CHALLENGING BOUNDARIES: EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS IN PUBLIC/PRIVATE POST-SECONDARY HEALTH PROGRAMS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

by

DIANE E. REED

B.Sc.N., The University of Saskatchewan, 1977
M.A. (Adult Education), The University of British Columbia, 1984

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

(Educational Leadership and Policy)

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

(Vancouver)

April 2009

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this interpretive/descriptive qualitative study was to develop a framework to enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary institutions in British Columbia (B.C.), Canada. In B.C., both public and private post-secondary institutions offer health programs for employment purposes. Through interviews with representatives of institutions in both sectors, industry stakeholders, and government, this study documented that there were limited interactions and few existing partnerships between the two types of institutions. Significant distrust and negative attitudes toward potential partners were evident although advantages and positive strategic outcomes of partnerships, as well as examples of potential partnerships, were cited by interviewees. Perspectives from interviewees about the role of the B.C. government with regard to private institutions and potential partnerships between the two sectors of education were also documented. Partnership vignettes were created based on the reports of interviewees. The academic literature about partnerships in business, the academic literature about post-secondary education, and information from a variety of sources about the context of post-secondary education in B.C., including mechanisms government uses to influence post-secondary institutions, were used to reflect on the interview findings. Distinctions between public and private post-secondary institutions were identified.

Reasons for the lack of partnerships were proposed, including lack of knowledge about the potential partner, philosophical disagreement, concerns

about quality in the private sector, and "bad experiences" with the opposite sector. A typology of purposes of partnerships was proposed. Matters related to institutional compatibility, based on the concepts of institutional complementarity, self-sufficiency, the concept of adaptive efficiency (Alter & Hage, 1993), as well as competition between institutions, willingness to collaborate, and the purposes of the partnerships being contemplated, were considered. The concept of boundaries as a framework for understanding partnerships between the two types of institutions was developed. Boundaries identified included philosophy and values, the culture of institutions, administrative/management, attitude, and institutional accountabilities. Recommendations for researchers, educators/educational administrators, and policy-makers were provided.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF PARTNERSHIP VIGNETTES

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ACCC	Association of Canadian Community College
AUCC	Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
B.C.	British Columbia
BCCCA	British Columbia Career Colleges Association
BCAHC	British Columbia Academic Health Council
BCCAT	British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfers
BCGEU	British Columbia Government Employees Union
CEGEP	College d'enseignement general et professionnel / College of General and Vocational Education
HRDSC	Human Resources and Social Development Canada
NACC	National Association of Career Colleges
PCTIA	Private Career Training Institutions Agency
PCCs	Private Career Colleges
PVTS	Private Vocational Training Schools

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to my Committee members, Dr. Thomas J. Sork (Supervisor), Dr. Kjell Rubenson, and Dr. Thomas W. Ross, for their guidance through the dissertation process. In particular, I would like to thank Dr. Sork for his patient and useful responses to my many questions over an extended period of time.

I would also like to thank my fellow students in the 2001 cohort of the Ed.D. program at UBC who have graciously given their support and have become good friends and wonderful colleagues.

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

"Be prepared to develop symbiotic relationships with private [post-secondary educational] institutions. They are a reality and we must develop policy to relate to them." (Brown, 2000, p. 11)

"Inevitably, the issue of privatization will become more and more prominent in the lexicon of college education." (Dennison, 1995b, p. 8)

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework to enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary institutions in British Columbia (B.C.). This chapter introduces the study.

Introduction

For many years British Columbians have participated in learning experiences in both publicly funded and private post-secondary educational institutions in order to obtain entry-level credentials as health care workers and prepare themselves for employment, or to update their knowledge and skills for ongoing employment in the health care system. Interactions between the two types of institutions have generally been quite limited. The public and private institutions which have offered health programs of similar academic intent, and often in the same communities in B.C., seem to have operated on separate tracks with few obvious points of intersection and no major attempts at integration.

