a directory of voluntary cooperatives in education annually. The council lists sixty-two consortia in higher education involving over 600 different institutions.

Innovative designs have been sought for new patterns of training for a number of reasons. Egon Guba relates the following as a basis for the consortium model:

This arrangement has many models. The fight on cancer is being conducted through the coordinated efforts of a number of different agencies. The space effort similarly depends upon the cooperation of a number of otherwise competitive groups. Industry has found it possible to work cooperatively through cartels. Why not in education? ¹

New arrangements can be designed, developed, and tested for training persons to engage in collaborative endeavors and the development and testing of these alternative training models will at least produce new knowledge about training; and has the potential to influence favorably the training models now commonly used. Opening the basic assumptions about training to challenge enhances the possibility of fundamental reconceptualization occurring and especially opening opportunities to user institutions and agencies to provide training enhances the possibility of new approaches to training being

developed. According to HEW's Division of Planning, Research and Evaluation:

Massing resources, rather than spreading them, may produce synergistic benefits through (a) the building of a 'critical mass' of conceptual talent, (b) development of a power base of sufficient strength to effect changes in established institutional requirements and procedures, (c) certain economies of scale, e.g. spreading administrative costs and (d) attacks on broader problems than those that an agency individually could attack.

New arrangements may be developed for securing better qualitative and greater quantitative input from the related disciplines and professions.

Coordinating the preparation of varying types of trainees increases the likelihood there will be greater understanding among the trainees of the contribution to be made by each, and the possibilities for more fruitful interaction during their working lives.

By virtue of the accrued advantages noted above and because of its sheer size, the consortium is in a better position than its individual members to attract funding for its programs. As a result of this visibility a consortium is able to focus national attention on the areas of its concern and to enlist the public into its cause. Finally, it is able to play a political action role not possible to its individual members, since each obviously has parochial interests to protect.3


In April, 1970 the United States Office of Education released Request for Proposal 70-12, to Design New Patterns for Training Research, Development, Demonstration/Dissemination, and Evaluation Personnel in Education. Sixty-nine agencies responded to this RFP and by July 1, 1970 the Office of Education had funded twelve of the submitted designs for the development of "new patterns for training." Of these twelve patterns to be developed, three would be funded for implementation of the design submitted. RFP 70-12 established the following criteria for the twelve funded agencies:

It appears that training programs to accomplish the general objectives . . . will have to be built around designs which involve more than one institution because greater resources than those possessed by any single institution or agency will be needed. Multiple opportunities for internship experiences of a broad range of types will have to be available. Opportunities for collaborative work with professionals and trainees in several functional or technical areas will usually mandate there be training programs going on concurrently in a number of work and training settings. Drawing together a 'critical mass' of trainers with exceptional talent will usually necessitate crossing institutional and agency boundaries. A consortium or clustering of agencies seems necessary to carry out the training desired. 4

In June, 1970 the Evaluation Center of The Ohio State University was granted $50,036.00 by the United States Office of Education to develop an integrated model training program designed to meet manpower needs in Research, Development, Diffusion, and Evaluation. The Request for Proposal 70-12 (RFP 70-12) specifically stated that

the development and implementation of the program must be organized through a consortium or clustering of agencies model.

To design the training program a consortium of agencies was assembled which encompassed a seven-member decision-making team. A major responsibility of the decision-making team was the development of the consortium during the program design period and later, during the implementation and operable phases of the training program, building and maintaining the proper machinery for the successful functioning of the consortium.

The investigator in this study was involved in this effort to create a consortium training design through his assignment as the context and input evaluator. One responsibility of the evaluator was to provide information to the decision-makers regarding functioning consortia in education. More specifically, the charge to the evaluator was to uncover principles and success criteria generated from other consortium efforts which could serve as guides in the further development of The Ohio State University-based consortium.

Initial steps toward accomplishment of this task resulted in a survey of pertinent literature to identify cooperatives or consortia in education. Little empirical data were uncovered but descriptive literature of various programs and some evaluation studies of foundation-sponsored consortia were found. Meager data were found which related operational variables to the success of a consortium model.
A perusal of the descriptive literature and conversations with educators knowledgeable about consortia revealed that the model had experienced failures as well as successes. Reasons for failure had been identified as poor financial support, poor relationships among members, lack of obtainable objectives, communication problems internally and externally, and lack of a conceptual foundation among members.

Hooker, Mueller, and Davis, speaking about school study councils, related:

Those which failed to survive were those that were poorly financed, lacked relationships which would make their programs meaningful, and dealt with 'research' which was not applicable to concrete improvement of education. 5

The consortium model is increasingly being adopted so one might therefore assume that it can accomplish a felt need of institutions which adopt this type structure. To know why the consortium model survives or fails is not enough, one must constantly strive to improve the present level of success. Why have some consortia functioned for only one or two years? Does survival mean success? What are the variables that affect success? Do financial restrictions

relate to success or failure? What kind of communication network must be established? Conceptually, how does a group act in concert yet maintain autonomy? What type of governing body works best? How can the logistics problems of a consortium be ameliorated? These are but a few of the numerous questions that seek answers in operationalizing the consortium model. Various operational consortia have individually, through various internal and external evaluation, sought answers to these questions regarding their own operation. To date few, if any, attempts have been made to look at the consortium model at a macro level and try to identify variables that affect success.

The consortium model is being used quite frequently in developing training programs in education. Cooperative arrangements among a host of educational agencies are becoming commonplace, yet little empirical data have been gathered which can be used in planning for the operation of these cooperatives. The investigator was involved in the organization, implementation, and operationalizing of such a cooperative effort which involved universities, state departments, city school systems, an international fraternity, private business, and a national research council. The investigator was charged by the decision-making body of this cooperative to provide data relating to the operational variables which could be associated with the success of a consortium of agencies.
Definition of Terms

CONSORTIA/COOPERATIVE/INTERINSTITUTIONAL—These terms are used interchangeably in this document. The terms refer to a clustering of agencies existing for the purpose of apportionment of effort within, in relation to available means and/or resources.

VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATION OF INSTITUTIONS—A set of institutions which may be either private or public organized as a cooperative based upon the initiative of the institutions themselves.

INTERSTATE COMPACT TYPE OF CONSORTIA—A set of institutions organized as a cooperative by virtue of agreements ratified by state legislatures.

OPERATIONAL VARIABLES—Factors which impinge upon an institution, are changeable, and may assume any one of a set of values are defined as variables. This set of factors as they affect the functioning of organizational elements such as finance, structure, personnel, communication, etc., are defined in this paper as operational variables.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this descriptive study is to conduct research about selected consortia in education in an effort to identify operational variables that contribute to the success of consortia.
Objective's

The primary objectives of this study are:

1. Through the application of criteria (see sample p. 12), twelve voluntary association type of consortia in education will be identified.

2. To establish a list of operational variables for consortia. This list was established through a review of literature which historically traced consortia development and uncovered the operational variables that various authorities feel needed to be met in the development and operation of a consortium. To supplement the literature, a panel of experts had the responsibility of providing additional operational variables.

3. To test the significance of these operational variables, a description of the twelve selected consortia according to those variables was made internally (administrative body) and externally (policy-making body). This test was made to determine if the variables were essential to the function of consortia. Further, the test was made in order to find out if these variables do exist in the consortia used for this study.

4. To analyze the operational variables as they related to the twelve consortia in the sample study.

5. To develop a set of recommendations based upon the data
gained from these twelve consortia which are essential when organizing a consortia in higher education.

6. To generate hypotheses that relate operational variables to consortia success that can be tested empirically by future researchers.

Design

This study is a descriptive survey of selected consortia in education relating to operational variables that need to be met in consortium development. The descriptive survey investigation methodology is employed because it meets very well the needs of this study.

Good outlines the following regarding this type of study:

1. To secure evidence concerning the existing situation or current condition.

2. To identify standards or norms with which to compare present conditions, in order to plan the next step.

3. To determine how to take the next step (having determined where we are and where we wish to go).^6

This study includes the following procedures and steps:

1. A comprehensive review of related literature and research was conducted to:

   a. provide an historical view of the development and growth of consortia in American higher education

---

b. provide data to show the need for the consortia arrangement in American higher education
c. provide data to show that opportunity for consortia development presently exists
d. provide data which illustrates problem areas when implementing and operationalizing a consortium in education. This was the primary objective of the literature review and resulted in the establishment of a set of operational variables which became the key components of the data collection instrument used in this study.

2. A panel of experts was assembled to assist in the establishment of a list of operational variables. The panel was composed of the following:

1 - Dr. Susan Klein, Director, Task Force on Research on Training, National Institute of Education Code 600.
1 - Dr. Robin Farquhar, Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, Ontario Institute for Studies and Education.
1 - Dr. Juris C. Lasmanis, Associate Director, Council of Great City Schools.
A data collection instrument was developed to meet these functions: first, to obtain information from the sample population regarding the importance they assign to the operational variables identified. A second function of the instrument was to secure information from the study sample regarding the existence of these variables in their organization. The third function of the instrument was to seek data through open-ended questions which were asked of the sample population in a semi-structured interview. These questions were used as the basis for separate telephone interviews held with the consortium director and a representative of one member agency in each consortium.

Data collected through this method were synthesized and analyzed and a description of the twelve consortia is made.
according to the operational variables. Data collected were analyzed by showing the numerical ratings assigned to each variable by the sample population. The data collected are shown separately according to the responses made by the consortium director and member agency representative. The responses to the semi-structured interview are analyzed descriptively by the researcher, based on data gained from the sample in this study.

5. A set of variables is established which are essential when organizing a consortium.

6. A set of hypotheses are developed relating to the operational variables which need to be tested empirically in order to establish a more refined data base about consortia in higher education.

Sample

The sample population for this study is twelve selected consortia chosen from the list compiled by Raymond S. Moore, *A Guide to Higher Education Consortium: 1965-66*, which identified and described approximately 1,300 consortium efforts in American education and from the *Directory of Voluntary Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education* published annually by the Kansas City
Regional Council, which lists sixty-two consortia in higher education. (Discrepancy in numbers reflects criteria used by researchers.) The twelve consortia were chosen by the investigator based upon the following criteria:

1. A minimum of five agencies be represented within the cooperative.
2. It have at least regional representation on its policy-making body.
3. It has been in existence for at least five years.
4. That its primary responsibility be to the educational enterprise.
5. That one of its functions encompass some form of either in-service or pre-service training for its membership.
6. That geographically its administrative headquarters be located east of the Mississippi River.
7. That at least one agency within the consortium be an institution engaged in post high school education.
8. That it be a formal organization with a constitution and governing body.
9. That the consortium be a voluntary association of institutions as opposed to the interstate compact type.

Consortia meeting these criteria were selected and from this group a random sample was made in which the study sample of twelve was selected.
Assumptions

1. It is both possible and desirable that new training designs be studied, understood, and used as a basis upon which new and more effective training models may be created. The techniques and findings used in the creation and implementation of training programs should be used in the development of other training programs. There is clearly a need for sound planning in the development of new training programs which prepare personnel for leadership positions in education.

2. There are consortia in American education that can be identified.

3. These consortia, their administrative officers and policy-making body, are those most likely to provide evidence needed to realize the purpose of this study.

4. Operational functions are factors that greatly influence the degree of success or failure of consortia.

5. The consortium model can serve a needed and worthwhile function in education.

Significance of the Study

Many educational agencies have sought and established joint ventures with other agencies engaged in educational enterprises. Cooperative linkages have been developed among various Research and
Development Centers, Regional Educational Laboratories, universities, state departments of education, public school systems, and various business firms. This study considers one of these cooperative linkage systems--the consortium.

The existing knowledge dealing with the consortium model in education is descriptive and the findings of this study will supply some empirical data relating to operational variables that need to be met when organizing, implementing, and operating a consortium.

The findings of this study should assist those individuals who are charged with the responsibility of developing programs based on the consortium model.

It is hoped that the data from this study will assist various agencies in establishing more explicit criteria by which to evaluate the consortium designs presented by developers or programs which seek funding.

Mechanisms for joint participation and the establishment of cooperative linkage systems internal and external to the American educational complex are becoming more common. The consortium model is one of these linkage systems being utilized to increase participation. The increased knowledge and greater understanding of this participatory mechanism will aid the investigator in preparing for the functioning as a school administrator.
Limitations of this Study

This is a descriptive survey investigation and the findings will be limited regarding generalizability as a result of the number of consortia included in the study and by the other delimiting aspects of the sample. This investigation is not designed to show positive cause and effect relationships. It is intended to provide insights into the operational problems consortia encounter in an effort to provide direction when operationalizing the consortium model.

A study of this nature is also limited by time and resources.

Plan of the Study

The chapters to follow consist of the literature base for the study, the design and procedures utilized, the data, and the findings of the study:

1. Chapter I contains the textual material found in this proposal. It presents the background of the problem under investigation, the problem statement, assumption, objectives of the study, design of the study, the limitations, and significance of the research.

2. Chapter II presents a review of the relevant literature and research relating to consortium. Chapter II also includes the operational variables suggested by the panel of experts.
3. Chapter III, the design and procedures, includes instrumentation, data collection, data organization, data analysis, and treatment of the data.

4. Chapter IV consists of the analysis of the data generated in the study relating to the operational variables which are essential when organizing, implementing, and operating a consortium in education. Data is also presented and analyzed regarding the degree to which these variables exist in the consortia used for this study. In addition, results of the semi-structured interviews are analyzed.

5. Chapter V, findings, contains interpretation of the data reported in Chapter IV with generalizations and limitations and the implications and recommendations as revealed from an analysis of the study. A set of hypotheses for further study is included in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature related to consortia in education was conducted to provide data to meet the following objectives:

a. Provide an historical view of the development and growth of consortia in American higher education.

b. Provide data which shows the need for the consortia arrangement in American higher education.

c. Provide data which shows that opportunity for consortia development presently exists.

d. Provide data which illustrates problem areas when implementing and operationalizing a consortium in education. This is the primary objective of the literature review and will result in the establishment of a set of operational variables which become some of the items on the semi-structured interview guide.

A. Historical View

The American higher education complex has a long history of spawning both number and variety of autonomous colleges and universities. Johnson states that the center of gravity in American higher
education is low, its imperturbability high, except in one respect: quantitative growth. Because of this one does not expect, in his lifetime, to witness more than a few significant new educational phenomena. He feels interinstitutional cooperation is one such phenomenon. 7

The Martorani, Messersmith, and Nelson study established historically, three basic factors leading to separateness of colleges. They suggest that the "ivory tower" concept of many higher education institutions which separated them from the community was a major factor; while the self-sufficient concept, which separated them from one another, and the highly-selective nature of single-purpose program, which drew relatively few students to any one college were equally important factors.

These factors produced an academic community as a result which could ignore upstart cooperative arrangements because they lacked authority and were possessed with financial weakness. 8 But as a result of enormous growth in enrollments, rising costs, and the


government's insistence on institutional sharing cooperatives have shown rapid growth, especially since World War II.  

The year 1925 seems the accepted date for the birth of consortia when a number of small liberal arts colleges in Claremont, California joined to eliminate unnecessary duplication of facilities and to increase the effectiveness of their staff.  

In 1943 Harvard and Radcliffe entered into a close association that saw undergraduates from the women's school commute to the campus of their Cambridge brothers. This relationship progressed and since 1970 Radcliffe became an administrative unit with their graduates getting Harvard degrees.

During the developing years, 1925 to about 1960, institutional cooperation in higher education organized itself into basically two discrete types, namely, the interstate compact or statuatory type and the voluntary type. The interstate compact type organization is one in which public institutions participate by virtue of agreements ratified by state legislatures. Three characteristic organizations are the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) comprising fifteen states; the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

---


(WICHE) comprising thirteen states; and the New England Board of Higher Education (NEBHE) comprising six states.

Interstate compact type of consortia are managed by boards of representatives appointed by the governors of participating states, and their principal funds come from state appropriations. Generally speaking, the compact provides for reciprocal student exchanges in highly specialized fields, especially medicine and nursing, and for a general sharing of instructional and research resources. Possibly the most basic purpose of this type consortium is fact-finding and research for the purpose of concerted planning.

The other major form of cooperation is the voluntary association of institutions—which may be public or private or both—organized on the initiative of the institutions themselves. Voluntary educational cooperatives are those cooperative educational arrangements that are in no way mandated by legislation or regulation. Voluntary educational cooperatives generally have a short history of development and are considerably more flexible than older organizations in education; many of these are emerging organizations formed through a "grass roots" local concern.

While not exhaustive, an exemplary list of this type consortium seems useful. Organizations representing this form include: the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), which is composed of fifty-nine major universities nationwide; the Committee
on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) composed of the Big Ten Universities and the University of Chicago; the Associated Colleges of the Midwest (ACM) and the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) both of which are combinations of distinguished liberal arts colleges; the Mid-America State Universities Association (MASUA), a grouping of public universities and technical colleges; the Five-Colleges Cooperative in Massachusetts, which consists of four liberal arts colleges and a state university, and the Consortium of Universities, an organization in the nation's capital composed of American, Catholic, Georgetown, and George Washington.

Voluntary associations of institutions are often multi-lateral groups whose activities are conducted on a voluntary basis. Their boards of directors are composed of the presidents, high-level administrators, or faculty elected or appointed by administrators or faculty. Most all of the association type consortium have an administrative staff whose responsibility is to plan programs, administer the unit, provide budgetary control, and maintain the central office.

The purposes of the voluntary consortia in higher education, in addition to their special areas of emphasis, are: (1) to establish a mass of specialized institutional, research, and literary facilities, (2) to institute arrangements which provide additional specialized programs, (3) to increase offerings in low enrollment subject matter areas, (4) to raise funds and influence public policy, (5) to facilitate
change, and (6) to promote information exchanges.

This pattern of development continued and presently represents the basic types of interinstitutional cooperation. It seems, however, that 1960 represents a logical dividing point between sub rosa activity or Phase I development and the beginning of Phase II or an open implementation of cooperative activity. Moore's study conducted in 1965-1966 identified 1,017 consortia in existence and another 245 in the planning stages. Utilizing criteria similar to this writer the Kansas City Regional Council lists sixty-two cooperative arrangements in higher education. They say the number doubled from 1967 to 1970 and that currently about ten to twelve new cooperatives are formed yearly.

While there may be numerous consortia of various sizes and kinds in American education, some wonder if this in itself indicates that interinstitutional cooperation has made it as a viable

---


organizational structure. Some of the early groupings were casual marriages of convenience, and some of this type consortia exist today. One might question if the consortia movement is just one more educational fad. 14

B. Need

By the growth pattern depicted in the historical development section of this paper it is evident that the educational community feels a need to engage in building connecting links, associations, councils, partnerships, clusters, consortia, centers, committees, confederations, and federations. Indeed, it seems education has entered a phase which embraces interinstitutional coordination and cooperation as a necessary step for completeness.

Consortia arrangements are advocated by many of the nation's most knowledgeable educational statesmen, foundation heads, presidents of the most prestigious educational associations and top federal officials.

Johnson points out that the phenomenon worth noting is not so much the quantitative growth of interinstitutional cooperation, but the trend toward more formal, more systematic, more tightly organized, legally incorporated, cooperating entities, with their own

offices, independent budgets, representative policy-making bodies and joint programs distinguishable from the programs of the constituent members. These comprise the fully institutionalized consortium while increasingly instruments of action and operations, they remain administrative bodies. They do not teach or perform other academic functions directly through their own staffs.  

Stanley Salwak feels there is a need to identify the groups and the patterns of organization that work; on a scale comprehensive enough to be useful in meeting increasing needs. He feels that a need exists to study groupings which have developed along some consciously systematic lines because it is from these that we can learn how to direct what has been what he terms, "a wild growth and disorderly evolution."  

Consortia seem to have unlimited potential but there is a need for a more vigorous look into the mechanics of operation in an effort to determine what really works and what the benefits are in proportion to the resources invested, what does not work and why?  

15 Eldon L. Johnson, op. cit., p. 341.  


17 Lewis Patterson, op. cit., p. 20.
Babel's study states that:

As education is confronted with ever-increasing problems and the complexities involved in solving them, more and more schoolmen are becoming aware that neither they nor individual school systems can do the job alone. Leaders in the schools are turning in many different directions to obtain help. They look to universities . . . to private industry . . . to federal and state governments. . . . Another and possibly the most effective direction in long-range terms, they turn to fellow schoolmen for resources, knowledge, and power to confront common problems. 18

There is in existence the felt need of educational organizations to move toward more formal cooperation and toward economic efficiency, as well as toward a sharing of information to help solve common problems. 19

Regarding need for educational cooperatives, the Appalachian Educational Laboratory states that education needs cooperatives so it can effect better utilization of staff, enable education to overcome problems of deprivation, of distance and time, and deal more effectively with the knowledge explosion. 20

18 John Babel, Jr., An Investigation of the Operational Functions of School Study Councils with Recommendations for the Improvement of These Functions (The Ohio State University, 1970), pp. 2-3.