In years past, it may have seemed that there was little need, and certainly little appetite, for interaction between the two worlds of post-secondary education. However, circumstances change. Political climates, workplace human resource requirements, and

technological innovation conspire to create shifts which are subtle at first, but are the harbingers of more complexity and the need for different approaches.

With respect to the preparation of health care workers in B.C., the two types of educational institutions have tended to become more acutely aware of each other when problems have arisen. One problem that has been difficult to document has been the concerns sometimes expressed by employers to administrators of health programs in the public post-secondary system about the quality of graduates and inconsistencies of graduate skills between private institutions. Another problem has been the competition among public and private institutions for the increasingly scarce clinical placements required for students in health programs. Unfortunately, historically, these types of problems have tended to result in suspicion of private institutions by publicly funded institutions.

In 1997, the Working Committee on Public-Private Articulation Agreements (B.C. Ministry of Education, Skills and Training, and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology, 1997) identified other concerns of public sector representatives working to articulate courses with private sector institutions. These included the perspective that private sector institutions are "the lucky beneficiaries of limited regulation, lower expenses, a more compliant work force, and more flexible and responsive governing and administrative apparatuses" (B.C. Ministry of Education, Skills and Training and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology, 1997, p. 19). Consistent with that, public system representatives offering health programs have, in the past, also been concerned that, in the cases in which there are programs with provincial curricula developed with public funds, private institutions would have free

access to materials from which, in essence, the private institutions have the potential to generate a profit. In fact, in 2004, at the time of the closure of the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology, which had been the clearinghouse for educational materials for B.C.'s post-secondary system, provincial course materials were placed into an electronic database. Access to the materials was restricted to public institutions that had signed a licensing agreement (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, 2008b).

There have been some movements toward integration and rationalization of the activities of public and private post-secondary educational institutions in general. An important development was described in a publication by the British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer (BCCAT) in 2004 (BCCAT, 2004b, p. 4) with the creation by BCCAT of a policy whereby the private institutions offering degree programs with Ministerial consent were permitted to formally articulate their course offerings within the B.C. system of transfer of credit. This is not entirely surprising given that articulation between individual public and private institutions has taken place informally for many years. However, the amount of this activity is unknown, because much of it has been at the level of college credentials, has been on an informal basis, and has not been recorded centrally in the *BC Transfer Guide* published annually by BCCAT (BCCAT, 2009).

Another development that created opportunities for integration was the advent of the British Columbia Academic Health Council (BCAHC). The mission of this umbrella organization which straddles institutions associated with health care and post-secondary education, was to serve "as a major strategic forum for effective collaboration, partnership by senior leaders in health care and

education" (BCAHC, 2009a, p. 1). Although the roster of members of BCAHC did not include any private post-secondary institutions, private institutions have had one of their umbrella organizations, the British Columbia Career Colleges Association (BCCCA), representing them on a BCAHC committee. One of these committees is the Practice Education Committee which has addressed "the BC Academic Health Council's strategic priority to coordinate a systematic approach to student practice education" (BCAHC, 2009b, p. 1).

Other than the BCAHC activities described above, the consequences of the lack of integration between the two types of institutions for health human resource planning in B.C. have largely been unrecognized. Historically, when government has made decisions about numbers of seats for particular health programs in publicly funded institutions based on labour market data, the numbers of anticipated graduates from private sector institutions have not been considered. This information gap had been brought to the attention of government by representatives of public post-secondary institutions (B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors, 2002). The gap is increasingly important as more private institutions offer health programs and begin offering degree programs.

The BCAHC has clearly taken a role in linking the human resource needs of health care service organizations with the services of post-secondary institutions in providing health care workers. The involvement of private institutions, no matter how modest, has been an important development.

The problems associated with a lack of integration of programs and related activities toward remedies seem to have been reflective of a growing and increasingly sophisticated private post-secondary sector in B.C. (B.C. Ministry of

Education, Skills and Training, and Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology, 1997; Brown, 2000).