19 Hughes, et al., op. cit., p. 2.

20 The Educational Cooperative, Charleston, West Virginia: Appalachian Educational Laboratory, Inc. (Brochure) w.d.
Further interinstitutional cooperation is needed because it can enrich the academic program because of a more general scope of offerings as well as a more stable selection. Also each agency in the cooperative can enhance its community service through the selection of competence areas of the range of consortia offerings. 21

Guba suggests that consortia are needed because they (1) can attack broader problems than those that an agency individually could attack, (2) are better able to play a more political action role than individual members, (3) are able to focus national attention on areas of its concern, and (4) are in a better position to attract funding than individual members. 22

In addition to these factors, a study of the governance documents of fifty-one consortia identified that consortia are needed to facilitate change. 23

"Most of us must face the absolute necessity of interinstitutional cooperation through voluntary or regional or state or national organizations in which each institution sacrifices some of its

21 Martorana, et al., op. cit., p. 22.

22 Guba, op. cit., p. 18.

institutional autonomy for the larger good, " states Martha Peterson.24

To accomplish this new leadership role the spirit of entrepreneur­
ship and innovation must be present by all the managers and
clients of the consortium movement.25

C. Opportunity

Consortia development in the 1970s represents at best a
paradoxical situation. While going through a period of testing, re­
examination, and confusion, interinstitutional cooperation is ex­
periencing a rather steady growth. Resulting from the abundance of
pressing current issues and needs facing colleges and universities, it
is apparent that opportunities exist for voluntary consortia to move
beyond the paradoxical position they now face to an important orga­
nizational model for higher education.26

Regarding the steady growth of consortium in higher educa­
tion one assumes that this organizational model is to some degree
meeting the needs of member agencies. In higher education many de­
velopments internally and externally have created an atmosphere

24 Martha E. Peterson, The Acquaintner (An International
   Newsletter for Academic Consortia for Higher Education), Vol. 5,
   Number 3, November 1972, p. 3.

25 William C. Nelsen, "Entrepreneurship and Innovation in
   Consortia." Papers of the Academic Consortia Seminar, Vol. 7,
   March 5, 1972, p. 191.

favorable to consortium development and it seems relatively safe to project opportunity for further growth. The American Association for Higher Education developed a department to serve as a resource center for the consortium movement. The function of the department is to assess the effectiveness, strengths, weaknesses, potential, and significance of consortia for higher education.  

Johnson established an indepth rationale for continued rapid growth and development of cooperatives. He states that (1) this is a time of large-scale organization and systems operation; when we get too many independent entities, we pull them together wholly or partially, through new entities, to reap advantages otherwise neglected, (2) the sheer number of colleges and universities and their changed status has increased comparative study among colleges and universities. Proximity and accessibility have bred mutual awareness, (3) industry and government increasingly want to acquire academic agents for certain tasks or to purchase certain professional services—research, laboratory operations, training programs, or overseas institution building. This is one of the most potent direct sources of interinstitutional cooperation when the undertaking is of immense proportions, (4) in addition it is clear that the federal government is

---

increasingly offering general encouragement through legislation and administrative guidelines. Several acts to aid higher education explicitly authorize support for cooperative interinstitutional programs or agencies. 28

Another factor which will continue to provide an opportunity for consortia development is the more widespread acceptance of a social climate that recognizes the virtues of interdependence as well as those of self-sufficiency. 29

Opportunities for development also exist as a result of higher education's desire to provide better programs at a smaller cost to the student and to the cooperative; the inability, alone, to provide the staff, facilities, and services for the more complex and costly programs.

Encouragement by the federal government for cooperation among institutions which draw upon combined resources has given the consortia arrangement added thrust and provided a boost for the development of cooperative efforts. The implementation of cooperative activity came about as a result of opportunities created by various federal legislation. Public Law 89-329, The Higher Education Act,

28 Eldon L. Johnson, op. cit., p. 344.

29 Fritze H. Grupe, Interinstitutional Cooperation at the Departmental Level, Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, Potsdam, N. Y., 1972, p. 3.
requires universities to share their resources with communities for the solution of common problems. More specifically, Title I and Title III of this act provide for cooperation between a cooperating institution and a developing institution; connection of a cooperating institution with a consortium of developing institutions, and for consortia of developing institutions to work on common or similar problems.

Public Law 89-10, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in many cases requires cooperative planning in order for an agency to be eligible for funds. Title I promotes the idea of educating disadvantaged youth by a host of non-school social agencies while Title III, Programs to Advance Creativity in Education (PACE), either encourage or demand that PACE projects be designed to utilize the consortia arrangement. Title IV set aside funds for the creation of regional educational laboratories to foster cooperatives and Title V suggests that multi-state cooperation be utilized in combating common problems. Title V also provides that 10 per cent of these funds be allocated to school districts which encourage multi-district planning.

The opportunity for educational cooperation has also been encouraged by the federal government through the Model Cities Program which provides for cooperative planning between community groups and school educators, and through funds provided for the development of area vocational and technical schools.
Another interesting development which could create a great opportunity for the development of cooperative arrangements in higher education is occurring at the state level. In Illinois, Governor Richard Ogilvie, in September 1972, signed House Bill 4528, The Higher Education Cooperative Act which authorized cooperative interinstitutional programs of higher education instruction between all public and private colleges and universities. The bill provided for $350,000 for specific cooperative programs. Regarding this state aid to consortia, Governor Ogilvie commented that, at the operational level, the bill provided a mechanism to avoid duplication of effort which, in his words, "is so costly to institutions." 30

Encouragement of the consortia arrangement most certainly has been aided by the advancement of both communication and transportation networks.

Social pressures, such as demands for accountability and public reluctance to support education financially, are encouraging educators to seek new organizational approaches to education. As schools try to retrain staffs and provide the broader spectrum of services that society seems to expect from them, there is a concurrent searching for new ways to make use of community resources.

and to share the expertise of nearby schools.  

D. Operational Variables

As a result of rapid growth of consortia and with opportunity for further growth and development, there is need to look at organizational and implementational factors affecting consortia. To assure that orderly growth based on some tested principles serve as a foundation, implementors need available data regarding operational factors which need to be accounted for in their planning. As a result of changing goals and functions of colleges and universities "organizational lag" has developed and created archaic organizational structures. What then are the operational variables which should characterize interinstitutional cooperation, the organizational model being suggested by some as having high potential in filling this "organizational lag."  

Guba visualizes four cooperative networks essential for successful operation of a consortia. He suggests a (1) communications network, (2) conceptual network, (3) logistical network, and

31 Franklin Patterson, op. cit., p. 54-55.


(4) production network. He visualizes a consortium working best if it honors the autonomy of its members; allows each to make a useful contribution; is flexible and open to change; has political viability; is characterized by economic efficiency, and has visibility and scope. 34

E. Brooks Smith feels that to get disparate groups of people to work together amicably and productively is to bring them together to work on a task which is just outside their immediate area of concern, but which is of mutual interest and is something to which they can both contribute. 35

There seems to be developing among those interested in the consortia model a fear that faculty unionism may have negative impact on interinstitutional cooperation and that this potential danger be assessed carefully by those who are implementing consortia. 36

No one governance structure or organizational model seems to be best for all combinations of institutions. A key idea seems to be that the governing structure possess the flexibility that allows a


cooperative to tailor a "board of control" to fit its own needs. Substructures need to be built to support each institution while allowing particular organizational patterns to emerge within a general framework of checks and balances.

The roles, responsibilities, and commitments of each participating institution must be clearly delineated. The greater the scope and complexity of the cooperative venture, the greater the need for explicit, written statements concerning the terms and provisions of agreement. Formal contracts committing institutions to participate in joint efforts with others represent a rather common procedure for explicating these understandings. 37

A major weakness of consortia is that the autonomy of the participants is such that there is no direction or forcing for diffusion. There seems to be an absence of a plan to get ideas accepted or into practice. Aron's study indicated that one of the factors which limited the success of governmental cooperatives was the fear of each member agency that it would lose its autonomy. 38

The AACTE Subcommittee on School-College Relationships with the assistance of James Nicherson suggested criteria for

37 Martorana, et al., op. cit., p. 40.
assessing proposals of joint operation between various agencies. They suggest that general policy and procedures be developed by representatives of the professional agencies, institutions or groups directly concerned through consensus of persuasion of majorities which reflect different outlooks. They further reason that conveners of policy-making groups must be designated either on a rotation plan or by election processes in order that no one institution will be able to dominate this phase of cooperation. There should be provisions for the extension of the agreed-upon policies and procedures by designating persons to be responsible for administering and coordinating the mutually accepted program and processes. AACTE urges that administrative structures be based upon the roles each person plays in relation to delineated responsibilities rather than on immediate strengths and weaknesses of certain persons in order that the cooperative venture may continue despite personnel changes. In presenting their criteria, they stressed that provision for continuous review and consequent adaption oe built into all agreements in order that administrative structures not overwhelm individuals and retard their initiative.  

The leadership role suggested by Robert Balster, Associate Director, the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas, is one in which the administrator is a process helper in the dissemination and utilization of knowledge. He becomes a consortium manager.  

Brickell, relating to study councils, pointed out that operationally councils have been ineffective because of inadequate leadership and apathetic responses by schools to study council proposals. Further, he states that councils have been unable to provide a body of services complete enough to justify membership charges.  

A stronger statement on leadership is made in the Martorana, et al., as they state, "Administrative leadership is perhaps the single most important element in stimulating and effecting interinstitutional cooperation."  

Interinstitutional cooperation, in order to be successful, must be able, through massing of resources, to provide a bank of conceptual capital which makes it possible for a college or university to enrich those programs which lack luster and to provide the

---


42 Martorana, et al., op. cit., p. 35.
opportunity for broad educational experience. Consortia arrangements
tend to promote the more effective and efficient utilization of limited
or specialized resources. Cooperative arrangements reduce the
needless duplication caused by competition.

Wayne Anderson pointed out that the chief aim of cooperation
seems to be to enhance the educational program of the participating
colleges or universities. 43

Improved instruction and more accessibility to educational
opportunities is the claim made for consortia by the Educational Co­
operative Program (ECP). 44

There is the need for consortia to become "risk takers" or
innovators. It is expressed often that there is danger for a consortia
which becomes provincial and locked in a capsule of immediate con­
cerns and lets the world literally go by. In the publication, Appala­
chian Advance, it was indicated that people are often afraid to
innovate because they fear being blamed for failure, but by innovating
cooperatively the risk of failure is reduced or eliminated. 45

43 Wayne W. Anderson, Cooperation Within American Higher
Education, Association of American Colleges (Washington, D. C.,


45 "The Dilenowisco Education Cooperative," Appalachian
Characteristics of successful consortia presented by Grupe suggest that the organization provide activities which are programmatic in nature and that the programs, while strengthening and reinforcing existing programs, should be compatible to member agency programs. The institutional impact of consortia activity must be tangibly experienced by students and staff of each participating agency. He also stresses that consortia, to be successful, must be expert in their field of focus. 46

There are many claims but little hard data to support cost benefits of cooperatives. Most members of consortia seem to feel that cooperation will provide a better return for their dollar while, at the same time, providing wider educational opportunities.

Presidents Edward E. Eddy of Chatham College and J. C. Wamer of the Carnegie Institute of Technology suggest that cooperative efforts offer possibilities for enlarged educational scope without additional expense. Further, they state that each institution covered provides enriched educational programs at costs significantly below those required if each institution were to attempt the same program on its own. 47

William C. Nelsen, Program Executive, The Danforth

46 Fritz H. Grupe, op. cit., p. 5-9.
47 Anderson, op. cit., p. 5.
Foundation, states, "Consortia can save money, and they ought not be timid about the fact." 48

Financial support systems for cooperatives must be established. These systems should be designed to solicit funds internally (from agency members) and externally (from foundations, corporations and government). 49

Much of the literature alludes to geographical proximity, regional representation, and local initiative as factors which are important in consortia development. Hughes reports that "successful educational cooperation often is located where school development and/or study councils have existed." 50

Salwak visualizes consortia developed on a regional basis as holding the greatest promise, 51 while Martorana, et al., state that geographical proximity is a significant factor in the establishment of cooperative arrangements. 52


50 Hughes, op. cit., p. 63.

51 Salwak, op. cit., p. 495.

52 Martorana, et al., op. cit., p. 35.
A major problem in operationalizing and managing a consortium is that of a communications network. Day-to-day operations of consortia are fraught with the dangers that a lack of communication brings. It is important that means for communicating among and within consortia agencies and personnel be regularized and kept simple. Information concerning the consortium's objectives and activities becomes an important part of each of the member institution's fund of knowledge about the resources available to it. This type of information must be channeled systematically to all institutions in the consortium. Carrole Hanson states that interinstitutional cooperation should include a total communications program which would include interinstitutional newsletters, pictorial tabloids, traveling exhibits, and combined talent programs.  

Panel of Experts

To supplement the review of literature which identified some operational variables needing consideration by the individuals and institutions who are engaged in implementing interinstitutional cooperation in higher education, the establishment of a panel of experts knowledgeable in this area was assembled to provide their thinking regarding operational variables needing attention by planners of the

53 Carrole Hanson, "The Strangers in Your Midst," Pride, November, 1959, p. 11.
consortia arrangement. The individuals on this panel were:

Dr. Susan Klein, Director, Task Force on Research and Training, National Institute of Education.

Dr. Robin H. Farquhar, Chairman, Department of Educational Administration, Ontario Institute of Studies.

Dr. Jerry P. Walker, Associate Director for Evaluation, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University.

Dr. Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Professor, Western Michigan University.

Dr. James N. Jacobs, Director of Program Research and Design, Cincinnati Public Schools.

Dr. Francis S. Chase, Professor Emeritus, University of Chicago.

Dr. Juris C. Lasmanis, Associate Director, Council of Great City Schools.

By letter five members of the panel responded to their task with an in-depth list of success variables representing their individual thinking (see Appendix A). Two members responded by telephone.

In an initial review of this information there seemed to be evident some consistent ideas throughout: ideas which seemed to group themselves according to Stufflebeam's response which suggested that success variables be categorized into four continuous phases;
namely, Start-Up Variables, Planning Variables, Initial Operational Variables, and Institutionalization Variables. This framework represents a longitudinal developmental process. There also seemed to be usefulness in further categorization of this data cross-sectionally into a vertical developmental process. Egon Guba's ideas regarding essential networks for consortia development, namely, Conceptual Network, Logistics Network, Production Network, and Communication Network seem useful for this purpose. Therefore, the ideas of Guba and Stufflebeam form the basis of a conceptual framework used to analyze the information gathered from panel members. The operational variables provided by them were then classified within the following matrix.

**SUCCESS VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORKS</th>
<th>Start-Up Variables</th>
<th>Planning Variables</th>
<th>Initial Operational Variables</th>
<th>Institutionalization Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Start-Up Variables**

**Conceptual Network**

Stufflebeam suggests that there should be in existence a set of institutions where common goals, common problems, and common opportunities as well as complimentary capabilities exist. Jacobs contends that common goals are not always obvious. He emphasizes that some spade work often is needed to dig out the essential common goals. Clarity of expectations regarding both obligations and rewards is identified by Chase as a crucial variable. Further, he indicated that congruence of objectives of the consortium and member agencies be clearly delineated.

**Logistics Network**

Physical proximity of agencies is listed by Jacobs as a crucial concern at this stage of development. He feels that agencies close to each other may be more likely to have common goals because they serve the interests of a more homogeneous community, which fosters more personal interaction. Stufflebeam commented that a necessary component at this point of development is external start-up funds.

**Production Network**

Farquhar implied that each member institution have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium. To this end he feels that there must be established an
understanding of give and take by all members of the consortium.

**Communication Network**

Stufflebeam visualizes the existence of an "invisible college" which includes persons from various subgroups of the institutions represented in the consortium. He supports the notion that these people should have worked together in the past and as a result developed a mutual respect and trust. Implicit agreements that they help each other in relation to future problems must be understood by each group in the "invisible college." Jacobs supports this idea and contends that provision be built into the operation for the enhancement of interpersonal relationships through personal interaction. Klein stresses that beyond commitment to consortia goals and objectives there should be loyalty and commitment to a central administrator or person.

**Planning Variables**

**Conceptual Network**

Farquhar states that the consortium should establish itself in both a leadership position and as a service agency to member institutions. To this thesis he visualizes it not only responding to immediate needs but that it should identify future needs and be capable of designing programs for responding to them. He makes provision for a mechanism by which the consortium can assess the effectiveness of
its operation and, more specifically, in establishment of objectives by which the consortium is to be guided. Further, Farquhar emphasizes that careful discrimination is needed between consortium responsibilities and activities that should be decentralized to member institutions and those that must remain with headquarters staff. He supports this thesis by suggesting that most of the work on consortium projects be done by member institutions and that headquarters staff limit its efforts to stimulation, facilitation, coordination, communication, monitoring, and evaluation roles.

Stufflebeam visualizes the availability of context evaluation information pertaining to the proposed consortium as a crucial variable and that the establishment of a set of objectives reflecting information gained in context evaluation be assembled by the planning group. Continuing, he stresses that a necessary step in planning is that an input evaluation be conducted in an effort to identify and assess alternate strategies for meeting the consortium goals. Walker indicates a necessity for policy level representation at this stage of consortium development. Refining this idea he suggests that officially delegated and designated representatives from the member agencies who have sufficient, actual, or delegated authority to make policy level decisions for their agency be involved in the planning relative to their agency's involvement in the consortium effort.
Logistics Network

Walker stresses that centralized planning and monitoring is essential and that a participatory decision structure is necessary to assume shared understanding and commitment during implementation. A procedure and criteria for adding new institutions or dropping old institutions from consortium membership is a variable that Farquhar suggests.

Production Network

According to Farquhar there should be internal balance among contributions and a Gestalt effect that is greater than the sum of each individual part. Further, he states that provision needs to be made for utilization of the contributions of the member institutions so that they will complement or supplement one another. Klein visualizes different classes of membership--associate and full--to insure that diversity of program can be developed according to the needs and available resources of each member. Correlating closely with Stufflebeam's ideas relative to context and input evaluation, Farquhar details his thinking to encompass the idea that not only do the objectives need to be classified but that methods of determining the degree to which these objectives are achieved must be developed and procedures for adapting consortium operations or changing their objectives on the basis of this evaluation feedback must be established.
Stufflebeam, in establishing a set of planning variables, makes provision for the establishment of a policy group representing the proposed consortium. Further, he states there must be an establishment of an operational staff to service this policy group. Klein suggests establishing specific criteria for membership. She feels contracts with each agency should spell out their contribution and rewards. Walker concludes that there must be clear success criteria established. Refining this thought, he presents the idea that intermediate and ultimate criteria by which the cooperative effort will be judged successful must be clear, understood, measurable, attainable, and shared by sponsors, consortium members, prime contractors and ultimate learners—the clients. Going beyond the policy group and operational staff, Stufflebeam suggests that there be involvement of several persons from each of the consortium agencies in both planning and evaluation activities.

Communication Network

Jacobs portrays establishment of effective liaison mechanisms among institutions as a variable needing planning attention. He comments that successful consortia must build liaison with interface personnel who keep each member informed about what's happening. These interface personnel are visualized by Jacobs as human relations experts. In presenting his thoughts relative to communications
Farquhar indicates that mechanisms must be established for fast and easy communication. He further defines this thinking to include not just consortium members in the central agency but also among all member institutions. Relative to communications, Walker establishes a priority for an information flow from a central originating and coordinating point. He indicated that shared understanding among the member agencies was essential and that each must thoroughly understand procedures, strategies, objectives, and functions of the entire consortia effort. Chase suggests parity of decision making among member agencies or their representatives. He also emphasizes that means must be worked out through which all participating agencies will be assured of benefits in terms of improved performance of its own function and approval by its own constituency and sources of support. Stufflebeam states that there must be formalization of communication within and between consortium agencies.

Initial Operational Variables

Conceptual Network

Transferring the policy leadership role from the operational staff to policy representatives of the consortium agencies is an initial operational variable suggested by Stufflebeam. Jacobs suggests that a commitment by top administrative heads of consortium agencies is imperative at this point. He feels that it is not uncommon for "the
middle echelon people" to be the instigators and the ones committed to consortium, but he says that when decision points arrive it is often the top administrator who has to take action and unless he is committed to the concept, it is likely that the consortium may fail.

Farquhar supports Jacobs, stating that a major source of potential conflict exists between the extent to which a consortium agency serves unique interests of individual members and the extent to which it focuses upon a few selected interests held in common by groups of members. He implies that a delicate balance be arrived at and carefully monitored in order to assure that a majority of members are deriving value from consortium activities and that selected programmatic thrusts are evident in consortium priorities. Klein supports this thesis and suggests that the delicate balance must be struck regarding the degree of autonomy of the member agencies.

**Logistics Network**

Securing external operational funds to support the consortium's work and the equitable distribution of funds to both the central operational staff and to each consortium agency are variables for which Stufflebeam makes provision. Klein and Stufflebeam provide for regular periodic business meetings and work sessions between the central consortium administrative staff and the policy making staff who are required to operationalize the consortium in their agency in
order to reallocate operational authority to each group.

Production Network

Chase proposes discrete distribution of functions and responsibilities among consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are. In Stufflebeam's scheme during the initial operational phase, a systematic evaluation of the consortium mission and operations is to be made.

Farquhar feels that it is essential that the consortium not only respond to its immediate needs but should begin to identify future needs and design programs for responding to them.

Communication Network

Farquhar suggests that orientation mechanisms be devised whereby new individuals and institutions can be educated with respect to their various rights and privileges and responsibilities of consortium membership. Continuing, he states that this socialization process should provide information regarding the history, purposes, and functions of the consortium. He also recommends a full explanation of policies, processes, and products of the consortium operations as well as the structure, governance, and the support mechanisms of the consortium. Klein visualizes a two-way communication network which provides the consortium and individual agencies the mechanism to present their needs and possible avenues for accomplishment.
Institutionalization Variables

Conceptual Network

Each consortium agency, according to Stufflebeam, must be made to feel that the central administrative staff of the consortium is providing them a valuable service. Supporting this thesis, Jacobs visualizes cooperation in terms of "organic ties" which he defines as taking the form of shared staffing arrangements or a common budget utilized by all member agencies of the consortium. Further, he establishes a priority for the clear understanding among consortium members of an equal decision power in the allocation of the resources of the consortium. Jacobs suggests that budget resources be goal directed.

Logistics Network

Stufflebeam establishes that provision be made for continuous funding of a consortium central administrative staff through allocations made by the various consortium member agencies. Continuing, he further states that at this stage the consortium must secure external finances if it is to further its work. Walker argues for sufficient resources through the availability of time, personnel, money, and talent—either internally or externally—to the consortium. Walker suggests that continuity of sponsorship is of valued importance. Continuity of support as viewed by Walker is both monetary and
substantive. Substantive relates to the necessity of avoiding shifting performance expectations as a result of some phenomena (political). Klein suggests that consortium headquarters have geographical proximity to member agencies.

Production Network

Chase suggests the equitable allocation of the variety of tasks and the results of consortium activities be received by each member institution, and that planning require each member to contribute to a pool of substantial resources. Each agency's contribution should be determined by consideration both of its resources and of the returns which it may anticipate on its investment in the common effort. Chase wants methods established which de-emphasize competition among agencies which foster rivalry in respect to credit for accomplishment. Farquhar envisions a monitoring system which is geared toward ameliorating functional competition between consortium members regarding consortium related operations. To this end he suggests that the consortium yield both direct and significant benefits to all member institutions. Chase feels that to this end the perception of benefits by key personnel of member agencies is vitally important. Farquhar articulates his thinking by visualizing not only a common core of benefits as a result of consortium membership but that it should yield "spin-off" benefits to members as well. The need for
reciprocal benefits for member agencies is suggested by Walker. Continuing, Walker establishes the importance of continuity of goals. Refining this view, he reminds that original goals should not become displaced in favor of a means for the attainment of that goal (materials development should not become the major focus or the major goal of a training effort). Stufflebeam makes provision for mechanisms which would provide for systematic evaluation of the mission, goals, objectives, and operation of the consortium.

Communication Network

Perception of benefits by key personnel of member agencies is of vital importance according to Chase. Farquhar depicts the need to communicate relationships between consortia agencies regarding its products and processes to external individuals and institutions. Also there must be channels of communication established which assist external agencies in their effort to determine their input to and output from the consortium. Farquhar establishes the need for a mechanism which provides evaluation feedback to consortium members--both to the policy-making group and to the individual members. He feels it is imperative that member institutions have clearly established equal and regular opportunities and channels in which to influence consortium programs and policies. Further, Farquhar feels that a strong and effective spokesman's role with the member
institutions' central administration be played by someone who is representing the particular area of endeavor which the consortium serves.

This chapter has presented the operational variables identified through a review of literature and from support documents submitted by consortia in higher education. Further, the data suggested by a panel of experts as being critical to the success of educational consortia is included:
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to provide data about selected consortia in American higher education and to identify those operational variables which relate and contribute to the success of consortia. From this data, operational variables were to be selected and tested in order to provide a list of essential organizational elements which need to be satisfied in consortia development if they are to be successful. The population used for this study was twelve select consortia primarily organized to provide a set of services for American higher education. Descriptive survey research was used as an appropriate strategy for gathering information relating to the problem under investigation. Data in this study were obtained through the use of ratings on questionnaires and through semi-structured interviews. This chapter describes the purpose for undertaking the study; the basic design of the study; data collection techniques; organization and descriptive of the method of data analysis and treatment.

Purpose of the Study

Mechanisms for joint participation and the establishment of
cooperative linkage systems, internal and external to the American educational complex, have in recent years become more common. The consortium model is one of these linkage systems being utilized to increase participation.

The existing knowledge dealing with the consortium model in education, for the most part, is descriptive. The purpose of this study is to supply some empirical data relating to operational variables that need to be met when organizing, implementing, and operationalizing a consortium. The findings of this study should assist those individuals charged with the responsibility of developing programs based on the consortium model. It is hoped that the data from this study will assist various agencies in establishing more explicit criteria by which to evaluate the consortium models and designs presented by developers or programs which seek funding.

This study is designed in Five Phases. Phase One, a comprehensive review of the literature, was conducted in an attempt to identify what needs, opportunities, and problems the consortia organizational model might encounter. The primary objective of the review was to generate a series of operational variables which this model would need to meet in order for it to be successful. Further activity in Phase One dealt with the establishment of a panel of experts whose function was to suggest a set of operational variables; the establishment of the sample population for the study; and the
collection of governing documents and related literature from consortia agencies provided more information relating to the activities of consortia. Phase Two of this study related to the establishment of a series of operational variable statements taken from collected data. The second function performed in this phase was the development and pilot testing of the instrument used for data collection. Phase Three provided for data collection from the sample population through the use of a survey questionnaire and semi-structured interview guide. Phase Four analyzed the data obtained through data collection in order to identify the nature and scope of the operational variables under study. Phase Five includes findings, conclusions, implication, and recommendations for further study.

An in-depth description of each phase of the study follows in order to give the reader a better understanding of the sequence of events as well as the methodology used in each of the five phases of the study.

**Phase One**

Phase One describes the method used to establish the study sample and the technique used to collect data related to operational variables characteristic of consortia.

**Study Sample**

The study sample for this research was established through
two primary sources. First, the Raymond Moore study, *A Guide to Higher Education Consortiums: 1965-66*, listed 1,262 consortia of varying types. These 1,262 consortia were then characterized in the Moore study by a series of descriptors, i.e., number of years in existence, areas of service, regional, voluntary, etc. By applying the criteria established by this researcher (see page 15) to the organizations in the Moore study it was possible to reduce the 1,262 consortia to 25.

The second primary source of organizations was the list complied by the Kansas City Regional Council, published in 1971, entitled *A Directory of Voluntary Academic Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education*, which lists sixty-two consortia in higher education. By applying the criteria used in this study to this list, seven additional consortia were added to the list from the Moore study, thus creating a sample of thirty-two consortia, identified as meeting all the criteria established in this research study. The next step in reducing this population to twelve, the necessary number for the sample population, was the assignment of each consortia to a table of random numbers. From the table of random numbers, twelve consortia and one alternate were chosen (see Appendix B). At this stage in the establishment of the sample population a questionnaire was developed which was administered by telephone to each of the selected thirteen consortia in an effort to verify that each did meet the criteria.
established in this study (see Appendix C). Each of the thirteen consortia responded positively to all criteria on the questionnaire.

At this point all member agencies of each selected consortia located east of the Mississippi River were assigned a number from a table of random numbers and one member institution from each agency was chosen based on their selection from the table (see Appendix B).

The final step in establishment of the study sample was a telephone call to each executive director and member agency representative of the sample, asking if they would assist with the research being conducted through their participation in the study. Each executive director and member agency representative agreed to participate in the study. A thank-you letter and detailed explanation of their function was sent to each (see Appendix D).

**Preliminary Data Collection**

The primary objective of preliminary data collection was to establish a set of operational variables related to success of consortia in higher education. Three methods, namely, a comprehensive review of literature; establishment of a panel of experts; and collection of organizational documents were utilized in uncovering these variables. Below each of these methods are discussed.

**Literature Review**

An in-depth review of literature was conducted to provide
information which would satisfy four objectives: (a) to provide a historical view of the development and growth of consortia in higher education, (b) to provide data which would show the needs of the consortia arrangement in American higher education, (c) to provide data which would show the opportunity for consortia development presently existing, and (d) the primary objective: to provide data illustrating problem areas when implementing and operationalizing consortia in higher education. From these problem areas operational variables were to be selected which would become a number of the items on the instrument utilized for data collection.

Panel of Experts

A panel of experts was established to assist in providing operational variables which they felt related to the success of consortia in higher education. A seven member panel was chosen with a membership composition based on the criteria that: (1) one member have administrative experience in a consortia that had as its basic function the provision of services to the higher education community; (2) one member be a college professor who had been involved in organizing a consortia in higher education; (3) one member be a public school administrator who had been involved in organizing a consortia; (4) one member have experience at the federal government level in working with institutions interested in the consortia as an
organizational model; (5) one member be a nationally known educator with experience in consortia development; (6) that one member be a graduate student who had served as a graduate assistant in a consortium of agencies; and (7) one member be an administrator in a national consortia whose primary function was oriented toward providing services to public school systems.

Names of individuals who met these criteria were gathered through recommendations of various educators, personal contact, and from knowledge of the academic work they had accomplished relative to consortia in higher education.

The panel of experts selected (see page 12) were telephoned and asked to participate in the study after they had been given an explanation of their function. Each of the individuals agreed to serve on the panel and were instructed that a follow-up letter would be sent explaining in detail their function (see Appendix D). Five of the seven members of the panel of experts responded by letter with their opinion relative to operational variables needing to be met to insure success of the consortia (see Appendix A). Two members responded by telephone.

Support Documents

The thirty-two consortia, meeting the criteria of this study, were sent a letter explaining the purpose of the research being
conducted and asked if they would submit copies of their constitution, by-laws, documents, organizational structure, goals, objectives, and functions of their consortia (see Appendix D). From the thirty-two agencies, twenty-three responses were received. Of the twenty-three responses, nine of them were from members of the study sample. The information from this material became part of the literature review in Chapter II.

Phase Two

Phase Two dealt with synthesizing the data collected in Phase One into a series of operational variable statements, constructing a data collection instrument, and pilot testing the instrument. Each of these activities are described below.

Establishment of Operational Variable Statements

A team composed of an evaluation specialist, a research specialist, and the researcher in this study all from the Department of Planning and Evaluation, Montclair Public Schools, Montclair, New Jersey, working from the definition of an operational variable used in this study, synthesized the data in Chapter II into a series of seventy-five operational variable statements.

First, each team member independently sorted these discrete variables into four organizational networks. The four organizational networks are those suggested by Guba as necessary networks for
consortia development. The three individuals who categorized the data from Chapter II into this matrix worked from a set of consensus definitions of the four organizational elements shown in the contingency table (see Appendix E).

Results of the independent ratings were placed in a contingency table to show the degree of consensus achieved. Table 1 indicates that 53 of the 75 variables were unanimously agreed upon; 10 were agreed upon by 2 raters, and on 12 there was no agreement.

TABLE 1

CONSSENSUAL RATINGS OF VARIABLES INTO ORGANIZATIONAL CATEGORIES
FIRST STEP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating*</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Logistics/Resources</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Program/Production</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While there was consensus by the three raters in assigning a variable to the same organizational category, that variable was given a rating of three. Similarly, the variables agreed upon by two raters were assigned a rating of two, and those remaining on which there was no agreement were assigned a rating of one.

All variables receiving a three or a two rating were accepted as belonging to the particular organizational category to which they
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were assigned. Of the twelve variables receiving a rating of one, eight variables in this group were not represented in any category because there had been a total lack of agreement by the three raters. To assure that all identified variables be represented, those eight variables on which there was no agreement were then studied by the three member team, reworded for clarity, and assigned by verbal consensus to one of the four organizational categories.

Table 2 shows the resultant numbers of variables in each category.

**TABLE 2**

**ORGANIZATIONAL CATEGORIES**

**STEP II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Logistics/Resources</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
<th>Program/Production</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(4)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 9 16 22 28 75

*These four variables are included in the ratings by the other two individuals. Therefore, they are not added into the total.

Based on this process the operational variables selected for this study and categorized according to the four networks are:
Communication Network

1. A consortium should develop methods for forcing member agencies to disseminate the policies of the consortium.

2. A consortium should develop a formalized two-way communication network which provides the consortium and individual agencies the mechanism to present their needs and possible avenues for accomplishment of these needs.

3. A consortium should develop a systematic communications network where information can be channeled to all member agencies on a regular basis.

4. A consortium should establish channels of communication with external agencies in an effort to determine the input from those agencies and to influence the output of the consortium.

5. An educational consortium should have a built-in system for focusing national attention on major areas of its concern.

6. Consortium members should have equal decision power in the allocation of resources of the total consortium.

7. A consortium should build liaison with key interface personnel in member agencies, whose responsibility it is to keep member agencies informed about consortium activities.

8. It is important that key personnel of member agencies are aware of the vital importance of the benefits derived from consortium membership and from the services of the administrative staff.
9. A consortium should establish a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institution's central administration.

Logistics/Resources Network

10. A consortium needs available external start-up funds.

11. A consortium should develop and utilize budget resources that are goal directed.

12. Educational cooperatives should be in a better position to attract soft money than individual members of the consortium.

13. A consortium should provide for the equitable distribution of funds to a central operational staff and to each member agency staff.

14. A consortium must develop mechanisms by which external finances can be secured to continue and further its work.

15. A consortium should provide a set of fixed services and benefits as a result of consortium membership.

16. A consortium must have provisions for continuous funding of its central administrative staff through allocations made by various consortium member agencies.

17. A consortium should require each member to contribute to a pool of financial resources.

18. A successful consortium should have a governing office
with geographical proximity to all member agencies.

19. The consortium should be developed on a regional basis.

20. A consortium should be organized in a way that it will provide more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources of member agencies.

21. A consortium should build into its procedure regular periodic business meetings and work sessions planned between a central consortium administrative staff and policy-making staff.

22. A consortium should provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for member agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institution.

23. Educational cooperatives should effect better staff utilization than individual agencies may achieve.

24. A consortium should provide mechanisms to synthesize and deal with the information explosion.

25. A consortium makes provisions for member institutions, through regularly scheduled meetings, to influence consortium programs and policies.

Conceptual Network

26. Educational cooperatives should be more able to play a political action role than any individual member.

27. Members of a consortium should be institutions which
have common goals, problems, and opportunities.

28. Educational cooperatives should be especially designed to attack broader problems than any agency member individually.

29. There should be discrimination between consortium responsibilities and member institutions' responsibilities and activities.

30. The consortium should incorporate a set of institutions which have complementary capabilities.

31. The consortium should incorporate institutions and individuals who do not have competing interests.

32. An educational consortium should occupy a leadership position in its area of expertise.

33. A consortium must be available for public scrutiny.

34. A consortium establishes the criteria by which it is judged to be either successful or unsuccessful.

35. Members of a consortium must be willing to maintain a dependence on others as well as a sense of autonomy.

36. Though policies of a consortium must reflect a majority opinion there must be provisions to consider minority interests.

37. A consortium should be organized so that administrative structures are conducive to individual initiative.

38. A commitment by top administrative officers of member agencies to the consortium is necessary for its effective functioning.

39. No only must a successful consortium meet immediate
needs of its clients, but it must also identify future needs and prepare for them.

40. A consortium should de-emphasize competition among agencies.

41. A consortium should have a governing document which will be explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership.

42. One of the major purposes of a consortium is innovation.

43. The consortium should address itself to the potential conflict of faculty unionism.

44. A consortium should be designed to honor the autonomy of its members.

45. A consortium should design a procedure to facilitate change in higher education.

46. There should be a loyalty and commitment of member agencies to some central administration or person in the consortium.

47. Consortia should be built to enhance interpersonal relationships through personal interaction.

Production Network

48. The consortium should be composed of institutions that have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium.
49. To insure a diversity of programs which meet the needs and tap the available resources of each member, it is necessary for a consortium to have equitable allocation of tasks among its member agencies.

50. It is the role of the central office staff to stimulate, facilitate, coordinate, communicate, monitor, and evaluate consortium activities.

51. A consortium must develop mechanisms so that continuity of sponsorship is to be continued both monitarily and philosophically.

52. Plans should be designed so that no one institution is able to dominate the policy-making phases of the consortium.

53. Member agencies should provide designated representatives who have policy-making authority to represent them in consortium planning.

54. Member agencies of a consortium should design an administrative unit which is organized to be responsive to their needs.

55. A consortium should provide for systematic evaluation of its goals and operations.

56. There should be centralized planning as well as provision for members' participation in decision making in consortia development.

57. Procedures and criteria for adding or dropping institutions from the consortium should be developed.
58. Contracts with each member agency by the consortium should list contributions and rewards.

59. A consortium should provide activities which can be tangibly experienced by both students and staff of participating member agencies.

60. A consortium should develop a total program which is compatible with member agency programs, and which serves to strengthen their existing programs.

61. A consortium set of activities should yield rebounding benefits to members.

62. A consortium should provide a body of services to its member agencies which are complete enough for each member agency to justify membership charges.

63. A consortium should involve individuals from each member agency in the planning of evaluation activities of the total consortium.

64. A consortium should provide for a systematic evaluation of its programs in order to determine the degree to which its objectives are achieved, as well as a mechanism for changing procedures based on evaluation feedback.

65. The chief executive of a consortium must be an individual who is an established leader in the field of higher education.

66. A consortium has as its chief executive an individual
who is strong in the area of dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

67. The role of the chief executive of the consortium should be that of a process helper or consortium manager.

68. A consortium should design orientation mechanisms whereby new individuals and new institutions can be educated with respect to their rights, privileges, and responsibilities of consortium membership.

69. A consortium should distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are.

70. There should be congruence of objectives between the consortium and its member agencies.

71. A consortium provides for the establishment of a permanent policy group representing the consortium.

72. A consortium should provide for the implementation of agreed upon policies and procedures through designated persons in each of the member agencies.

73. Roles should be defined in terms of job responsibilities rather than in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of certain persons.

74. A consortium should have formal contracts with member agencies committing them to participate in joint efforts of the consortium.
75. A consortium must have a wider scope of academic programs than member agencies.

The second function performed in Phase II was the development of these operational variable statements into an instrument which would be used for data collection. The instrument was designed into two sections (see Appendix F). The first section was designed so that the operational variables could be tested in order to determine their importance as success variables in consortia development as judged by the study sample. A Likert type rating scale was assigned to each of the variables so that each could be rated in relation to the degree of importance the executive director and member agency representative assigned to the variable. The second section of the questionnaire asked specific questions about the consortia in the study sample. This section was designed by creating questions from the operational variable statements. Questions in this section sought data about what really exists in the organizations in the study sample. A yes--no rating scale was provided for this section. The third section of the instrument was designed with a series of four open-ended interview questions structured to elicit information about how the consortia in the study sample were organized to address each of the organizational networks suggested by Guba.56 This information was sought in an

56 Guba, op. cit., p. 20.
effort to get a more in-depth explanation of a set of operational variables based on the experiences of individuals presently engaged in a consortia in higher education.

Pilot Study

Before the questionnaire and interview guide were sent to the sample population, a pilot study of the instrument was conducted. The purpose of this study was to test the instrument as a data-collection tool to determine if it needed revision. Four individuals were chosen to evaluate the instrument.

Dr. Lewis Patterson, Associate Director, American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D. C. was chosen because of his experience in organizing and implementing consortia in higher education. In addition to major research on consortia, Dr. Patterson is editor of The Acquaintor, an international newsletter which reports consortia activity in higher education.

The second member of the pilot study, Dr. Fritz H. Grupe, Executive Director, The Associated Colleges of the St. Lawrence Valley, Potsdam, New York, was chosen because of his present position as an executive director. Further, he has conducted research and has written numerous articles relating to consortia.

The third member, Dr. John Lattes, President, Kansas City Art Institute, Kansas City, Missouri, was chosen because he is the
representative of his agency in the Kansas City Regional Consortium. In addition, Dr. Lattes has been involved in organizing two other consortia and has authored articles concerning this organizational model.

The fourth member of the pilot study, Dr. Gerhard Lang, Director of Research and Evaluation, Montclair State College, Montclair, New Jersey, was chosen because of his expertise in instrument development.

Each of these individuals was telephoned and given a brief explanation of the study being conducted and was asked if they would evaluate the instrument to be used for data collection. After an explanation of the different components of the instrument and of their task, each agreed to assist.

A thank-you letter was sent to each member of the pilot study on May 23, 1973 (see Appendix D).

On May 23, 1973 copies of the instrument were sent to the pilot study team. Included with the instrument was a detailed letter explaining their task and asking that each operational variable and the set of interview questions on the instrument be rated according to the following six criteria: (1) clarity of the language in the questionnaires; (2) specificity of the content; (3) singleness of purpose; (4) freedom from assumption; (5) freedom from suggestion; (6) linguistic completeness and grammatical consistency.

---

As a result of changes suggested by the pilot study team, a final instrument was developed which was used for data gathering. Suggestions from the pilot study team on changes in the questionnaire were minor, but did result in changes in wording of some of the statements in order that clarity of language was first rate.

Phase Three--Data Collection

The data collection instrument was mailed to each of the executive directors and member agency representatives on June 25, 1973.

The day the instruments were mailed a telephone call was made to each of those individuals who were to receive the instrument to inform them that it was being sent and to establish a schedule to conduct the interview portion of the questionnaire. A cover letter explaining the procedure which they were to follow was also sent (see Appendix D).

The interviews were conducted by the researcher in this study and two other individuals from the Department of Planning and Evaluation who were trained regarding interview techniques by Dr. Gerhard Lang, Director of Research and Evaluation, Montclair State College, Montclair, New Jersey. All interviews were conducted during the week of July 23, 1973.
Phase Four--Analysis of Data

Each operational variable tested was stated as it was in Part I of the questionnaire to determine how essential the variable was considered by the respondents. The ratings of the twelve executive directors and the twelve responses from member agencies for each of the operational variables were tabulated.