Despite having been largely ignored by the public sector for decades, the private sector in post-secondary education in B.C. is likely to continue and may expand, with regard to numbers of institutions, student numbers, and variety of programs offered (Brown, 2000). This is consistent with documentation by academics in multiple constituencies around the world about trends in private sector educational activities (Altbach, 1999a; Duderstadt & Womack, 2003; Geiger, 1986; Levy, 1999). These authors have provided evidence from various countries that growth of private education at the post-secondary level can be expected. It appears that private post-secondary institutions have become a force to be reckoned with. Due to labour market realities and shortages of some categories of health care workers, private post-secondary education for the health care sector has been a growth area for those with an entrepreneurial spirit.

It also appears that government resources for publicly funded post-secondary education in any field, including health care, will never meet the demand for education from either employers or potential students (Dennison, 1995b; Geiger, 1987; Perkins, 1997). It is time to look at the work of public and private post-secondary educational institutions and identify some alternate approaches to interaction between them.

I found myself particularly struck by this during my employment as Dean of Health & Human Service Programs at the Open Learning Agency (OLA), a publicly funded post-secondary educational institution in B.C. In a one-year period in the early 2000s, I was approached separately by four private post-secondary institutions about significant partnership activities of different types.

In each case, the proposals probably had some merit for both my own institution, the proposing partner institution, and students. However, despite being in an organization known for innovation and collaborative activities, it was difficult to envision how to make the proposed partnerships work. Questions which arose included, "Who exactly is the partner organization? Can we trust the organization and its principles? Is there specific legislation or government policy that promotes or precludes this partnership? Is there institutional policy which allows for such partnerships? What are the legal ramifications? Which of the partners would be responsible for selected issues? How will students and employers benefit? How will the organizations benefit? What are the political ramifications of partnering with private institutions, particularly in the eyes of other public postsecondary institutions?"

In the end, none of the proposed partnerships moved ahead, primarily because the B.C. government announced the imminent closure of OLA. However, my experience as a member of the B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors, as Chair of the Committee's Working Group on Public and Private Institutions, and as principal author of a draft working paper for that group (B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors, Working Group, 2004), left me with a sense of opportunity lost and many questions for further consideration. These experiences became the subject of this dissertation.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop, from an exploration of the academic literature, documents from other sources, and the perspectives of senior academic administrators in public and private post-secondary institutions,

a framework to enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary institutions in B.C.

It was hoped that the framework developed through this exploration could be used by public and private institutions when considering activities which are intended to be mutually-beneficial and beneficial for other stakeholders. Other stakeholders include students, graduates, other types of institutional partners, employers and government.

This study was based on a recognition, although poorly documented in any substantial or formal way in B.C., of the number and range of activities of private sector post-secondary educational institutions in the province (Brown, 2000). The study was also based on a recognition of the limitations of government funding for publicly funded post-secondary institutions in attempting to respond to continuing growth of the need for, and access to, health programs. This exploration could provide direction for new policy at the provincial level.

The study documented, in a limited way, the health programs offered in B.C. by public and private post-secondary institutions accredited by the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), using information from web-sites, reports, and documents, and by direct interaction with representatives of the respective institutions. The study documented the opinions of senior administrators in both public and private institutions, and representatives of other key stakeholders such as the (then) Ministry of Advanced Education, about the potential for educational partnerships in health programs and possible frameworks. Information about existing educational partnerships related to health programs was sought. Existing approaches to, and features of,

partnerships from the literature of business were analyzed using theory related to partnerships.

I brought to this study 20 years of experience as an academic and administrative leader in health sciences programs in one of B.C.'s publicly funded post-secondary institutions. My observation was that, although rumours about the activities of private institutions abound and are difficult to substantiate, there was considerable suspicion and innuendo among academics and administrators in public institutions about many of the activities and outcomes of private post-secondary health programs. Public sector academics and administrators should recognize that the reverse may also have been true.