In Part II of the questionnaire, each question was restated to ascertain the existence or non-existence of the factor in the consortia and the dichotomous responses tabulated from the twelve executive directors and from the twelve member agency representatives according to the rating they placed on each of the questions.

In Part III of the data collection instrument each member of the sample population was asked to comment on four open-ended questions. Their comments on these questions were analyzed descriptively according to their statements.

Phase Five--Conclusions

Phase Five of the study presents concluding remarks, a summarization of the findings, and recommendations.

Summary

This was a descriptive survey study which identified and investigated operational variables which need to be considered when designing and implementing a consortium in higher education. In this
chapter the researcher reviewed his purposes for undertaking the study and the basic design of the study. A five-phase approach was described as the method used in obtaining information relative to these operational variables. The methodology involved the development of a questionnaire which had as its components a rating system of selected statements, and a semi-structured interview.

Chapter IV contains a presentation and analysis of the findings of this study.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The data outlined in Chapter III was drawn from two sources, twelve executive directors of consortia and twelve member agency representatives of consortia. This data was collected through:

A. interviews conducted with the twelve executive directors and the twelve member agency representatives of the consortia in this study;

B. a questionnaire sent to each of the twelve executive directors and the twelve member agency representatives of the consortia in this study. The questionnaire was designed to test whether criteria expressed in the variable exist in the consortia used for this study, and to ascertain whether criteria expressed in the variable are essential or superfluous to the successful functioning of consortia.

Thus, data was collected to determine support for seventy-five statements relating operational variables to consortia success.

This chapter is based on these seventy-five statements and
is organized by sections. Section One incorporates those variables which measure communication functions of a consortium; Section Two considers logistical resources of a consortium; Section Three focuses on conceptual needs of a consortium; Section Four analyzes the production needs of a consortium.

The data collected through the interview questions is presented in the conclusion of each of the four sections in Chapter IV.

As previously indicated, the questions relating to essential value of variables were rated on a 1 to 5 scale, 1 indicating strongest agreement with the value of the variable, and 5 indicating the opinion that that variable was not needed at all. Thus, the lower the score, the greater is the agreement expressed. A score of 3 indicates no consensus either way.

Questions regarding the present existence of these variables in the consortia called for a YES or NO response. As NO received a score of 0 and YES a score of 1, scores greater than .5 indicate the opinion that the variable considered does indeed exist. Similarly, scores less than .5 indicate the prevailing opinion that that variable does not exist. Thus, a score of .5 is the expected chance value, and indicates no agreement either way.

A t-test was computed between the achieved mean and the expected mean (i.e., 3 for the questions regarding importance and .5 for those questions regarding existence) for each variable to
determine whether or not the difference was significant. This was done for the composite score of the two groups as well as separately for each group. Significance level is reported for a two-tailed test, as the direction of findings had not been predicted. A .05 probability level was required to consider a mean significant. Significance level is reported for a two-tailed test, as the direction of findings had not been predicted. A .05 probability level was required to consider a mean significantly different from chance. This level of probability is used to represent all significant findings, although some variables may have been more significant. NS is used to indicate a non-significant finding.

This chapter presents a table for each individual variable, showing the above information. For example, in Table 1 the number of subjects responding to each question, the mean score, the standard deviation and the level of significance are presented in composite response as well as separately for two groups. This has been done for both of the questions considered.

Furthermore, to determine if the member agencies and executive directors were in agreement in their responses, a one-way analysis of variance was performed on each question. These findings are presented in Appendix G, and are mentioned in the body only in the event of a significant discrepancy. Pearson's correlations were computed between the stated importance of each variable and its felt
presence on the composite scores, to determine whether the two are related. Significant correlations (all positive) indicate that respondents who rated a variable as essential correspondingly tended to answer the question on the variables' existence in their own consortium positively, while those who did not feel the variable was essential also tended to respond that the variable was not existent in their own consortium (see Appendix G). As with the t-test, level of significance is reported for a two-tailed test.

To facilitate comparison, a standard format is used for each of the seventy-five tables which follow. Thus, each operational variable receives the degree of in-depth consideration indicated by the nature of the responses.

Section One--Communication Network

TABLE 3

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DEVELOP METHODS FOR REQUIRING AGENCIES TO DISSEMINATE THE POLICIES OF THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does not exist in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups feel this variable does not presently exist, when viewed separately, only the opinions of the Executive Directors reached a level of significance. The responses of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 4

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DEVELOP A FORMALIZED TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION NETWORK WHICH PROVIDES THE CENTRAL STAFF AND INDIVIDUALIZED AGENCIES THE MECHANISMS TO PRESENT THEIR NEEDS AND POSSIBLE AVENUES OF ACCOMPLISHMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
TABLE 5

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DEVELOP A SYSTEMATIC COMMUNICATIONS NETWORK WHERE INFORMATION CAN BE CHANNELED TO ALL MEMBER AGENCIES ON A REGULAR BASIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
TABLE 6

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD ESTABLISH CHANNELS OF COMMUNICATION WITH EXTERNAL AGENCIES IN AN EFFORT TO DETERMINE THE INPUT FROM THOSE AGENCIES AND TO INFLUENCE THE OUTPUT OF THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>N 24</td>
<td>Mean 2.08</td>
<td>SD 0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>N 23</td>
<td>Mean 0.83</td>
<td>SD 0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter; N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 7

VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD HAVE A BUILT-IN SYSTEM FOR FOCUSING NATIONAL ATTENTION ON MAJOR AREAS OF ITS CONCERN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23 2.43 1.24 .05</td>
<td>12 2.00 1.21 .05</td>
<td>11 2.91 1.14 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23 0.30 0.47 .05</td>
<td>11 0.46 0.52 NS</td>
<td>12 0.17 0.39 .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately it is apparent that this significant finding is due to the strong opinion of the Executive Directors. The responses of the Member Agencies were varied and did not reach a consensus opinion as to the importance or nonimportance of this variable.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does not exist in the consortia used for this study. However, when viewed separately it is only the Member Agency Representatives who
agree that this variable does not exist. The Executive Directors are split in their responses and do not represent a consensus opinion.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant

### TABLE 8

VARIABLE MEASURED: CONSORTIUM MEMBERS SHOULD HAVE EQUAL DECISION POWER IN THE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES OF THE TOTAL CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. Although both groups, when viewed separately, support this opinion, only the responses of the Member Agencies reach significance. The failure of the Executive Directors' responses to reach significance was due to the greater variability of their responses (i.e., the high
standard deviation), indicating a greater range of opinions.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. Although a majority of members in both groups feel that this variable exists in the consortia they represent, when analyzed separately, this opinion is not great enough to be significant in either group. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- N Number of Respondents
- SD Standard Deviation
- P Probability
- NS Not Significant

**TABLE 9**

**VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BUILD LIAISON WITH KEY INTERFACE PERSONNEL IN MEMBER AGENCIES WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IT IS TO KEEP MEMBER AGENCIES INFORMED ABOUT CONSORTIUM ACTIVITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant
TABLE 10

VARIABLE MEASURED: IT IS IMPORTANT THAT KEY PERSONNEL OF MEMBER AGENCIES ARE AWARE OF THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF THE BENEFITS DERIVED FROM CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP AND FROM THE SERVICES OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- N  Number of Respondents
- SD Standard Deviation
- P  Probability
- NS Not Significant
TABLE 11

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD ESTABLISH A STRONG AND EFFECTIVE SPOKESMAN'S ROLE WITH EACH MEMBER INSTITUTION'S CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors’ Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies’ Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In addition to the data collected by means of the questionnaire, further information regarding day-to-day consortium operation was elicited through interviews with the Executive Director and with a representative of a Member Agency of each of the consortia in the study sample. In response to the question, *WHAT PROCEDURES EXIST IN YOUR CONSORTIUM WHICH ENABLE MEMBER AGENCIES TO COMMUNICATE AN EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION AMONG THEMSELVES AS WELL AS WITH THE CONSORTIUM HEADQUARTERS?*, the following kinds of more personal responses were obtained: A check list was established to use as an unstructured guide in determining to what degree the twelve consortium in this study sample utilized various activities for formal and informal communication. Two areas were looked at; first, communication between the headquarters and member agencies; and second, utilization of methods to communicate among member agencies. The following chart, therefore, is a summation of the methods used for the communications network.

Since no one form of communication appears either to predominate or to be exclusive, one may conclude that the particular needs of individual consortia—which may vary from day to day—are the prime factor in determining how a given communication is to be made. The most significant aspect here, of course, is that so much
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method Used in Communication</th>
<th>Executive Director Office ( (N=12) )</th>
<th>Among Member Agencies ( (N=12) )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Reports</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brochures</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/Local</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences/National</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaison Faculty Members</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of Activities and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings Distributed</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Contacts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Meetings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Annual Board of Directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings of Executive Staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seminars</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Bulletins/Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone/Conferences</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

communication of highly varied form and nature does indeed take place. One might even term the very existence of a consortium a form of communication.
## TABLE 13

**VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM NEEDS EXTERNAL START-UP FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:** N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 14

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DEVELOP AND UTILIZE BUDGET RESOURCES THAT ARE GOAL-DIRECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or non-existence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 15

VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE ORGANIZED TO ATTRACT SOFT MONEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24  2.88  0.99  NS</td>
<td>12  3.00  1.04  NS</td>
<td>12  2.75  0.97  NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24  0.67  0.49  NS</td>
<td>12  0.67  0.49  NS</td>
<td>12  0.67  0.49  NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation;

P- Probability; NS- Not Significant.
TABLE 16

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE FOR THE EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS TO A CENTRAL OPERATIONAL STAFF AND TO EACH MEMBER AGENCY STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors(^\prime) Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies(^\prime) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortia. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while
this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant

**TABLE 17**

**VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM MUST DEVELOP MECHANISMS BY WHICH EXTERNAL FINANCES CAN BE SECURED TO CONTINUE AND FURTHER ITS WORK**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately it is apparent that this significant finding is due to the strong opinion of the Executive Directors. The responses of the Member Agencies were varied and did not reach a consensus.
opinion as to the importance or nonimportance of this variable.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, when viewed separately, it is only the Executive Directors' opinion that reaches significance. The Member Agencies' responses are more varied, and although most feel this variable exists, this opinion does not reach significance.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- N  Number of Respondents
- SD Standard Deviation
- P  Probability
- NS Not Significant

### TABLE 18

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE A SET OF FIXED SERVICES AND BENEFITS AS A RESULT OF CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortia. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant
### TABLE 19

**VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM MUST HAVE PROVISIONS FOR CONTINUOUS FUNDING OF ITS CENTRAL ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF THROUGH ALLOCATIONS MADE BY VARIOUS CONSORTIUM MEMBER AGENCIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant
TABLE 20

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD REQUIRE EACH MEMBER TO CONTRIBUTE TO A POOL OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of Existence Variable Statement

There is unanimous agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation;
P- Probability; NS- Not Significant

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
TABLE 21

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD HAVE A GOVERNING OFFICE WITH GEOGRAPHICAL PROXIMITY TO ALL MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortia. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

On this variable, the two groups differ significantly in their opinions on the existence of this variable in their consortia (see Appendix). When viewed separately the Member Agency Representatives feel that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. The
Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed opinion about the existence of this variable. Although a majority of this group feel it does not exist, there is not sufficient agreement to reach a significant consensus. When viewed compositively, these two groups negate each other. Thus, the total score indicates that there is no agreement as to the existence of this variable. It is interesting to note that this finding reflects a difference in perspective as a function of position in the consortium and not a true difference in consortia, since the two groups of respondents, after all, represent the same twelve consortia.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- \( N \) Number of Respondents
- \( SD \) Standard Deviation
- \( P \) Probability
- \( NS \) Not Significant

**TABLE 22**

VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE DEVELOPED ON A REGIONAL BASIS, AS OPPOSED TO NATIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>( N ) Mean SD p</td>
<td>12 2.92 1.24 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N ) Mean SD p</td>
<td>12 2.50 0.90 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>( N ) Mean SD p</td>
<td>12 0.75 0.45 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N ) Mean SD p</td>
<td>12 0.75 0.45 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. Although a majority of members in both groups feel that this variable exists in the consortia they represent, when analyzed separately, this opinion is not great enough to be significant in either group. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t-value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant
TABLE 23

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE ORGANIZED TO UTILIZE THE LIMITED OR SPECIALIZED RESOURCES OF MEMBER AGENCIES EFFECTIVELY AND EFFICIENTLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatitives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation; P- Probability; NS- Not Significant.
TABLE 24

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BUILD INTO ITS PROCEDURE REGULAR PERIODIC BUSINESS MEETINGS AND WORK SESSIONS PLANNED BETWEEN A CENTRAL CONSORTIUM ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND POLICY-MAKING STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant
TABLE 25

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE A RESOURCE BANK OF IDEAS WHICH MAKES IT POSSIBLE FOR MEMBER AGENCIES TO ENRICH THOSE PROGRAMS WHICH LACK PROMINENCE WITHIN THEIR INSTITUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N- Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 26

VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD EFFECT BETTER STAFF UTILIZATION THAN INDIVIDUAL AGENCIES CAN ACHIEVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortia. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. However, when viewed separately, only the Member Agency Representatives' opinion is strong enough to indicate a significant consensus. The responses
of the Executive Directors are varied, so that the mean score does not show a significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable. It is interesting to note that on this variable it is the Member Agencies that find it's important and in existence. The Executive Directors have mixed opinions on both questions.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 27

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE MECHANISMS TO SYNTHESIZE AND DEAL WITH THE INFORMATION EXPLOSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22  2.55 0.60 .05</td>
<td>10  2.40 0.70 .05</td>
<td>12  2.67 0.49 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24  0.21 0.41 .05</td>
<td>12  0.25 0.45 NS</td>
<td>12  0.17 0.39 .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does not exist in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate this opinion, when viewed separately, it is only the Member Agency Representatives' responses that are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. The Executive Directors' opinions do not reach significance.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant

**TABLE 28**

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM MAKES PROVISION FOR MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, THROUGH REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETINGS, TO DETERMINE CONSORTIUM PROGRAMS AND POLICIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant

Section Two - -Interview, Logistics/Resource Network

In addition to the data collected by means of the questionnaire, further information regarding day-to-day consortium operation was elicited through interviews with the Executive Director and with a representative of a Member Agency of each of the consortia in the study sample. In response to the question, IN YOUR CONSORTIUM WHAT PROCEDURES HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED TO ORGANIZE BOTH INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL RESOURCES? HOW ARE SUCH AREAS AS BUDGET, INVENTORY OF RESOURCES, RECORD MAINTENANCE, REQUESTS FOR RESOURCES, TRANSFERENCE OF RESOURCES AND ACCOUNTABILITY DEALT WITH?, the following kinds of more personal responses were obtained: Three sources of
revenue predominate among the consortia in the study sample; annual dues or assessments ranging from $1,000.00 to $11,000.00, grant-seeking and specific program charges. A pragmatic spirit prevails: Whatever works best in the particular situation, is the best solution. This flexible attitude extends, generally, to the structuring of bureaucratic responsibilities. The structures perceived to exist in these consortia function in a highly individualized manner. Plans for a given project or proposal may flow from the bottom of the organizational chart up (i.e., originate at a Board of Directors' meeting). Record-keeping may be centralized, or dispersed among local campus offices. Funds may be handled by the Executive Director, a designated member institution or a designated non-member institution. Reports may be annual or periodic, conclusory or interim. An Internal Budget Review Committee or an outside firm of accountants may be responsible for regular audits.

What is significant is that these structures are perceived to exist for the sake of a useful purpose, not for their own sake. The degree of bureaucratization varies with each individual consortium, and appears to have taken place at all only insofar as the needs of the member institutions require it. The hesitancy to over-structure and the desire to remain flexible are seen as positive factors.
TABLE 29
VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE MORE ABLE TO PLAY A POLITICAL ACTION ROLE THAN ANY INDIVIDUAL MEMBER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed separately the Member Agency Representatives feel that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. The Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed opinion. Thus, half of this group feels it exists and half feels it does not exist. A consensus for this group does not emerge. The resulting composite score, therefore, does not indicate a significant opinion as to the
existence of this variable.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

N  Number of Respondents  
SD Standard Deviation  
P  Probability  
NS Not Significant

**TABLE 30**

**VARIABLE MEASURED: MEMBERS OF A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE COMMON GOALS, PROBLEMS, AND OPPORTUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors; Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately it is only the Member Agencies who agree that this variable exists. The Executive Directors are split fairly evenly in their responses and do not represent a consensus opinion.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
N Not Significant

TABLE 31

VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO ATTACK BROADER PROBLEMS THAN ANY AGENCY MEMBER INDIVIDUALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, it is only the Member Agencies whose responses are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. Although the Executive Directors indicate the opinion that this variable exists, their responses are more varied and do not represent a significant consensus.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 32

VARIABLE MEASURED: THERE SHOULD BE DISCRIMINATION BETWEEN CONSORTIUM RESPONSIBILITIES AND MEMBER INSTITUTIONS' RESPONSIBILITIES AND ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement in both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant

**TABLE 33**

**VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD INCORPORATE A SET OF INSTITUTIONS WHICH HAVE COMPLEMENTARY CAPABILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors(^1) Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies(^1) Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is
essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, it is only the Member Agencies whose responses are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. Although the Executive Directors indicate the opinion that this variable exists, their responses are more varied and do not represent a significant consensus.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 34

VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD INCORPORATE INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS WHO DO NOT HAVE COMPETING INTERESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When meant compositively, there is agreement that this variable is not essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. Although the average opinion in both groups conforms to this, when analyzed separately, this opinion is not total enough to be significant in either group. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. It is interesting to note that this is a variable that presently exists, but is judged to be
unimportant for the success of a consortium.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 35

VARIABLE MEASURED: AN EDUCATIONAL CONSORTIUM SHOULD OCCUPY A LEADERSHIP POSITION IN ITS AREA OF EXPERTISE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 36

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD SEEK
COMMUNITY SUPPORT THROUGH PUBLIC
RELATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed separately the Member Agency Representatives feel that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. The Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed opinion. Thus, half of this group feels it exists and half feels it does not exist. A consensus for this group does not emerge. The resulting composite score, therefore, does not indicate a significant opinion as to the existence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:
N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 37

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM ESTABLISHES THE CRITERIA BY WHICH IT IS JUDGED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortium. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of
the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 38

VARIABLE MEASURED: MEMBERS OF A CONSORTIUM MUST ACCEPT A DEPENDENCE ON ONE ANOTHER AS WELL AS MAINTAIN A SENSE OF AUTONOMY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortia. The Executive Directors, although indicating the importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a
significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. Although a majority of members in both groups feel that this variable exists in the consortia they represent, when analyzed separately, this opinion is not great enough to be significant in either group. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.

TABLE 39

VARIABLE MEASURED: POLICIES OF A CONSORTIUM MUST REFLECT A MAJORITY OPINION, ALTHOUGH THERE MUST BE PROVISIONS TO CONSIDER MINORITY INTERESTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 40

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE ORGANIZED SO THAT ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURES ARE CONDUCIVE TO INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, the Executive Directors' rated this variable significantly more important than the respondents from the member agencies (p. 7.05).

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

A significantly high correlation (r=.69 p. 7.05) accounting for approximately 48 per cent of the variability was found between those who believe this statement to be essential and present in the correlation sampled.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant
### TABLE 41

VARIABLES MEASURED: A COMMITMENT BY TOP ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS OF MEMBER AGENCIES TO THE CONSORTIUM IS NECESSARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- **N**  Number of Respondents
- **SD**  Standard Deviation
- **P**   Probability
- **NS**  Not Significant
TABLE 42

VARIABLE MEASURED: NOT ONLY MUST A SUCCESSFUL CONSORTIUM MEET IMMEDIATE NEEDS OF ITS CLIENTS BUT IT MUST ALSO IDENTIFY FUTURE NEEDS AND PREPARE FOR THEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N- Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 43

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DE-EMPHASIZE COMPETITION AMONG MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

However, the tendency to respond in agreement or disagreement with the statement is significantly correlated respectively to a positive or negative view of the existence of this factor in the
respondent's own consortium (p. 7.05, r = .45).

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N   Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P   Probability
NS  Not Significant

TABLE 44

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD HAVE A GOVERNING DOCUMENT WHICH WILL BE EXPLICIT IN DEFINING ROLES AND OBLIGATIONS OF ALL PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS, AS WELL AS THE REWARDS FOR MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately, only responses of the Member Agencies agree significantly with the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortium. The Executive Directors, although indicating the
importance of this variable, had a greater range of opinions and a significant consensus did not emerge.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 45

VARIABLE MEASURED: ONE OF THE MAJOR PURPOSES OF A CONSORTIUM IS INNOVATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24  2.13  0.99 .05</td>
<td>12  1.67  0.89 .05</td>
<td>12  2.58  0.90 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24  0.58  0.50 NS</td>
<td>12  0.67  0.49 NS</td>
<td>12  0.50  0.52 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

The two groups differ significantly in the opinions on the importance of this variable to the successful functioning of a consortium (see Appendix). When viewed separately the Executive Directors support the necessity of this variable to the success of a consortium. The Member Agency representatives, although leaning in that direction, have a greater variety of responses; and the average opinion does not indicate a consensus. When viewed compositely, the total score indicates the opinion that this variable is essential.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

Respondents showed a pattern that reached significance (p. 7.05) on the correlation between the essential nature of the factor and whether or not it is seen as operating in the respondent's own consortium (r=.50).