It may be that academics and administrators in public post-secondary institutions in B.C. possess limited knowledge of both the range and details of the health programs which private post-secondary institutions offer and what outcomes are achieved. There is no obvious coordinated and publicly available source which has compiled or analyzed any significant information about these institutions. The Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA) in B.C. receives reports about these topics on a confidential basis from individual private institutions seeking accreditation with that organization. This study, in a limited way, further informs senior personnel in both public and private institutions offering health programs in B.C. about each other and their perspectives on each other's work.

Ultimately, this study may contribute to policy research and policy development. For this study, policy research is viewed "as addressing a democratic polity with conflicting interest groups and shifting agendas" (Gaskell, 1988, p. 413). Policy questions arise from the realities of the limitations

of resources (Green, 1994). By those definitions, partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions are a policy matter.

Research Question

Essentially, the research question guiding this study was, "What framework can be developed that will enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary institutions in British Columbia?"

Related questions, many of which were asked of senior administrators of public and private post-secondary institutions in interviews, were developed to address the primary research question. The process of developing the questions and the use of the questions in interviews in the study is described in Chapter Five.

Significance of the Study

The question which defined the underlying significance of this study was, "What can B.C. and its citizens gain from educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions which offer health programs in the province?"

Related questions were, "What are the benefits of these types of partnerships? Who will benefit? What framework for understanding partnerships might be useful? What sectors other than health might use the findings?"

The public post-secondary education system has struggled to be able to respond to a number of challenges it faces in today's world (Brown, 2000; Gallagher, 1995). One of the challenges is to meet the demands of potential students for access to post-secondary learning opportunities. Another is to meet the demands of employers for training their existing workforce and creating the "human capital" (Shack, 1987, p. 20) needed to make our society and economy function. A third challenge is to cope with the rapidity of changes in society, including the knowledge that underpins it and changes in technology (Levine, 2001) which effect both what people need to learn and how they learn it. These challenges apply equally in general post-secondary education and in post-secondary education for health care personnel.

Governments worldwide have a shortage of resources that can be directed to public post-secondary institutions (Altbach, 1999a; Duderstadt & Womack, 2003) for any purpose, including development of health care personnel but, due to public pressure, are reluctant to agree to higher tuition fees. Individuals flock to private post-secondary institutions and pay ever higher tuition fees in order to participate in learning opportunities that otherwise may be denied them in the public system.

Phases of the Study

This study had two phases. The first phase had three components, two of which were primarily conceptual in nature. In Phase One, the academic literature about business, focusing on business partnerships, was reviewed as was selected academic literature about post-secondary education. A review of the current realities which form the context of the study was completed, including

information about existing public and private institutions, umbrella organizations, and related government activities. Phase Two of the study, the more interactive phase, involved interviews with academic administrators in public and private post-secondary institutions offering health programs in B.C. and administrators in three related stakeholder organizations.

The Study in the Context of This Doctoral Program

This study was undertaken as a research project to fulfill part of the requirements of the Doctor of Education (EdD) program in Educational Leadership and Policy at the University of British Columbia. Butler, Grosjean, and Sork (2008) described this doctoral program as "a research-based professional doctorate with an explicit focus on understanding and improving practice" (p. 22). During the program of studies, and particularly through the dissertation process, students are expected to identify and analyze problems in their practice, examine related research and theory, and then examine how what has been learned may be applied in the practice setting in which the problem exists. Thus, the intent of the program is depicted in the slogan which has been applied to it: "from practice to practice" (Butler et al., 2008, p. 22).