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 46

VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD ADDRESS ITSELF TO THE POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF FACULTY UNIONISM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When reviewed compositively, there is agreement that this variable is not essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. Although the average opinion in both groups conforms to this, when analyzed separately, only the Member Agencies' responses reached significance. The Executive Directors have a larger variety of responses and the mean score does not reach significance.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement:

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does not exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 47

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE DESIGNED TO HONOR THE AUTONOMY OF ITS MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of Existance Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 48

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DESIGN PROCEDURES TO FACILITATE CHANGE IN MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

The two groups differ significantly in their opinion on the existence of this variable in their consortia (see Appendix). When viewed separately the Member Agency Representatives feel that this variable does not exist in the consortia they represent. This opinion is strongly felt with only one respondent disagreeing. The Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed opinion about the variable. Approximately half of this group thinks it exists and half thinks it does not. A
representative opinion does not emerge. Similarly, the composite score does not indicate a consensus. It is interesting to note that this finding reflects a difference in perspective as a function of position in the consortium and not a true difference in consortia since the two groups represent the same consortia.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 49

VARIABLE MEASURED: THERE SHOULD BE A COMMITMENT OF MEMBER AGENCIES TO SOME CENTRAL ADMINISTRATION OR PERSON IN THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents  
SD  Standard Deviation  
P  Probability  
NS  Not Significant

TABLE 50
VARIABLE MEASURED: CONSORTIA SHOULD BE BUILT TO ENHANCE INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the
responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or non-existence of this variable.

However, there is a strong positive correlation ($r=0.55$, p. 7.05) that those who feel this variable is essential also believe that their consortium is structured this way while those who rated this variable as non-essential also rated it as non-existent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three --Interview, Conceptual Network

In addition to the data collected by means of the questionnaire, further information regarding day-to-day consortium operation was elicited through interviews with the Executive Director and with a representative of a Member Agency of each of the consortia in the study sample. In response to the question, WHAT ARE THE PRIMARY GOALS OF YOUR CONSORTIUM AND THE PHILOSOPHIES UPON WHICH THESE GOALS ARE BASED? HOW WERE THESE GOALS AND PHILOSOPHIES CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THE ROLES OF THE MEMBER AGENCIES AND THE CENTRAL COORDINATING AGENCY?, the following kinds of more personal responses were obtained: Respondents most frequently cited as significant the goals listed below.

1. To develop and/or expand programs in international education

2. To strengthen local/regional academic environment

3. To pool resources for the most effective and efficient use thereof

4. To avoid duplication of expensive programs, often through cross-registration.

Thus, one may observe that the consortia considered in the study sample have distinctly outer-directed aspects, as well as internal operational foci.
Money—finding it, saving it, sharing it—was mentioned directly or indirectly by almost every respondent to this question, often couched in such euphemistic terms as "resources," "budgetary capabilities," "assistance," or "funds." Money management by whatever name is of high priority in framing a consortium, and as a practical consideration should be faced in practical terms.

Section Four—Production Network

TABLE 51

VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE COMPOSED OF INSTITUTIONS THAT HAVE SOMETHING UNIQUE TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE PRODUCTIVE OPERATION OF THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

A significant correlation (\( r = .64, p = .05 \)) exists; however, between a respondent's rating on the essential scale and his belief in the existence (or non-existence) of this variable in his own consortium.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- N Number of Respondents
- SD Standard Deviation
- P Probability
- NS Not Significant

| VARIABLE MEASURED: TO INSURE A DIVERSITY OF PROGRAMS WHICH MEET THE NEEDS AND TAP THE AVAILABLE RESOURCES OF EACH MEMBER, IT IS NECESSARY FOR A CONSORTIUM TO HAVE EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF TASKS AMONG ITS MEMBER AGENCIES |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variable | Composite Response | Executive Directors' Response | Member Agencies' Response |
| | N | Mean | SD | p | N | Mean | SD | p | N | Mean | SD | p |
| Essential | 24 | 3.25 | 0.99 | NS | 12 | 3.17 | 1.03 | NS | 12 | 3.33 | 0.98 | NS |
| Exists | 23 | 0.65 | 0.49 | NS | 12 | 0.67 | 0.49 | NS | 11 | 0.64 | 0.50 | NS |
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

A significant correlation (r=.46; p. 7.05) between the two scales on this variable indicates that those who believe it is necessary for a consortium to have equitable allocation of tasks among its member agencies for the purpose stated also believe that their consortium provides for this. Conversely, those who rate this variable as unessential tend to deny its existence in their own organizational structure.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 53

VARIABLE MEASURED: IT IS THE ROLE OF THE CENTRAL OFFICE STAFF TO STIMULATE, FACILITATE, COORDINATE, COMMUNICATE, MONITOR, AND EVALUATE CONSORTIUM ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Composite Response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. The Analysis of Variance reveals that the directors' responses were considerably more in agreement on the essential nature of this variable than the responses of agency representatives (p. 7.05)

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 54

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM MUST DEVELOP MECHANISMS SO THAT CONTINUITY OF SPONSORSHIP IS TO BE CONTINUED BOTH MONETARILY AND PHILOSOPHICALLY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. A significant difference emerged between the groups, however. The means reveal that this was due to the greater importance of this variable as viewed by the Executive Director.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, it is only the Member Agencies whose responses are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. Although the Executive Directors indicate the opinion that this variable exists, their responses are more varied and do not represent a significant consensus.
TABLE 55

VARIABLE MEASURED: NO ONE INSTITUTION SHOULD BE ABLE TO DOMINATE THE POLICY-MAKING PHASES OF THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

All respondents are in unanimous agreement that this variable does not exist in their consortia.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 56

VARIABLE MEASURED: MEMBER AGENCIES SHOULD PROVIDE DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES WHO HAVE POLICY-MAKING AUTHORITY TO REPRESENT THEM IN CONSORTIUM PLANNING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 57

VARIABLE MEASURED: MEMBER AGENCIES OF A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DESIGN AN ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT WHICH IS ORGANIZED TO BE RESPONSIVE TO THEIR NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is unanimous agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 58

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE FOR SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF ITS GOALS AND OPERATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. Although a majority of members in both groups feel that this variable exists in the consortia they represent, when analyzed separately, this opinion is not great enough to be significant in either group. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 60

VARIABLE MEASURED: PROCEDURES AND CRITERIA FOR ADDING OR DROPPING INSTITUTIONS FROM THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE DEVELOPED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

On this variable, the two groups differ significantly in their opinions on its existence in the consortia used for this study (see Appendix). When viewed separately the Executive Directors strongly feel that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. The Member Agency Representatives, in contrast, are equally divided as to whether or not they feel this variable exists. The composite score indicates the presence of this variable, but this is due to the strong opinion of the Executive Directors which raised the mean score. As the two groups represent the same twelve consortia, this difference
in perspective as a function of position in the consortium and not a true difference in consortia.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- **N** Number of Respondents
- **SD** Standard Deviation
- **P** Probability
- **NS** Not Significant

**TABLE 61**

**VARIABLE MEASURED: CONTRACTS WITH EACH MEMBER AGENCY BY THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD LIST CONTRIBUTIONS AND REWARDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Director's Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does not exist in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate this opinion, when viewed separately, it is only the Executive Directors' responses that are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. The mean of the Member Agency Representatives' responses does not reach significance.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant

TABLE 62

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE ACTIVITIES WHICH CAN BE TANGIBLY EXPERIENCED BY BOTH STUDENTS AND STAFF OF PARTICIPATING MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24  2.08  0.88 .05</td>
<td>12  2.08  0.90 .05</td>
<td>12  2.08  0.90 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24  0.79  0.41 .05</td>
<td>12  0.75  0.45 NS</td>
<td>12  0.83  0.39 .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, it is only the Member Agencies whose responses are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. Although the Executive Directors indicate the opinion that this variable exists, their responses are more varied and do not represent a significant consensus.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- N  Number of Respondents
- SD  Standard Deviation
- P  Probability
- NS  Not Significant

TABLE 63

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DEVELOP A TOTAL PROGRAM WHICH IS COMPATIBLE WITH MEMBER AGENCY PROGRAMS, AND WHICH SERVES TO STRENGTHEN THEIR EXISTING PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or non-existence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 64

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SET OF ACTIVITIES SHOULD YIELD REBOUNDING BENEFITS TO MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that the variable exists in the consortia used for this study. Although both groups indicate the opinion that this variable exists, when viewed separately, only the Executive Directors' responses reach significance. The opinions of the Member Agencies were varied, so that the mean score does not show significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 65

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE A BODY OF SERVICES TO ITS MEMBER AGENCIES WHICH ARE COMPLETE ENOUGH FOR EACH MEMBER AGENCY TO JUSTIFY MEMBERSHIP CHARGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 66

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD INVOLVE INDIVIDUALS FROM EACH MEMBER AGENCY IN THE PLANNING OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES OF THE TOTAL CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, only the Member Agency Representatives' opinion was in sufficient agreement to be significant. The responses of the Executive Directors are varied so that the mean score does not show a significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 67

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE FOR A SYSTEMATIC EVALUATION OF ITS PROGRAMS IN ORDER TO DETERMINE THE DEGREE TO WHICH ITS OBJECTIVES ARE ACHIEVED, AS WELL AS A MECHANISM FOR CHANGING PROCEDURES BASED ON EVALUATION FEEDBACK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:** N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation; P- Probability; NS- Not Significant.
TABLE 68
VARIABLE MEASURED: THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF A CONSORTIUM MUST BE AN ESTABLISHED LEADER IN THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and to not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, only the Member Agency Representatives' opinion was in sufficient agreement to be significant. The responses of the Executive Directors are varied so that the mean score does not show a significant agreement as to the existence or nonexistence of this variable. It is interesting to note that this variable is, for the most part, considered presently to exist, but opinions as to whether or not it is important are approximately evenly divided.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N-Number of Respondents; SD-Standard Deviation; P-Probability; NS-Not Significant.
TABLE 69

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD HAVE AS ITS CHIEF EXECUTIVE AN INDIVIDUAL WHO IS STRONG IN THE AREA OF DISSEMINATION AND UTILIZATION OF KNOWLEDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively, there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. Although the average opinion in both groups conforms to this, when analyzed separately, there is not sufficient agreement in either group to reach significance. When combined, however, the increased number of respondents raises the t-value sufficiently to result in a significant composite score.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups approximately an equal number of representatives feel it exists, as say it does not exist. Thus, while
this is considered essential, many of the consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 70
VARIABLE MEASURED: THE ROLE OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OF THE CONSORTIUM SHOULD BE THAT OF A PROCESS HELPER OR CONSORTIUM MANAGER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
<td>N  Mean  SD  p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23 2.52 1.16 NS</td>
<td>12 2.83 1.03 NS</td>
<td>11 2.18 1.25 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>21 0.86 0.36 .05</td>
<td>10 0.70 0.48 NS</td>
<td>11 1.00 0.00 S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed separately the Member Agency Representatives feel that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. The Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed
opinion. Their responses range from finding it very important, to not important at all. A consensus for this group does not emerge. The resulting composite score, therefore, does not indicate a significant opinion as to the importance of this variable.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable does exist in the consortia used for this study. The two groups differ significantly, however, in their opinions on the existence of this variable in their consortia (see Appendix). When viewed separately, the Member Agency Representatives agree unanimously that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent. The Executive Directors, in contrast, show a mixed opinion about the existence of this variable. Their responses are too varied to reach a significant consensus.

It is interesting to note that on this variable it is the Member Agency Representatives that feel, significantly, that this aspect is both important and in existence. The Executive Directors are ambivalent on both questions.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant
TABLE 71

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DESIGN ORIENTATION MECHANISMS WHEREBY NEW INDIVIDUALS AND NEW INSTITUTIONS CAN BE EDUCATED WITH RESPECT TO THEIR RIGHTS, PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONSORTIUM MEMBERSHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, the analysis of variance indicates a significant difference in the means of the two groups of respondents. This was due to the stronger feelings of the directors that this variable is essential.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups, both opinions were expressed, and a significant consensus did not emerge. Thus, although this is considered essential, many of the consortia seem to have existed without
it in the opinion of the respondents.

**KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:**

- **N**: Number of Respondents
- **SD**: Standard Deviation
- **P**: Probability
- **NS**: Not Significant

**TABLE 72**

**VARIABLE MEASURED:** A CONSORTIUM SHOULD DISTRIBUTE FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES TO CONSORTIUM AGENCIES ON THE BASIS OF WHAT THEIR SPECIALIZED CAPABILITIES AND INTERESTS ARE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis of Essential Variable Statement**

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

**Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement**

It is interesting to note that although this variable is considered important, there is no agreement as to whether or not it presently exists. In both groups, both opinions were expressed, and
a significant consensus did not emerge. Thus, although this is considered essential, many of the consortia seem to have existed without it in the opinion of the respondents.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:
N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 73

VARIABLE MEASURED: THERE SHOULD BE CONGRUENCE OF OBJECTIVES BETWEEN THE CONSORTIUM AND ITS MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus, "S" is used to represent "significance."

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N Number of Respondents
SD Standard Deviation
P Probability
NS Not Significant

TABLE 74

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM PROVIDES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT POLICY GROUP REPRESENTING THE CONSORTIUM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. Although both groups, when viewed separately, support this opinion, only the responses of the Member Agencies reach significance. The failure of the Executive Directors' responses to reach significance
was due to the greater variability of their responses (i.e., the high standard deviation), indicating a greater range of opinions.

Analysis of In Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

- N Number of Respondents
- SD Standard Deviation
- P Probability
- NS Not Significant

TABLE 75

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD PROVIDE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREED-UPON POLICIES AND PROCEDURES THROUGH DESIGNATED PERSONS IN EACH OF THE MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.
Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

There is agreement by both groups that this variable does exist in the consortia they represent.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

N  Number of Respondents
SD  Standard Deviation
P  Probability
NS  Not Significant

| TABLE 76 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VARIABLE MEASURED: ROLES SHOULD BE DEFINED IN TERMS OF JOB RESPONSIBILITIES RATHER THAN IN TERMS OF THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF CERTAIN PERSONS |
| | Composites Response | Executive Directors' Response | Member Agencies' Response |
| Variable | N | Mean | SD | p | N | Mean | SD | p | N | Mean | SD | p |
| Essential | 23 | 2.61 | 0.89 | .05 | 11 | 2.27 | 0.79 | .05 | 12 | 2.92 | 0.90 | NS |
| Exists | 23 | 0.78 | 0.42 | .05 | 11 | 0.73 | 0.47 | NS | 12 | 0.83 | 0.39 | .05 |

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

When viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. However, when viewed separately it is apparent that this significant finding is due to the strong opinion of the Executive Directors. The responses of the Member Agencies were varied and did not reach a
consensus opinion as to the importance or nonimportance of this variable.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Viewed compositively there is agreement that this variable exists in the consortia used for this study. However, viewed separately, it is only the Member Agencies whose responses are in sufficient agreement to reach significance. Although the Executive Directors indicate the opinion that this variable exists, their responses are more varied and do not represent a significant consensus.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>Not Significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 77

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM SHOULD HAVE FORMAL CONTRACTS WITH MEMBER AGENCIES COMMITTING THEM TO PARTICIPATE IN JOINT EFFORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As there was complete agreement in the group, t-tests could not be performed because of the lack of variability. Thus "S" is used to represent "significance."
TABLE 78

VARIABLE MEASURED: A CONSORTIUM MUST HAVE A WIDER SCOPE OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS THAN MEMBER AGENCIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Composite Response</th>
<th>Executive Directors' Response</th>
<th>Member Agencies' Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of Essential Variable Statement

There is no agreement as to whether or not this variable is essential to the successful functioning of a consortium. That is, the responses of the members in both groups are varied and do not represent a consensus opinion.

Analysis of in Existence Variable Statement

Furthermore, there is no agreement as to whether or not this variable presently exists. In both groups, the responses are quite varied, thus it appears that the variable does exist in some consortia and not in others.

KEY to abbreviations used in this chapter: N- Number of Respondents; SD- Standard Deviation; P- Probability; NS- Not Significant.

Section Four--Interviews, Production Network

In addition to the data collected by means of the questionnaire,
further information regarding day-to-day consortium operation was elicited through interviews with the Executive Director and with a representative of a Member Agency of each of the consortia in the study sample. In response to the question, *WHAT MECHANISMS AND METHODS HAVE BEEN DESIGNED TO CREATE MATERIALS, PROGRAMS, IDEAS, PRODUCTION CAPABILITIES, ETC., FOR YOUR CONSORTIUM?*, the following kinds of more personal responses were obtained: Respondents perceived their consortia basically in two roles; as a stimulator of projects and programs with concomitant fund-hunting, and as the actual day-to-day administrator of any number of given projects.

Responsibilities are loosely structured. In many instances, the Executive Director is the channel through which groups and/or individuals are able to develop an idea. Concepts run the full gamut of university activity, from pure laboratory research to saving money on shuttle buses. While ideas are received whenever they strike, a number of respondents also mentioned more formalized planning sessions of varying personnel composition, at which time possible programs are discussed and developed. Again, the degree of formalized structure is a practical matter that varies according to the needs of each consortium.
CHAPTER V

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Findings and interpretations of data reported in Chapter IV will be summarized in this chapter, and conclusions drawn with the appropriate limitations, generalizations and implications for practice. Finally, recommendations for further study will be suggested, based on the results generated from this study. However, a brief review of the problem considered and summary of the design utilized is in order at this point to insure a proper perspective of the study.

Problem Summary

Increasing complexity of educational systems and institutions has necessitated the development and growth of mechanisms for joint participations and cooperative linkage systems. The consortium concept has provided a means to this goal. In general, voluntary consortia in higher education function with these purposes: (1) to establish a mass of specialized institutional, research and literary facilities, (2) to institute arrangements which provide additional specialized programs, (3) to increase offerings in low enrollment subject matter areas, (4) to raise funds and influence public policy, (5) to facilitate change, and (6) to promote information exchanges.
This study was designed with the primary objective of determining which operational variables contribute to the success of selected voluntary consortia in higher education. As a secondary objective, recommendations for further study were developed based on the data gained which related to organization, implementation and operation of consortia in higher education. As an additional secondary objective, hypotheses were generated that related operational variables to consortia success and could be tested empirically by future researchers.

Design Summary

Utilizing Carter Good's outline for descriptive survey investigation methodology (see p. 9), this study included the following:

1. A comprehensive review of related literature and research was made.

2. Twelve voluntary-association-type of consortia in higher education were identified and consented to participate in the research component of the study. (See Chapter I for criteria for selection.)

3. A list of operational variables for consortia was established.

4. These operational variables were synthesized.

5. The operational variables were analyzed as they related to the twelve consortia in the study sample.
6. A data collection instrument was developed to obtain information regarding importance assigned to operational variables; to secure information regarding the existence of these variables in the sample organizations and finally, to seek data from the sample population through open-ended questions in a semi-structured interview.

7. Data was collected, analyzed and synthesized.

8. Based on the limited sample in this study, a set of recommendations for organizing, implementing and operationalizing a consortium was drawn.

9. Hypotheses, capable of being tested empirically, were developed relating to these operational variables which appear essential to the successful functioning of a consortium.

**Findings**

For first consideration, those variables which were felt by the respondents to be essential to the successful operation of a consortium are presented. However, the rating of the existence of a variable within a consortium was not always in agreement with the raters' judgment of the necessity of that variable for the successful functioning of the consortia. Clearly, further research is indicated in at least two areas; one, with regard to those variables deemed essential but not in existence in the consortium, and two, with regard to those variables deemed non-essential to successful function, but
present in the consortium nevertheless. It is possible, for example, that differences in perception of a variable's existence or non-existence among Member Agency Representatives as opposed to Executive Directors could be accounted for because the structure under consideration in the variable was either in the process of being developed, or being "phased out." This possibility, and the apparently self-contradictory data from which it was extrapolated, will be further considered in this chapter. However, first those variables deemed essential and in existence will be covered.

It should be noted, of course, that at this stage, the set of operational variables deemed essential and in existence still cannot be considered absolute. They can be used as a guide to the establishment and operation of a successful consortium. Nor has it been definitively established that those variables deemed non-essential and non-existent must indeed be so, in order for a consortium to function. This study has identified the variables. The variables should be further tested in terms of the actual effects of their presence or absence, collectively or singly, upon the actual functions of consortia. It should then be possible to extract a definitive set of practical applications.

Follow-up interviews or correspondence, after a given period of continued successful functioning, should confirm the continued necessity and existence of the variables deemed essential and in
existence. A more finely honed testing instrument should be devised to consider the degree to which those variables which have been consistently over a period of time considered essential and in existence, have been so.

In the interviews almost every respondent either directly or indirectly, by suggestion or by omission, brought up the question of the degree to which a consortium should be bureaucratized. Obviously, as shown in Chapter IV, many structures are perceived as necessary to the existence of the consortia, and existence becomes in itself a function. However, it is interesting to note how many of the individual respondents interviewed felt that their consortia had to be flexible and somewhat informal in many areas of responsibility. This leads to the conclusion that although one function of any consortium must be to exist—creating thereby a climate of expanded academic community feeling—the consortium must be self-limiting in order not to strangle on its own growth.

As findings presented in Chapter IV indicate, a questionnaire designed to test whether criteria expressed in the seventy-five variables exist in the consortia, and whether these criteria are essential or superfluous to the successful functioning of the consortia, was sent to each of the twelve Executive Directors and the twelve Member Agency Representatives of the consortia in this study. The questions relating to essential value of variables were rated by the respondents
on a 1-to-5 scale, with a rating of one indicating strongest agreement with the value of the variable, and a rating of five indicating an opinion that the variable was superfluous. Low scores, therefore, indicate the greatest degree of agreement with the variable. A score of three indicates no consensus.

A t-test was computed between the achieved mean and the expected mean (i.e., three for the question of essential value of the variables) for each variable, to establish whether or not a significant difference did indeed exist, for the composite score of the two groups of respondents (Executive Directors and Member Agency Representatives) as well as separately for each group. Since the direction of findings had not been predicted, significance level is reported for a two-tailed test. Findings with regard to each individual variable are presented in detail in the tables in Chapter IV.

However, in summation, as a result of the foregoing methodology, the following variables have been deemed essential to the successful functioning of a voluntary consortium in higher education:

Communications Network

Operational variables categorized in the Communications Network are those which suggest methods and mechanisms through which member agencies can communicate and exchange important information among themselves and with a consortium headquarters.
Variable 2

A consortium should develop a formalized two-way communication network which provides the central staff and individualized agencies the mechanisms to present their needs and possible avenues of accomplishment of these needs.

Variable 3

A consortium should develop a systematic communications network where information can be channeled to all member agencies on a regular basis.

Variable 4

A consortium should establish channels of communication with external agencies in an effort to determine the input from those agencies and to influence the output of the consortium.

Variable 5

An educational consortium should have a built-in system for focusing national attention on major areas of its concern.

Variable 6

Consortium members should have equal decision power in the allocation of resources of the total consortium.
Variable 7

A consortium should build liaison with key interface personnel in member agencies whose responsibility it is to keep member agencies informed about consortium activities.

Variable 8

It is important that key personnel of member agencies are aware of the vital importance of the benefits derived from consortium membership and from the services of the administrative staff.

Variable 9

A consortium should establish a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institution's central administration.

Logistics/Resource Network

Operational variables categorized in the Logistics/Resource Network deal with such areas as budget, inventory or resources, maintenance of records, processing requests for the utilization of resources, transferring of resources, and determining accountability. Logistical network operational variables deal with the solicitation of resources internal and external to the consortia.

Variable 11

A consortium should develop and utilize budget resources
that are goal-directed.

**Variable 13**

A consortium should provide for the equitable distribution of funds to a central operational staff and to each member agency staff.

**Variable 14**

A consortium must develop mechanisms by which external finances can be secured to continue and further its work.

**Variable 15**

A consortium should provide a set of fixed services and benefits as a result of consortium membership.

**Variable 16**

A consortium must have provisions for continuous funding of its central administrative staff through allocations made by various consortium member agencies.

**Variable 17**

A consortium should require each member to contribute to a pool of financial resources.

**Variable 18**

A consortium should have a governing office with geographical proximity to all member agencies.
Variable 20

A consortium should be organized to utilize the limited or specialized resources of member agencies effectively and efficiently.

Variable 21

A consortium should build into its procedure regular periodic business meetings and work sessions planned between a central consortium administrative staff and policy-making staff.

Variable 22

A consortium should provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for member agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institution.

Variable 23

An educational consortium should effect better staff utilization than individual agencies can achieve.

Variable 24

A consortium should provide mechanisms to synthesize and deal with the information explosion.

Variable 25

A consortium makes provisions for member institutions, through regularly scheduled meetings, to determine consortium programs and policies.
Conceptual Network

Operational variables categorized in the Conceptual Network deal with those ideas which suggest a common, cognitive map which can be used to guide joint activity. A conceptual network deals with the common basis used by the consortium for guiding its overall effort so that the contributions of each member can be planned, timed and evaluated while the overall effort is geared toward a common set of goals, purposes and philosophical base. Therefore, operational variables listed under conceptual network deal with ideas and philosophies used for developing this cognitive map in relation to the efforts of member agencies and the central coordinating agency of a consortium.

Variable 28

An educational consortium should be designed to attack broader problems than any agency member individually.

Variable 29

There should be discrimination between consortium responsibilities and member institutions' responsibilities and activities.

Variable 32

An educational consortium should occupy a leadership position in its area of expertise.
Variable 33

A consortium should seek community support through public relations.

Variable 34

A consortium establishes the criteria by which it is judged.

Variable 35

Members of a consortium must accept a dependence on one another as well as maintain a sense of autonomy.

Variable 36

Policies of a consortium must reflect a majority opinion, although there must be provisions to consider minority interests.

Variable 37

A consortium should be organized so that administrative structures are conducive to individual initiative.

Variable 38

A commitment by top administrative officers of member agencies to the consortium is necessary.

Variable 39

Not only must a successful consortium meet immediate needs of its clients but it must also identify future needs and prepare for them.
Variable 41

A consortium should have a governing document which will be explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership.

Variable 42

One of the major purposes of a consortium is innovation.

Variable 44

A consortium should be designed to honor the autonomy of its members.

Variable 46

There should be a commitment of member agencies to some central administration or person in the consortium.

Production Network

Operational variables categorized in the Production Network deal with organizational mechanisms and methods designed to create materials, programs, ideas, production capabilities, etc., for the consortium.

Variable 50

It is the role of the central office staff to stimulate, facilitate, coordinate, communicate, monitor, and evaluate consortium activities.
Variable 51

A consortium must develop mechanisms so that continuity of sponsorship is to be continued both monetarily and philosophically.

Variable 52

No one institution should be able to dominate the policy-making phases of the consortium.

Variable 53

Member agencies should provide designated representatives who have policy-making authority to represent them in consortium planning.

Variable 54

Member agencies of a consortium should design an administrative unit which is organized to be responsive to their needs.

Variable 55

A consortium should provide for systematic evaluation of its goals and operations.

Variable 56

There should be centralized planning as well as provision for member's participation in decision making in consortium development.
Variable 57

Procedures and criteria for adding or dropping institutions from the consortium should be developed.

Variable 59

A consortium should provide activities which can be tangibly experienced by both students and staff of participating member agencies.

Variable 60

A consortium should develop a total program which is compatible with member agency programs, and which serves to strengthen their existing programs.

Variable 61

A consortium set of activities should yield rebounding benefits to members.

Variable 62

A consortium should provide a body of services to its member agencies which are complete enough for each member agency to justify membership charges.

Variable 63

A consortium should involve individuals from each member
agency in the planning of evaluation activities of the total consortium.

**Variable 64**

A consortium should provide for a systematic evaluation of its programs in order to determine the degree to which its objectives are achieved, as well as a mechanism for changing procedures based on evaluation feedback.

**Variable 66**

A consortium should have as its chief executive an individual who is strong in the area of dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

**Variable 68**

A consortium should design orientation mechanisms whereby new individuals and new institutions can be educated with respect to their rights, privileges and responsibilities of consortium membership.

**Variable 69**

A consortium should distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are.

**Variable 70**

There should be congruence of objectives between the consortium and its member agencies.
Variable 71

A consortium provides for the establishment of a permanent policy group representing the consortium.

Variable 72

A consortium should provide for the implementation of agreed-upon policies and procedures through designated persons in each of the member agencies.

Variable 73

Roles should be defined in terms of job responsibilities rather than in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of certain persons.

The apparently dichotomous data developed in Chapter IV, with regard to variables deemed necessary to success, but nevertheless not in existence in the particular consortium, and those variables deemed not essential to success but nevertheless in existence in the consortium, must, of course, be considered in further detail.

The following table extracts and presents the pertinent data.
**A statistical phenomenon is to be observed in Table 69, wherein the composite responses of the two groups of respondents differs from the level of significance reached in responses viewed separately. See Table 69.**

It is apparent from this chart that the twelve consortia in the study sample, which are functioning successfully, are doing so in the absence of a number of operational variables which their Executive
Directors and a Member Agency Representative have deemed essential to such successful functioning. As a matter of practical application, this appears somewhat improbable. In light of the possibility that the missing structure or concept may represent a felt need not yet developed, or may have received lower priority in terms of funds available, personnel and other resources, this apparent contradiction calls for follow-up testing to determine if, after a given period has elapsed, the respondents still feel the variable is essential, and if so, if it has come into existence in the individual consortia.

The chart also indicates several instances where Executive Directors and Member Agency Representatives disagree with one another, in either their judgment as to whether or not a variable is necessary, or in their perception of its actual existence or non-existence. Again, the possibility of the variable being in a formative stage at one or another level must be accounted for here.

The variable considered on Table 36, "A Consortium Should Seek Community Support Through Public Relations," provoked an interesting set of responses. Although a statistically significant portion of both groups of respondents agreed that this is essential to success, the Executive Directors felt that their consortia did not carry out such activity, and the Member Agency Representatives felt that they did. This dispute may have its roots in the differences in administrative responsibilities inherent in the roles of the respondents.
Table 37, which considers "A Consortium Establishes the Criteria by Which It is Judged," also depicts disagreement between Executive Directors and Member Agency Representatives as to the necessity of a particular variable. Many consortia, in the judgment of the respondents, seem to have succeeded without it, despite the tendency of Member Agency Representatives to find it necessary.

Data presented in Table 44, which considers the variable, "A Consortium Should Have a Governing Document Which Will Be Explicit in Defining Roles and Obligations of All Participating Institutions As Well As the Rewards for Membership," illustrates disagreement among groups of respondents as to the actual existence of the variable. Again implicit in the nature of the variable tested is the possibility that such a document may be evolving through day-to-day operations, and the disparity in perception may stem from the roles of the different groups of respondents.

Role differentiation may also account for the disparity remarked in Table 45, "One of the Major Purposes of a Consortium is Innovation." (See Table 45.)

**Recommendations for Future Study**

The first step in any future study of the operational variables affecting the success of voluntary consortia in higher education must be to follow up, under carefully structured test conditions, those
variables which were deemed essential but not present in the consortia considered. For example, after a period of continued successful operation, the possibility that respondents' opinions as the essential nature of a given variable may have altered, should be investigated. Further research should establish whether or not those missing structures or concepts which respondents felt to be essential, have indeed been developed, and if so, to what degree the functioning of the consortium has improved. Researchers must also raise questions as to the meaning of the consortia's ability to operate successfully in the absence of concepts and conditions they themselves have defined as necessary, specifically:

Table 4

A consortium should develop a formalized two-way communication network which provides the central staff and individualized agencies the mechanisms to present their needs and possible avenues of accomplishment of these needs.

Table 11

A consortium should establish a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institution's central administration.

Table 16

A consortium should provide for the equitable distribution of
funds to a central operational staff and to each Member Agency staff.

**Table 18**

A consortium should provide a set of fixed services and benefits as a result of consortium membership.

**Table 23**

A consortium should be organized to utilize the limited or specialized resources of Member Agencies effectively and efficiently.

**Table 25**

A consortium should provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for Member Agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institution.

**Table 67**

A consortium should provide for a systematic evaluation of its programs in order to determine the degree to which the objectives are achieved, as well as a mechanism for changing procedures based on evaluation feedback.

**Table 71**

A consortium should design orientation mechanisms whereby new individuals and new institutions can be educated with respect to their rights, privileges and responsibilities of consortium membership.
Table 72

A consortium should distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are.

Improvement in function and operation due to the advent of any or all of the above variables should also be considered in depth. Further exploration of these areas may well generate implications for practical application.

Future study should also pursue further validation of those variables deemed to be both essential to the success of a consortium, and in existence, as listed on pages 181 to 190 of this chapter. Questions can be raised as well from those variables deemed both non-essential and non-existent in the study sample of successful consortia. Would their presence have detracted from the success of the consortia, in terms of time, money and person-hours consumed? Were these variables present, and to what degree, in consortia that have failed?

Suggestions for Further Testing and Research

The following list of operational variables was generated by the responses to questions posed in this study, and should be investigated in terms of the variables' necessity to the successful functioning of a consortium.
1. Information regarding proposals, procedures, strategies, progress, objectives and functions of the entire consortia effort should flow from a central originating and coordinating point.

2. Different classes of membership should exist to insure that diversity of program can be developed according to the needs and available resources of each member.

3. Member institutions should establish effective liaison mechanisms among themselves.

4. A monitoring system should be established to assure that a majority of members are deriving value from consortium activities.

5. Consortium directors should possess high-level administrative backgrounds.

6. Each member agency can enhance its community service through the selection of competence areas of the range of consortium offerings.

7. Each member institution must be prepared to sacrifice some of its autonomy for the larger good.

8. The formation and growth of a consortium should be based only on tested principles.

9. The success of a consortium is directly related to the length of time it has existed.

Research involving these variables should cover their presence or absence in consortia defined as successful, as well as possible
effects their presence or absence may have had upon consortia that have not succeeded.

Hypotheses To Be Tested

The following hypotheses have been generated as a result of this study. Provided that a workable and satisfactory definition of "optimum efficiency" can be developed for purposes of empirical testing, a study of these points would constitute a significant contribution to the body of knowledge already formulated regarding the successful operation of educational consortia.

1. In order to operate at optimum efficiency, work on consortium projects must be done only by member institutions.

2. In order to operate at optimum efficiency, a consortium's goals and objectives must be clearly defined.

3. In order to operate at optimum efficiency, a consortium must establish specific criteria for membership.

4. In order to operate at optimum efficiency, the staff of the consortium should limit its activities to consortium business and projects and should not teach or perform other academic functions.

Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

The essential variables set forth previously comprise, of course, the most valuable summary of the data collected for this study. It is very obvious that successful voluntary consortia in higher
education have many factors in common. The variables found to be non-essential have been considered in terms of future study, and need not be reiterated here.

For a broader, more inclusive point of view, potential problem areas may be examined in terms of the four networks heretofore categorized.

1. Communication: In order to survive, a consortium must establish formalized, systematic channels of communication between its member representatives, its member institutions and its staff. This, of course, should not be taken to preclude informal, continual day-to-day types of communication that constantly occur in the consortia considered.

2. Logistics/Resource: A consortium must be assured of funding both from its members and from external sources in order to carry out its programs. Member agencies must be considered by the consortium in terms of the resources they can contribute and the needs they must fulfill, as well as in terms of the benefits that can or will accrue to them through membership.

3. Conceptual: A consortium must be built on a philosophical foundation which is made up of common goals, unifying administrative structure, delineated responsibilities and programs which benefit member agencies. Benefits of consortium membership in terms of improved function of member agency, and approval by its
own constituency and sources of support, relate to the structure of this foundation.

4. **Production:** A consortium must create organizational methods and mechanisms for the purposes of evaluation, sponsorship perpetuation, instigation of worthwhile programs and decision-making processes.

It is noteworthy that projects, of mutual interest to all member agencies but outside the scope or immediate area of concern of any individual member agency, have provided and presumably will continue to provide strong impetus for the formation of a consortium.

To function successfully presupposes the ability to continue to grow. For a consortium, growth must involve both the development of its own internal administrative structures and the conceptualizing and implementation of projects and programs. Both of these categories must have sufficient tolerance to allow the termination of outgrown projects or structures. Each consortium, then, evolves those structures essential to its own survival, and discards those it finds irrelevant or unnecessary. The question of existence *qua* function is summed up in the Bauhaus dictum, "Form is function." Such an evolving or streamlining process may account for differences in the perception of the existence or non-existence of a number of variables. Growth in function, then, may take place in the form of tightening up as well as expansion of structures and concepts. Each group that
forms a consortium must set its own limits in such areas as member involvement, breadth of program, and time/personnel commitment, and must determine for itself to what degree it will formalize its operations, without either falling apart from lack of participation or becoming so administratively intricate that program suffers. This on-going form of self-criticism could be shown, for consortia, in the form of a reversible reaction:

\[ E \leftrightarrow F \]

(Existence becomes Function as Function becomes Existence.) One might suggest further that consortium success may well depend upon this equation remaining in a state of balance: too great the emphasis on existence, and it is detrimental to function; too great the emphasis on function, and it can adversely affect existence.
APPENDIX A

RESPONSES FROM PANEL OF EXPERTS
November 7, 1972

Mr. Walter L. Marks  
Board of Education  
Montclair Public Schools  
22 Valley Road  
MONTCLAIR, New Jersey  07042  
U.S.A.

Dear Walt:

Thanks for inviting me to serve on a panel of experts for your doctoral study. I shall be pleased to help out in whatever ways I can.

After more than a year spent in a UCEA member university, I have had an opportunity to think further about UCEA's operation as a consortium, from a perspective different from that of a central staff member. The twelve "Principles for Success of a Consortium" that I developed for the Ohio State Group still seem fully valid to me. In retrospect, however, I would add the following three additional ones:

13. If a consortium is established to facilitate a particular area of endeavour within member institutions (rather than generally serving the institutions' interests as a whole), a strong and effective spokesman's role with the institutions' central administrations must be played by those representing the particular area of endeavour served by the consortium.

14. A major source of potential conflict exists between the extent to which a consortium serves the several unique interests of individual members and the extent to which it focuses upon a few selected interests held in common by groups of members; a delicate balance must be struck and carefully monitored to ensure both that a majority of members derive value from consortium activities and that selected programmatic thrusts are evident in consortium priorities.
15. Careful discrimination is needed between consortium responsibilities and activities that can be decentralized to those in member institutions, and those that must remain with the headquarters staff; in general, most of the work on consortium projects should be done by those in member institutions, and the headquarters staff should limit its efforts to stimulation, facilitation, coordination, communication, monitoring, and evaluation roles vis-a-vis consortium work.

At the moment, I think these fifteen principles reflect about as much as I can contribute to your identification of significant operational variables in consortia development. As your study progresses, you may want to provide me with different kinds of stimuli that might evoke further thoughts that could be of help to you. If so, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Best wishes to you for every success in completing your interesting and worthwhile study.

Yours sincerely,

Robin H. Farquhar
Chairman

RHF:bg
Operating Principles for Success of a Consortium

1. Member institutions should not be in dysfunctional competition with one another, at least insofar as consortium-related operations are concerned.

2. Each member institution should have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium; there must be give, as well as take, by all members.

3. Participation in the consortium should yield direct and significant benefit to all Member institutions.

4. Contributions of member institutions in the consortium should complement or supplement one another in a fruitful fashion; they should not cancel one another out in terms of impact or replicate one another unnecessarily. Overall, there should be an internal balance among contributions and a gestalt effect that is greater than the sum of the parts.

5. All member institutions should have clearly established, equal, and regular opportunities to influence consortium programs and policies.

6. The consortium should be a leadership as well as a service agency with respect to member institution operations; it should not only respond to immediate needs, but should identify future needs and design programs for responding to them.

7. Mechanisms must be established for fast and easy
communication, not just between consortium members and the central agency, but also among member institutions.

8. Approaches must be developed to assess the effectiveness of the consortium's program. This means that objectives for the consortium as a consortium must be specified; means of determining the degree to which these objectives are achieved must be developed; and procedures for adapting consortium operations (or changing consortium objectives) on the basis of evaluative feedback must be established.

9. Procedures and criteria for adding institutions to, or dropping them from, consortium membership must be established.

10. The relationships between the consortium (in terms of its products and processes) and external individuals and institutions must be delineated (with respect to both input to and output from the consortium).

11. While a core of benefits from consortium membership should be received by all participants in common, the value of other significant benefits received from the consortium should be directly related to the extent of contribution made to its operations.

12. Mechanisms should be devised whereby new individuals in member institutions and individuals in new member institutions may be educated and socialized with respect to the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of consortium membership; the history, purposes,
and functions of the consortium; the policies, processes, and products of consortium operations; and the structure, governance, and support mechanisms of the consortium.
October 27, 1972

Mr. Walter L. Marks
Director of Planning and Evaluation
Montclair Public Schools
22 Valley Road
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

Dear Walt:

Among the variables which contribute to the success of consortia or cooperatives in higher education, I would list the following:

- Congruency of objectives of the consortium and member agencies;
- Clarity of expectations regarding obligations and rewards;
- Perception of benefits by key personnel of member agencies;
- Distribution of functions and responsibilities on the basis of specialized capabilities and interests;
- Equitable allocation of tasks and rewards;
- Parity of decision-making among member agencies or their representatives.

The attached sheet will help to clarify the meaning which I attach to some of the variables listed. Others might be added.

Are you using a Delphi Technique to reach consensus on the variables or to achieve consistency of definition?

All good wishes.

Sincerely yours,

Francis S. Chase

FSC:ia
att.

The big problems in the building of effective consortia of the scope implied inhere in the long processes of planning and negotiations required (a) to bring about broad agreement on the needs to be met, the direction of change, and the goals of action; (b) to assess the capabilities and primary functions of the several agencies as a basis for differentiation of functions, and the playing of complementary roles for the accomplishment of the agreed upon purposes; (c) to assure equitable contributions by the several agencies to a pool of substantial resources, with each agency's contribution being determined by consideration both of its resources and of the returns which it may anticipate on its investment in the common effort; (d) to obtain agreement on the establishment of a decision-making body, or bodies, which will give all members equal opportunity to participate in policy making—and at the same time facilitate decisions based on analyzed information and shared values; (e) to work out means through which each participating agency will be assured of benefits in terms of improved performance of its own functions, approval by its own constituency and sources of support, and improved morale of its staff. These are conditions not to be achieved easily or without long and painful negotiations and the exercise of resourceful and imaginative leadership. Moreover, these conditions are difficult to attain at all under funding policies which reward competition among agencies and foster rivalry in respect to credit for accomplishments.
Mr. Walter L. Marks  
Director of Planning and Evaluation  
Montclair Public Schools  
22 Valley Road  
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

Dear Walt:

I will try to respond to your letter of October 30. Of course, I am willing to do whatever I can to assist in your dissertation, but the task is somewhat unclear to me. I don't know whether you are suggesting that I reflect on my experience in developing a consortium and identify what I consider to be critical factors, or whether you want me to do a more theoretical work-up on variables and their interrelationships in the development of consortia. Since I don't feel competent to do the latter without a lot of hard work, I am going to assume that you want the former and provide some of my reflections based on my experience with the MTP consortium.