Both the intent and approach of this dissertation were consistent with these tenets of research in the EdD program. As has already been described in detail in this chapter, the experience and/or dilemma being addressed in this dissertation has been identified in the practice of a reflective post-secondary education administrator. For the purposes of this dissertation, this individual described a practice situation, and then turned to the academic literature of two disciplines with the goal of taking learning from those sources and applying it in

the processes of constructing and conducting a suitable research project in the practice setting. The findings of the research were analyzed with the goal of further development and/or refinement of knowledge and theory by creating a framework for understanding the practice matter.

Overview of the Dissertation

Chapter One introduces the study, and describes its purpose and significance. The research question and the phases of the study are introduced.

Chapter Two addresses literature from the academic discipline of business focusing on business partnerships, including public-private partnerships. This chapter reviews the language used to describe business partnerships, their purposes and functional requirements, the particular features of public-private partnerships, and globalization as an important element in the context of business partnerships. Public-private partnerships are addressed as a subset of business partnerships.

Chapter Three reviews the academic literature of post-secondary education describing the nature of the literature about private post-secondary education, the purposes of post-secondary education and the specific purposes of universities, colleges and institutes, the contextual changes effecting the enterprise, and the impact of privatization. The chapter provides commentary on the differences between public and private post-secondary institutions with reference to the features of business partnerships. This chapter introduces some boundaries between public and private post-secondary institutions.

Chapter Four provides background information about public and private postsecondary institutions in British Columbia, their characteristics as

prospective partners, and the context in which they operate. The mechanisms which the B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education has developed to influence both public and private post-secondary institutions in the province are described.

The research approach for the study is described in Chapter Five. This study uses an inductive approach in the interpretive/descriptive qualitative research paradigm (Merriam, 2002) with the intent of developing a framework for considering partnerships between public and private institutions. This chapter describes information collection processes including the development of interview questions and the processes for selection of, and contact with, interviewees. The limitations of, and potential sources of bias in, the study are discussed.

In Chapter Six, the information gathered from interviewees is presented and described. This chapter focuses first on the perspectives of interviewees about the role of government in post-secondary education and potential partnerships between public and private postsecondary education. Information about existing and potential partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions is presented. The comments of interviewees about their counterparts in public and private post-secondary education are summarized and some significant negative attitudes and philosophical differences are noted. Advantages of partnerships as well as barriers and issues related to them are documented.

Chapter Seven focuses on how the findings of the study relate to the academic literature with particular consideration of the purpose of the study, the development of a framework for understanding partnerships. Consideration is given as to why there are so few partnerships and approaches regarding

partnerships and some causes of the distrust and negative attitudes which are evident between the parties. A typology of institutional purposes of partnerships is proposed. Elements of institutional compatibility are considered. The concept of boundaries is developed as a framework for understanding partnerships.

Chapter Eight summarizes the study, provides conclusions, and offers recommendations for other researchers, educators and educational administrators, and policy-makers.

The next chapter reviews the academic literature of business, focusing on business partnerships.

CHAPTER TWO: BUSINESS PARTNERSHIPS

Introduction

This chapter provides one of the two literature reviews undertaken for this study, specifically a review of the academic literature of business focusing on business partnerships, including the requirements of functional partnerships, and public-private partnerships as a subset of business partnerships.

Purposes

The specific purposes of the literature review in this chapter are to: explore the use of, and clarify the language or terminology regarding, partnerships as currently presented in the literature of business; explore the context of partnership-type activities as described in the literature of business; explore the purposes and functions of partnership activities as described in the literature of business; identify and document from the literature of business, common characteristics and/or structural features of business partnerships, and; identify and document from the literature of business, the unique characteristics and structural features of public-private partnerships, as a special case of partnerships.

The Literature of Business Regarding Partnerships

A revealing finding from the review of the literature of business is the centrality of the concept of partnership, albeit in many variations and with different labels, in business today.

Before examining the changes in the world of business which have given some, but not complete, preeminence to the concept of partnership in the academic literature, it will be helpful to examine the language which has evolved to describe various forms of partnerships. This will provide greater understanding of the perspective of the writers of the literature being reviewed and will contribute to decision-making about the use of terms in this study.