Start-Up Variables

1. The existence of a set of institutions that have common goals, problems, and opportunities, as well as some complementary capabilities.

2. An invisible college, including persons from a subset of the above-referenced institutions who have worked together in the past, developed respect for each other, learned to trust each other, and implicitly agreed to help each other in relation to future problems.

3. External start-up funds.
Planning Variables

1. Establishment of a policy group representing the proposed consortium.

2. Establishment of an operational staff to service the policy group.

3. Context evaluation pertaining to the proposed consortium, followed by establishment of a common set of objectives to be pursued by the consortium.

4. An input evaluation intended to identify and assess alternative strategies for meeting the consortium goals, followed by decision making by the consortium as to which strategy will be pursued.

5. Formalization of communication within and between consortium agencies.

6. Involvement of several persons from each consortium agency in planning and evaluation activities.

Initial Operational Variables

1. External operational funds to support the consortium's work.

2. Distribution of the funds to a central operational staff as well as each consortium agency, to foster consortium work centrally and locally.

3. Transferring the policy leadership role from the operational staff to the policy representatives of the consortium agencies.

4. Delegation of operational authority and responsibility to the consortium agencies as well as the operational staff.

5. Periodic business meetings and work sessions for the policy group and working group of the consortium.


Institutionalization of the Consortium

1. Funding of the consortium central staff by the consortium agencies.
2. Providing a valuable service by the central staff to the consortium agencies.


4. Securing external moneys to further the work of the individual consortium agencies as well as the central consortium thrust.

Off the top of my head, these are some factors that I believe to be important in the development of consortia, but I certainly wouldn't argue that this is a complete list. I hope, however, that the ideas will prove of some use to you.

Sincerely,

Daniel L. Stufflebeam
Director

DLS:jt
October 27, 1972

Mr. Walter Marks
Director of Planning and Evaluation
Montclair Public Schools
Administration Building
22 Valley Road
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

Dear Walt:

Attached is a brief list of variables which I see as important to the success of any consortium or cooperative effort in higher education.

Good hearing from you; good luck with the big "D"!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jerry F. Walker
Associate Director for Evaluation

JHW/mml

Enclosure
VARIABLES AFFECTING CONSORTIA SUCCESS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

RECIPIROCAL BENEFITS: Each member agency must feel that it is receiving as much as it gives.

SHARED UNDERSTANDING: Each member agency must thoroughly understand the procedures, strategies, objectives and functions of the entire consortia effort.

CONTINUITY OF GOALS: It is important that the original goals not become displaced in favor of means for their attainment (e.g., materials development should not become the goal of a training effort).

SUFFICIENT RESOURCES: Availability of time, personnel, money and talent must be sufficient.

CENTRALIZED PLANNING AND MONITORING: Although a participatory decision structure is necessary to assume shared understanding and commitment during implementation, it is essential that information flow have a central originating or coordination point.

CONTINUITY OF SPONSORSHIP: Sponsors must assure consortia of continued support throughout the cooperative program. Continuity of support is both monetary and substantive; the latter referring to the necessity of avoiding shifting performance expectations (usually political in origin).

POLICY-LEVEL REPRESENTATION: It is important that the officially designated representatives from the member agencies have sufficient actual or delegated authority to make policy level decisions for their agency relative to the consortium effort.

CLEAR SUCCESS CRITERIA: The intermediate and ultimate criteria by which the cooperative effort will be judged successful (or not) must be: (1) clear; (2) understood; (3) measurable; (4) attainable; and (5) shared by sponsors, consortia members, prime contractors, and ultimate learners (clients).
November 2, 1972

Mr. Walter L. Makus
Director of Planning and Evaluation
Montclair Public Schools
22 Valley Road
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

Dear Walt:

Your letter of October 23rd requested that I identify factors which seem to make the difference in the success or failure of consortia. I am sorry I cannot give this task the kind of attention that it deserves but I will list some factors which occur to me immediately as being important. Perhaps this top of the head reaction might be the best I could offer anyhow. I will itemize these factors and try to put them in as close a priority as I think they deserve.

1. Common Goals. It almost goes without saying that the extent to which two or more institutions have common goals, to that extent consortia are likely to be successful. Sometimes common goals are not that obvious and often spadework is needed to dig them out.

2. Commitment by Top Administrative Heads of Consortium Agencies. It is not uncommon for middle echelon people to be the instigators and the ones committed to consortia. When the press comes, however, it is often the top administrator who has to take action and unless he is committed to the concept it is likely that a consortium will fail. Often a sign-off by the top administrative head is a perfunctory matter.

3. Organic Ties. By this I mean forms of institutionalization that bind members of the consortium together. Organic ties may take many forms, such as shared staffing or a common budget from which each agency draws.

4. Clear Understanding and Equal Decision Power in the Allocation of Resources. Consortia that are dominated by one agency in the sense that they completely control the budget will usually find themselves alone in the press. Some type of budget committee with representation from each agency which actually has the power of budget allocation is probably the best form. Unfortunately, funds are usually allocated to one fiscal agent, which makes this type of structure difficult to achieve. Incidentally, budget resources should be goal-directed.
5. What's In It For Me? This is similar to number 1 above, relating to common goals, but it is a more crass statement. Nevertheless, it is people who make consortia work, and the personal values, needs and expectations of each person must be met to some degree if they are going to work in any cooperative effort with others. In some cases the answer to this question is simply more money. In other cases it is a matter of prestige, establishing a network of contacts to further one's personal or organizational goals, etc.

6. Liaison Among Institutions. I think successful consortia build in liaison or interface personnel who keep each member informed about what's happening and who make them feel that they are a part of a larger organization. These contact people are probably the most important people in making a consortium work. They must be human relations experts. They are the glue that keep the agencies together.

7. Interpersonal Relationships Across Agencies. People who have close professional or other ties across agencies usually make for successful consortia. There should be opportunity for personal interaction. When this interaction occurs at some depth in each agency in contrast to one or a few persons having contacts, it is more likely to be successful.

8. Physical Proximity of Agencies. Several of the factors listed above directly or indirectly deal with this factor. Agencies close to each other, for example, may be more likely to have common goals, e.g., serving the citizens of a community, would be more likely to have people who know each other and certainly would foster more personal interaction.

These are some of the factors that I think are most important. I hope they shed some light on the problem. I would be interested in receiving an abstract of your findings when you have completed your dissertation. Good luck to you in your pursuit of a union card.

Sincerely yours,

James N. Jacobs
Director of Program Research
and Design

JNJ/mmb
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APPENDIX B

STUDY SAMPLE--EXECUTIVE DIRECTORS

STUDY SAMPLE--MEMBER AGENCIES
STUDY SAMPLE---Executive Director

SOUTH

1. Dr. William G. Pollard, Executive Director
   Oak Ridge Associated Universities
   P.O. Box 117
   Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

2. Dr. Wingate Lucas, Director
   King College
   Box 391
   Bristol, Tennessee 37620

3. Dr. Paul A. Marrotte, Executive Director
   Piedmont University Center of North Carolina, Inc.
   Reynolds House
   Box 11045 Bethabara Station
   Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106

4. Dr. Richard Bender, Executive Director
   Association of Colleges and Universities
   for International-Intercultural Study
   P.O. Box 840
   Nashville, Tennessee 37203

MIDWEST

5. Dr. Jack Culbertson, Director
   University Council for Educational Administration
   Ramseyer Hall
   The Ohio State University
   Columbus, Ohio

6. Dr. Fredrick Jackson, Director
   Committee on Interinstitutional Cooperation
   Suite 970
   1603 Orrington Avenue
   Evanston, Illinois 60201

7. Dr. Henry A. Acres, President
   Great Lakes Colleges Association
   Suite 26J, '55 East William
   Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108
8. Dr. Dan M. Martin, President  
Associated Colleges of the Midwest  
60 West Walton Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60610

9. Dr. Samuel Baskin, President  
Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities  
Antioch College  
Yellow Springs, Ohio 45387

EAST

10. Dr. Robert A. Byerly, Executive Director  
University Center at Harrisburg  
2991 North Front Street  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110

11. Dr. Joseph Malone, President  
Regional Council for International Education  
1101 Bruce Hall  
University of Pittsburgh  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 13213

12. Dr. Lawrence Fox, Executive Director  
Worcester Consortium for Higher Education, Inc.  
Boynton Hall  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute  
Worcester, Massachusetts 01609
STUDY SAMPLE--Member Agency Representatives

SOUTH

1. Dr. Michael J. Pelczar  
   Vice President for Graduate Students and Research  
   University of Maryland  
   College Park, Maryland

2. Dr. James T. Northern  
   Academic Dean  
   Morristown College  
   P. O. Box 340  
   Morristown, Tennessee

3. Dr. Raymond Bost  
   LeNoir-Rhyne College  
   Hickory, North Carolina

4. Dr. William Wilson  
   Academic Dean  
   Virginia Wesslyn  
   Norfolk, Virginia

EAST

5. Dr. Morley J. Mays  
   Elizabethtown College  
   Elizabethtown, Pennsylvania 17022

6. Dr. Erno Dahl, Vice President  
   Academic Affairs  
   Wittenberg University  
   Springfield, Ohio

7. Dr. Loran W. Downey, Chairman  
   Department of Educational Administration  
   704 Commonwealth Avenue  
   Boston University School of Education  
   Boston, Massachusetts

8. Dr. Reamer Kline, President  
   Bard College, Anadale-on-the-Hudson  
   Anadale, New York
9. The Reverend John Brooks, President
   Holy Cross College
   Worcester, Massachusetts

MIDWEST

10. Dr. Herman King, Assistant Provost
    Michigan State University
    436 Administration Building
    East Lansing, Michigan 48823

11. Dr. George Rainsford, President
    Kalamazoo College
    Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

12. Dr. Miller Upton, President
    Beloit College
    Beloit, Wisconsin
APPENDIX C

TELEPHONE SURVEY--CONSORTIA AGENCIES
Hello:

I am a student at The Ohio State University pursuing a doctorate of philosophy in educational administration. I am conducting research for the purpose of identifying operational variables which contribute to the success of consortia or cooperatives in higher education.

Presently I am engaged in establishment of my study sample and need some additional data regarding your consortium. Would you please answer the following questions about your consortia.

Yes  No

1. Are there at least five agencies represented in the consortium to which you belong?

2. Has your consortium been in operation for 5 years or more?

3. Is the primary responsibility of your consortium to education?

4. Is one function of your consortium to provide some form of either in-service or pre-service training for your membership?

5. Is your consortium a formal organization with a constitution and governing body?

6. Is your consortium a voluntary association of institutions or is it mandated by state legislation?

Thank you for your cooperation.
APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE
Letter to Panel of Experts

October 24, 1972

Dear

I appreciate your willingness to assist me on my dissertation by serving as a member on a panel of experts. My research is being conducted to identify operational variables which contribute to the success of consortia or cooperatives in higher education.

Variables have been identified as factors which impinge upon an institution, are changeable, and may assume any one of a set of values; therefore, this set of factors as they effect the functioning of organizational elements such as finance, structure, personnel, communication, etc., are defined as operational variables.

To supplement a literature search for these operational variables my design makes provision for a panel of experts, knowledgeable about consortium development, to be established in order to provide additional operational variables.

As a result of your experience in consortium development I am pleased that you are able to serve on the panel and provide me with a set of operational variables which you feel need to be considered in developing and implementing a consortium.

I shall appreciate hearing from you by return mail. A self-addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Very truly yours,

Walter L. Marks
January 16, 1973

Dear

I am conducting a dissertation study relating to consortia in higher education. The purpose of my study is to identify operational variables which need to be met and incorporated in a consortia organizational model in higher education. To supplement other information sources it would be most helpful if I could obtain any type of document, by-laws or constitution, organizational charts, etc., that you have which relate to your consortia. The information from these documents will be included with other data in establishing operational variables.

Your cooperation would be much appreciated. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Walter L. Marks
Letter to Pilot Study Team

May 23, 1973

Dear

I am very appreciative that you have agreed to help me with my dissertation study by serving as a member of the pilot study team. In evaluating the enclosed instrument I would like the following criteria to be used: (1) clarity of the language in the questionnaire; (2) specificity of the content; (3) singleness of purpose of a statement; (4) freedom from assumption; (5) freedom from suggestion; (6) linguistic completeness and grammatical consistency. It would be most useful if these criteria could be applied to the seventy-five operational variable statements in Part I and Part II of the instrument.

A second function that I wish you to perform deals with your assessment of the four questions asked about communication, logistics, conceptual and production networks. The purpose of these questions is to seek in-depth information of how executive directors and member agency representatives see their consortium relating to each of these networks. Telephone interviews will be conducted with both groups in order to secure the information relative to these questions.

An early reply on this data gathering instrument would be much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Walter L. Marks
Letter sent to Executive Directors and Member Agency Representatives

Dear

I would like to thank you for your cooperation in assisting me with my dissertation studies. As stated in our telephone conversation, I am in the process of determining a set of operational variables which need to be met in a consortia organization model in higher education in order to insure a degree of success.

Variables in my study are defined as factors which impinge upon an institution, are changeable, and may assume any one of a set of values. This set of factors as they effect the functioning of organizational elements such as finance, structure, personnel, communication, etc., are defined in the study as operational variables.

The first function will be to rate the operational variables in relation to their importance to consortia development. The second function will be your reaction to a series of questions on a semi-structured interview to be conducted by telephone. The interview will seek data regarding the specific consortia with which you are associated.

I will call you in the near future to establish a time when the interview can be conducted. Once again, I thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Walter L. Marks
APPENDIX E

CONSENSUS DEFINITIONS--
ORGANIZATIONAL NETWORKS
CONSENSUS DEFINITIONS OF THE FOUR MAJOR NETWORKS:

COMMUNICATION, LOGISTICS, CONCEPTUAL,
AND PRODUCTION

1. Operational variables categorized in the Communications Network are those which suggest methods and mechanisms through which member agencies can communicate and exchange important information among themselves and with a consortium headquarters.

2. Operational variables categorized in the Conceptual Network deal with those ideas which suggest a common, cognitive map which can be used to guide joint activity. A conceptual network deals with the common basis used by the consortium for guiding its overall effort so that the contributions of each member can be planned, timed, and evaluated so that the overall effort is geared toward a common set of goals, purposes, and philosophical base. Therefore, operational variables listed under conceptual network deal with ideas and philosophies used for developing this cognitive map in relation to the efforts of member agencies and the central coordinating agency of a consortium.

3. Operational variables categorized in the Logistic Network deal with such areas as budget, inventory of resources, maintenance of records, processing requests for the utilization of resources, transferring of resources, and determining accountability. Logistical network operational variables deal with the solicitation of resources internal and external to the consortia.

4. Operational variables categorized in the Production Network deal with organizational mechanism and methods designed to create materials, programs, ideas, production capabilities, etc. for the consortium.
APPENDIX F

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT
PART I

Requirements for a Consortium to Succeed

Instructions

The following statements express ideas about consortia. I am interested in whether you think the implementation of these ideas is necessary for the success of the consortium.

Read each statement and decide if you agree or disagree with the statement. Then record your answer on the scale provided.

The two "agree" alternatives refer to the degree to which you think the ideas contained in the statement are necessary for the success of the consortium.

You should select the "of no consequence" response alternative if you think the opinion expressed in the sentence has no effect on the success of the consortium, or if you are undecided.

The two "disagree" alternatives refer to the degree to which you think the utilization of the ideas will interfere with the successful functioning of the consortium.

If there are any statements on which you would like to comment, do so next to the question or on the back of the paper.

Remember, I would like your opinion on whether the implementation of the ideas expressed in the statements will facilitate or interfere with the successful functioning of a consortium.

Rating Scale to be Used

Circle the appropriate number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>strongly agree</td>
<td>agree</td>
<td>of no consequence</td>
<td>disagree</td>
<td>strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


1 2 3 4 5 1. A consortium should develop methods for forcing member agencies to disseminate the policies of the consortium.

1 2 3 4 5 2. An educational consortium should have a built-in system for focusing national attention on major areas of its concern.

1 2 3 4 5 3. A consortium should establish a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institution's central administration.

1 2 3 4 5 4. A consortium should provide for the equitable distribution of funds to a central operational staff and to each member agency staff.

1 2 3 4 5 5. A consortium should require each member to contribute to a pool of financial resources.

1 2 3 4 5 6. A consortium should build into its procedure regular periodic business meetings and work sessions planned between a central consortium administrative staff and policy-making staff.

1 2 3 4 5 7. A consortium makes provisions for member institutions, through regularly scheduled meetings, to influence consortium programs and policies.

1 2 3 4 5 8. There should be discrimination between consortium responsibilities and member institutions' responsibilities and activities.

1 2 3 4 5 9. A consortium establishes the criteria by which it is judged to be either successful or unsuccessful.

1 2 3 4 5 10. A commitment by top administrative officers of member agencies to the consortium is necessary for its effective functioning.

1 2 3 4 5 11. One of the major purposes of a consortium is innovation.

1 2 3 4 5 12. There should be a loyalty and commitment of member agencies to some central administration or person in the consortium.
12345 13. It is the role of the central office staff to stimulate, facilitate, coordinate, communicate, monitor, and evaluate consortium activities.

12345 14. Member agencies of a consortium should design an administrative unit which is organized to be responsive to their needs.

12345 15. There should be centralized planning as well as provision for members' participation in decision making in consortia development.

12345 16. A consortium should develop a total program which is compatible with member agency programs, and which serves to strengthen their existing programs.

12345 17. A consortium should involve individuals from each member agency in the planning of evaluation activities of the total consortium.

12345 18. The role of the chief executive of the consortium should be that of a process helper or consortium manager.

12345 19. There should be congruence of objectives between the consortium and its member agencies.

12345 20. A consortium should have formal contracts with member agencies committing them to participate in joint efforts of the consortium.

12345 21. A consortium should develop a formalized two-way communication network which provides the consortium and individual agencies the mechanism to present their needs and possible avenues for accomplishment of these needs.

12345 22. Consortium members should have equal decision power in the allocation of resources of the total consortium.

12345 23. A consortium needs available external start-up funds.
24. A consortium must develop mechanisms by which external finances can be secured to continue and further its work.

25. A successful consortium should have a governing office with geographical proximity to all member agencies.

26. A consortium should provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for member agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institution.

27. Educational cooperatives should be more able to play a political action role than any individual member.

28. The consortium should incorporate a set of institutions which have complementary capabilities.

29. Members of a consortium must be willing to maintain a dependence on others as well as a sense of autonomy.

30. Not only must a successful consortium meet immediate needs of its clients but it must also identify future needs and prepare for them.

31. The consortium should address itself to the potential conflict of faculty unionism.

32. Consortia should be built to enhance interpersonal relationships through personal interaction.

33. A consortium must develop mechanisms so that continuity of sponsorship is to be continued both monitarily and philosophically.

34. A consortium should provide for systematic evaluation of its goals and operations.

35. Procedures and criteria for adding or dropping institutions from the consortium should be developed.
36. A consortium set of activities should yield re-
bounding benefits to members.

37. A consortium should provide for a systematic 
evaluation of its programs in order to determine 
the degree to which its objectives are achieved, as 
well as a mechanism for changing procedures based 
on evaluation feedback.

38. A consortium should design orientation mechanisms 
whereby new individuals and new institutions can be 
educated with respect to their rights, privileges, 
and responsibilities of consortium membership.

39. A consortium provides for the establishment of a 
permanent policy group representing the consortium.

40. A consortium must have a wider scope of academic 
programs than member agencies.

41. A consortium should develop a systematic commu-
nications network where information can be channeled 
to all member agencies on a regular basis.

42. A consortium should build liaison with key interface 
personnel in member agencies whose responsibility 
it is to keep member agencies informed about con-
sortium activities.

43. A consortium should develop and utilize budget re-
sources that are goal-directed.

44. A consortium should provide a set of fixed services 
and benefits as a result of consortium membership.

45. The consortium should be developed on a regional 
basis.

46. Educational cooperatives should effect better staff 
utilization than individual agencies may achieve.

47. Members of a consortium should be institutions 
which have common goals, problems, and oppor-
tunities.
1 2 3 4 5 48. The consortium should incorporate institutions and individuals who do not have competing interests.

1 2 3 4 5 49. Though policies of a consortium must reflect a majority opinion, there must be provisions to consider minority interests.

1 2 3 4 5 50. A consortium should de-emphasize competition among agencies.

1 2 3 4 5 51. A consortium should be designed to honor the autonomy of its members.

1 2 3 4 5 52. The consortium should be composed of institutions that have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium.

1 2 3 4 5 53. Plans should be designed so that no one institution is able to dominate the policy-making phases of the consortium.

1 2 3 4 5 54. Contracts with each member agency by the consortium should list contributions and rewards.

1 2 3 4 5 55. A consortium should provide a body of services to its member agencies which are complete enough for each member agency to justify membership charges.

1 2 3 4 5 56. The chief executive of a consortium must be an individual who is an established leader in the field of higher education.

1 2 3 4 5 57. A consortium should distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are.

1 2 3 4 5 58. A consortium should provide for the implementation of agreed-upon policies and procedures through designated persons in each of the member agencies.

1 2 3 4 5 59. A consortium should establish channels of communication with external agencies in an effort to determine the input from those agencies and to influence the output of the consortium.
60. It is important that key personnel of member agencies are aware of the vital importance of the benefits derived from consortium membership and from the services of the administrative staff.

61. Educational cooperatives should be in a better position to attract soft money than individual members of the consortium.

62. A consortium must have provisions for continuous funding of its central administrative staff through allocations made by various consortium member agencies.

63. A consortium should be organized in a way that it will provide more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources of member agencies.

64. A consortium should provide mechanisms to synthesize and deal with the information explosion.

65. Educational cooperatives should be especially designed to attack broader problems than any agency member individually.

66. An educational consortium should occupy a leadership position in its area of expertise.

67. A consortium must be available for public scrutiny.

68. A consortium should be organized so that administrative structures are conducive to individual initiative.

69. A consortium should have a governing document which will be explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership.

70. A consortium should design a procedure to facilitate change in higher education.
71. To insure a diversity of programs which meet the needs and tap the available resources of each member, it is necessary for a consortium to have equitable allocation of tasks among its member agencies.

72. Member agencies should provide designated representatives who have policy-making authority to represent them in consortium planning.

73. A consortium should provide activities which can be tangibly experienced by both students and staff of participating member agencies.

74. A consortium has as its chief executive an individual who is strong in the area of dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

75. Roles should be defined in terms of job responsibilities rather than in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of certain persons.
PART II

Attributes of Your Consortia

Instructions

In this part of the questionnaire I am interested in specific aspects of your consortium.

Read each statement carefully and decide whether or not the ideas that inhere in the statements apply to your consortium.

Answer "yes" if the statements pertain to your consortium, and "no" if they are unrelated.

If you would like to comment further on these statements, write your comment next to the statement or on the back of the paper.

Responding Key for Part II--Attributes of Your Consortia

Circle your response

yes no

yes no 1. Are there methods for forcing member agencies to disseminate the policy of the consortium?

yes no 2. Is there a built-in system for focusing national attention on major areas of its concern?

yes no 3. Does your consortium have a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institutions' central administration?

yes no 4. Has your consortium provided for the equitable distribution of funds to a central operational staff and to each member agency staff?

yes no 5. Is each member required to contribute to a pool of financial resources?
yes no 6. Are regular periodic business meetings and work sessions between a central consortium administrative staff and policy-making staff built into your procedure?

yes no 7. Are there provisions for member institutions, through regularly scheduled meetings, to influence consortium programs and policies?

yes no 8. Is there a discrimination between consortium responsibilities and member institutions' responsibilities and activities?

yes no 9. Has your consortium established the criteria by which it is to be judged either successful or unsuccessful?

yes no 10. Are top administrative officers of member agencies committed to the consortium?

yes no 11. Is one of the major purposes of your consortium innovation?

yes no 12. Is there a loyalty and commitment of member agencies to some central administration or person in the consortium?

yes no 13. In your consortium is it the role of the central office staff to stimulate, facilitate, coordinate, communicate, monitor, and evaluate consortium activities?

yes no 14. Do you feel that your consortium has an administrative unit which is responsive to the needs of the consortium?

yes no 15. Is there centralized planning as well as provision for participation in decision-making?

yes no 16. Does your consortium have a total program which is compatible with member agency programs, and which serves to strengthen their existing programs?
17. Does your consortium involve individuals from each member agency in planning evaluation activities of the total consortium?

18. Is the role of the chief executive of the consortium a process helper or consortium manager?

19. Is there congruence of objectives between the consortium and its member agencies?

20. Does your consortium have formal contracts with member agencies committing them to participate in joint efforts of the consortium?

21. Is there a formalized two-way communication network which provides the consortium and individual agencies the mechanism to present their needs and possible avenues for accomplishment of these needs?

22. Is there a clear understanding among consortium members that they have equal decision power in the allocation of resources of the total consortium?

23. Were there available external start-up funds?

24. Are there mechanisms by which external finances can be secured to continue and further the consortium's work?

25. Is your governing office in geographical proximity to all member agencies?

26. Does your consortium provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for member agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institutions?

27. Is your consortium more able to play a political action role than any individual member?

28. Do the institutions in your consortium have complementary capabilities?
29. Are the members of your consortium willing to maintain a dependence on one another as well as a sense of autonomy?

30. In addition to meeting the immediate needs of its clients, does your consortium identify future needs and prepare for them?

31. Does your consortium address itself to the potential conflict of faculty unionism?

32. Does your consortium enhance interpersonal relationships through personal interaction?

33. Are there mechanisms so that continuity of sponsorship is continued both monetarily and philosophically?

34. Does your consortium provide for systematic evaluation of its goals and operations?

35. Are there procedures and criteria for adding or dropping institutions from your consortium?

36. Does the set of activities of the consortium yield rebounding benefits to members?

37. Does your consortium provide for a systematic evaluation of its programs in order to determine the degree to which its objectives are achieved, as well as a mechanism for changing procedures based on evaluation feedback?

38. Does your consortium have orientation mechanisms whereby new individuals and new institutions can be educated with respect to their rights, privileges, and responsibilities of consortium membership?

39. Does your consortium provide for the establishment of a permanent policy group representing the consortium?

40. Does the consortium have a wider scope of academic programs than member agencies?
41. Is there a systematic communications network where information can be channeled to all member agencies on a regular basis?

yes no

42. Are there liaisons with key interface personnel in member agencies whose responsibility it is to keep member agencies informed about consortium activities?

yes no

43. Are the budget resources goal directed?

yes no

44. Are there a set of fixed services and benefits as a result of consortium membership?

yes no

45. Was your consortium developed on a regional basis?

yes no

46. Is there better staff utilization in your educational cooperative than could be achieved by individual agencies?

yes no

47. Are the members of your consortium institutions which have common goals, problems, and opportunities?

yes no

48. Does your consortium have institutions and individuals who have competing interests?

yes no

49. In your consortium are there provisions to consider minority interests?

yes no

50. Is competition among agencies de-emphasized?

yes no

51. Is it designed to honor the autonomy of its members?

yes no

52. Is your consortium composed of institutions which have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium?

yes no

53. Are plans designed so that no one institution is able to dominate the policy-making phases of the consortium?

yes no

54. Do the contracts between the consortium and the member agencies list contributions and rewards?
yes no 55. Are the bodies of services provided by the consortium to its member agencies complete enough for each member agency to justify membership charges?

yes no 56. In your consortium is the chief executive an individual who is an established leader in the field of higher education?

yes no 57. Does your consortium distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are?

yes no 58. Are there provisions for the implementation of agreed upon policies and procedures through designated persons in each of the member agencies?

yes no 59. Are there established channels of communication with external agencies in an effort to determine the input from those agencies and to influence the output of the consortium?

yes no 60. Are key personnel of member agencies aware of the vital importance of the benefits derived from consortium membership and from the services of the administrative staff?

yes no 61. Is your consortium in a better position to attract soft money than individual members of the consortium?

yes no 62. Are there provisions for continuous funding of your consortium's central administrative staff through allocations made by various consortium member agencies?

yes no 63. Was your consortium organized in a way that it provides more effective and efficient utilization of limited or specialized resources of member agencies?

yes no 64. Does it provide mechanisms to synthesize and deal with the information explosion?
65. Is your consortium especially designed to attack broader problems than any agency member individually?

66. Does your consortium occupy a leadership position in its area of expertise?

67. Is it available for public scrutiny?

68. Are administrative structures so organized as to be conducive to individual initiative?

69. Is there a governing document which is explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership?

70. Is your consortium organized to facilitate change in higher education?

71. Are there equitable allocations of tasks from the consortium's member agencies?

72. Do member agencies provide designate representatives who have policy-making authority to represent them in consortium planning?

73. Does your consortium provide activities which can be tangibly experienced by both students and staff of participating member agencies?

74. Is your chief executive an individual who is strong in the area of dissemination and utilization of knowledge?

75. Are roles defined in terms of job responsibilities and not in terms of strengths and weaknesses of certain persons?
PART III

Semi-Structured Interview

**Question Number One**

What procedures exist in your consortium which enable member agencies to communicate and exchange information among themselves, as well as with the consortium headquarters?

**Question Number Two**

What are the primary goals of your consortium and the philosophies upon which these goals are based? How were these goals and philosophies considered in determining the roles of the member agencies and the central coordinating agency?

**Question Number Three**

In your consortium what procedures have been established to organize both internal and external resources? How are such areas as budget, inventory of resources, record maintenance, requests for resources, transference of resources and accountability dealt with?

**Question Number Four**

What mechanisms and methods have been designed to create materials, programs, ideas, production capabilities, etc., for your consortium?
APPENDIX G

STATISTICAL DATA
## Communication Network Variables

1. A consortium should develop methods for requiring agencies to disseminate the policies of the consortium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t^1</td>
<td>p^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-5.79</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. A consortium should develop a formalized two-way communication network which provides the central staff and individualized agencies the mechanisms to present their needs and possible avenues of accomplishment of these needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t^1</td>
<td>p^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-7.67</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. indicates those questions asking for agreement or disagreement with the variable statement.
2. indicates those questions asking whether the variable exists in their consortia.
3. t-tests were computed between the achieved mean and the expected mean. A negative t indicates that the achieved mean is less than the expected mean.
4. Level of significance required for significance is .05. Greater significance levels is not reported but is presented as .05. For the t-tests and the correlations (r), probability is reported based on a two-tailed test as direction was not predicted.
5. Analysis of variance was performed between the Executive Group and the Member Agencies for each question to see if their responses differed. The attained F values for the differences between the means is reported.
6. Correlations between a and b for each question were computed to determine if there was a relationship between agreeing with a statement and whether or not the variable is judged as existing in the consortium. Level of significance is reported for a two-tailed test as direction was not predicted.
7. NS indicates "not significant."
### Communication Network Variables (continued)

3. A consortium should develop a systematic communications network where information can be channeled to all member agencies on a regular basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-13.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. A consortium should establish channels of communication with external agencies in an effort to determine the input from those agencies and to influence the output of the consortium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>-5.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. An educational consortium should have a built-in system for focusing national attention on major areas of its concern.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-2.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates those groups where t's or f's cannot be computed because there is no variability in response, (i.e., everyone gave the same response).

8* indicates significance in those cases where the t's or f's cannot be computed because of no variability.
Communication Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. A consortium should build liaison with key interface personnel in member agencies whose responsibility it is to keep member agencies informed about consortium activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-10.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. It is important that key personnel of member agencies are aware of the vital importance of the benefits derived from consortium membership and from the services of the administrative staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-4.74</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Communication Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  MEAN  SD  t  p</td>
<td>N  MEAN  SD  t*  p</td>
<td>N  MEAN  SD  t*  p</td>
<td>F  p  r  p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23 1.65 0.65 -9.98 .05</td>
<td>11 1.55 0.52 -9.06 .05</td>
<td>12 1.75 0.75 -5.68 .05</td>
<td>0.56 NS</td>
<td>0.30 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics/Resources Network Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24 1.06 1.08 -0.19 NS</td>
<td>12 3.17 1.27 0.46 NS</td>
<td>12 2.75 0.87 -1.00 NS</td>
<td>0.88 NS</td>
<td>0.11 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. A consortium should establish a strong and effective spokesman's role with each member institution's central administration.

10. A consortium needs external start-up funds.

11. A consortium should develop and utilize budget resources that are goal-directed.
### Logistics/Resources Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t'</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t'</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. An educational consortium should be organized to attract soft money.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. A consortium should provide for the equitable distribution of funds to a central operational staff and to each member agency staff.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>-2.90</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A consortium must develop mechanisms by which external finances can be secured to continue and further its work.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Logistics/Resources Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. A consortium should provide a set of fixed services and benefits as a result of consortium membership.

16. A consortium must have provisions for continuous funding of its central administrative staff through allocations made by various consortium member agencies.

17. A consortium should require each member to contribute to a pool of financial resources.
Logistics/Resources Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential 24</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>-2.51</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists 22</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. A consortium should have a governing office with geographical proximity to all member agencies.

19. The consortium should be developed on a regional basis, as opposed to national.

20. A consortium should be organized to utilize the limited or specialized resources of member agencies effectively and efficiently.
## Logistics/Resources Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-8.95</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. A consortium should build into its procedure regular periodic business meetings and work sessions planned between a central consortium administrative staff and policy-making staff.

22. A consortium should provide a resource bank of ideas which makes it possible for member agencies to enrich those programs which lack prominence within their institution.

23. An educational consortium should effect better staff utilization than individual agencies can achieve.
### Logistics/Resources Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N MEAN SD t p</td>
<td>N MEAN SD t' p</td>
<td>N MEAN SD t' p</td>
<td>F p t p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. A consortium should provide mechanisms to synthesize and deal with the information explosion.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22 2.55 0.60 -3.58 .05</td>
<td>10 2.40 0.70 -2.73 .05</td>
<td>12 2.67 0.49 -2.36 .05</td>
<td>1.10 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists 24 0.21 0.41 -3.44 .05</td>
<td>12 0.25 0.45 -1.92 NS</td>
<td>12 0.17 0.39 -3.03 .05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.23 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. A consortium makes provisions for member institutions through regularly scheduled meetings, to determine consortium programs and policies.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24 1.25 0.53 -16.13 .05</td>
<td>12 1.25 0.62 -9.72 .05</td>
<td>12 1.25 0.42 -13.46 .05</td>
<td>0.0 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists 24 0.92 0.28 7.19 .05</td>
<td>12 0.83 0.39 3.03 .05</td>
<td>12 1.00 0.0 + S</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.20 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Conceptual Network Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N MEAN SD t p</td>
<td>N MEAN SD t' p</td>
<td>N MEAN SD t' p</td>
<td>F p t p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. An educational consortium should be more able to play a political action role than any individual member.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22 3.18 1.18 0.72 NS</td>
<td>10 3.0 1.49 0 NS</td>
<td>12 3.33 0.89 1.23 NS</td>
<td>0.42 NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists 22 0.36 0.49 -1.30 NS</td>
<td>10 0.50 0.53 0 NS</td>
<td>12 0.25 0.45 -5.74 .05</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.44 NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Members of a consortium should be institutions which have common goals, problems, and opportunities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. An educational consortium should be designed to attack broader problems than any agency member individually.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-6.82</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

29. There should be discrimination between consortium responsibilities and member institutions' responsibilities and activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>-8.75</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The consortium should incorporate a set of institutions which have complementary capabilities.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The consortium should incorporate institutions and individuals who do not have competing interests.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

#### 32. An educational consortium should occupy a leadership position in its area of expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-7.80</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 33. A consortium should seek community support through public relations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-4.39</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 34. A consortium establishes the criteria by which it is judged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-2.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35.</th>
<th>Members of a consortium must accept a dependence on one another as well as maintain a sense of autonomy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>36.</th>
<th>Policies of a consortium must reflect a majority opinion, although there must be provisions to consider minority interests.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>37.</th>
<th>A consortium should be organized so that administrative structures are conducive to individual initiative.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-17.29</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>10.49</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-7.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. A commitment by top administrative officers of member agencies to the consortium is necessary.

39. Not only must a successful consortium meet immediate needs of its clients, but it must also identify future needs and prepare for them.

40. A consortium should deemphasize competition among members.
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. A consortium should have a governing document which will be explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>-2.60</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 42. One of the major purposes of a consortium is innovation. |
| Essential | 24  | 2.13 | 0.99 | -4.24 | .05 | 12  | 1.67 | 0.89 | -5.20 | .05 | 12  | 2.58 | 0.90 | -1.60 | NS | 6.31 | 05 | 0.50 | .05 |
| Exists    | 24  | 0.58 | 0.50 | 0.81  | NS | 12  | 0.67 | 0.49 | 1.20  | NS | 12  | 0.50 | 0.52 | 0     | NS | 0.65 | NS |

| 43. The consortium should address itself to the potential conflict of faculty unionism. |
| Essential | 24  | 3.58 | 0.97 | 2.93  | .05 | 12  | 3.67 | 1.15 | 2.03  | NS | 12  | 3.50 | 0.80 | 2.17  | .05 | 0.17 | NS | 0.35 | NS |
| Exists    | 23  | 0.99 | 0.29 | -6.87 | .05 | 12  | 0.17 | 0.39 | -3.00 | .05 | 11  | 0.00 | 0.00 | +     | S  | 2.01 | NS |

41. A consortium should have a governing document which will be explicit in defining roles and obligations of all participating institutions, as well as the rewards for membership.

42. One of the major purposes of a consortium is innovation.

43. The consortium should address itself to the potential conflict of faculty unionism.
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. A consortium should be designed to honor the autonomy of its members.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>-11.56</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. A consortium should design procedures to facilitate change in member agencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-1.63</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. There should be a commitment of member agencies to some central administration or person in the consortium.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-6.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.52</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Conceptual Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t   p</td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t'   p</td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t'   p</td>
<td>F   p   r   p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24     2.88  0.95 -0.62 NS</td>
<td>12     2.58  1.00 -1.45 NS</td>
<td>12     3.17  0.83  0.71 NS</td>
<td>2.42 NS</td>
<td>0.55 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23     0.83  0.39  5.15  .05</td>
<td>12     0.92  0.29  5.25  .05</td>
<td>12     0.73  0.47  1.64 NS</td>
<td>1.40 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Production Network Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t   p</td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t'   p</td>
<td>N      MEAN  SD   t'   p</td>
<td>F   p   r   p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24     2.75  0.90 -1.37 NS</td>
<td>12     2.83  1.11 -0.53 NS</td>
<td>12     2.67  0.65 -1.74 NS</td>
<td>0.20 NS</td>
<td>0.64 .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24     0.54  0.51  0.40 NS</td>
<td>12     0.50  0.52   0    NS</td>
<td>12     0.58  0.51  0.53 NS</td>
<td>0.16 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. Consortia should be built to enhance interpersonal relationships.

48. The consortium should be composed of institutions that have something unique to contribute to the productive operation of the consortium.

49. To insure a diversity of programs which meet the needs and tap the available resources of each member, it is necessary for a consortium to have equitable allocation of tasks among its member agencies.
### Production Network Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-13.78</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**50.** It is the role of the central office staff to stimulate, facilitate, coordinate, communicate, monitor, and evaluate consortium activities.

**51.** A consortium must develop mechanisms so that continuity of sponsorship is to be continued both monetarily and philosophically.

**52.** No one institution should be able to dominate the policy-making phases of the consortium.
53. Member agencies should provide designated representatives who have policy-making authority to represent them in consortium planning.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-9.68</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>10.99</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. Member agencies of a consortium should design an administrative unit which is organized to be responsive to their needs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>-5.56</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. A consortium should provide for systematic evaluation of its goals and operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>-34.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VARIABLES</td>
<td>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</td>
<td>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</td>
<td>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</td>
<td>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</td>
<td>CORRELATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-7.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. There should be centralized planning as well as provision for members' participation in decision-making in consortium development.

57. Procedures and criteria for adding or dropping institutions from the consortium should be developed.

58. Contracts with each member agency by the consortium should list contributions and rewards.
Production Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. A consortium should provide activities which can’t be tangibly experienced by both students and staff of participating member agencies.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-5.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. A consortium should develop a total program which is compatible with member agency programs, and which serves to strengthen their existing programs.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. A consortium set of activities should yield rebounding benefits to members.</td>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
62. A consortium should provide a body of services to its member agencies which are complete enough for each member agency to justify membership charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-6.78</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

63. A consortium should involve individuals from each member agency in the planning of evaluation activities of the total consortium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-6.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64. A consortium should provide for a systematic evaluation of its programs in order to determine the degree to which its objectives are achieved, as well as a mechanism for changing procedures based on evaluation feedback.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-13.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Production Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65. The chief executive of a consortium must be an established leader in the field of higher education.

66. A consortium should have as its chief executive an individual who is strong in the area of dissemination and utilization of knowledge.

67. The role of the chief executive of the consortium should be that of a process helper or consortium manager.
### Production Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>-6.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. A consortium should design orientation mechanisms whereby new individuals and new institutions can be educated with respect to their rights, privileges and responsibilities of consortium membership.

69. A consortium should distribute functions and responsibilities to consortium agencies on the basis of what their specialized capabilities and interests are.

70. There should be congruence of objectives between the consortium and its member agencies.
**Production Network Variables (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-2.22</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71. A consortium provides for the establishment of a permanent policy group representing the consortium.

72. A consortium should provide for the implementation of agreed-upon policies and procedures through designated persons in each of the member agencies.

73. Roles should be defined in terms of job responsibilities rather than in terms of the strengths and weaknesses of certain persons.
Production Network Variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>COMPOSITE RESPONSE</th>
<th>EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSE</th>
<th>MEMBER AGENCY RESPONSE</th>
<th>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-7.23</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exists</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

74. A consortium should have formal contracts with member agencies committing them to participate in joint efforts.

75. A consortium must have a wider scope of academic programs than member agencies.
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