The Language of Partnerships Used in the Literature of Business

The term partnership, for the purpose of this study, refers to an agreement to undertake activities of mutual benefit while remaining separate entities. This is a rather generic definition.

Other definitions of the term have been reviewed and, for the purpose of this study, found wanting. The definition provided in Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary (1981) is "a relationship resembling a legal partnership and usu. [sic] involving close cooperation between parties having specified and joint rights and responsibilities (as in a common enterprise)" (p. 829). This definition seems overly complex, and although it refers to cooperation, uses the term "partnership" to define itself. The 1993 Oxford English Dictionary defined partnership as, "An association of two or more persons for the carrying on of a business, of which they share the expenses, profit, and loss" (Pearsall & Trumble, 1993, p. 279). This definition is problematic because it makes exclusive reference to people, not entities or parties.

In the literature of business a number of terms have evolved to label business relationships which have a partnership element. The definitions which various authors in the literature of business provide for some of these terms quite

closely resemble the definition of partnership provided above and the definition proposed for use earlier in this study. Many of the authors of current publications using some of the newer terms in their titles, spend some effort explaining the new term and concept, but subsequently use the term partnership liberally, and often interchangeably with their new term, in the remainder of their publication. It is possible that this use of terms reflects the understandable desire of authors to present a unique and marketable perspective in their published work about a topic in their field. It may also reflect ongoing change in thinking about partnerships. The choice of terms may also reflect the fact that many of the authors are working in different fields, ranging from construction to high-tech industries, all being businesses but with different work cultures.

One exception to the frequent interchange of terms in the literature of business is regarding public-private partnerships, which, for the purposes of this study, are being dealt with as a special case of partnerships. The writers of documents addressing public-private partnerships tend to use that term exclusively.

Two terms frequently used in current literature about partnership-type activities are alliance (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003b; Bleeke & Ernst, 1993b; Doz & Hamel, 1998; Ernst, 2003; Kuglin, 2002; Ohmae, 1993; Ward, 2001) and strategic alliance (Doz & Hamel, 1998; Gerybadze, 1994; Kuglin, 2002; Ohmae, 1993; Ward, 2001). The two terms are very loosely defined and also tend to be used interchangeably.

Three authors provide similar definitions of an alliance. Gomes-Casseres (1996) defined an alliance as "any governance structure involving an incomplete contract between separate firms and in which each partner has limited control"

(p. 34). Ernst (2003) provided a similar definition of an alliance as being "a relationship between separate companies that involves joint contributions and shared ownership and control" (p. 20). Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003c) defined an alliance as "a unique organizational structure to enable cooperation between companies" (p. 37).

Other authors (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a; Doz & Hamel, 1998; Kuglin, 2002) have not provided a concise definition of alliances but spend more time describing the characteristics of alliances, what alliances can accomplish, and the variety of types of alliances. These ideas are described later in this literature review.

Based on the definitions provided by some authors, the term strategic alliance is closely related to the term alliance. For example, Ward (2001) defined a strategic alliance as, "a strategic collaboration between two or more independent and autonomous organizations to increase their value" (p. 3). Unfortunately, Ward (2001) used the word "strategic" in the definition of the term "strategic alliance", thus limiting the clarity of the definition. However, if either the word "intentional", or the word "planned", replaced "strategic", the meaning would be conveyed more clearly.

Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003b) defined a strategic alliance as a "deal, a new venture, an organization" (p. 2). The authors recommended that rather than focusing on a strategic alliance per se, organizations should adopt an "alliance strategy" (p. 2). Unfortunately, in their attempt to define the term alliance strategy, Bamford et al. (2003b) used the term "alliance" (p. 3). The definition Bamford et al. provided for the term "alliance strategy" (p. 2) is "an intent, a dynamic process, and a logic that guides alliance

decisions" (p. 2). Bamford et al. did, however, later clarify that one of the characteristics of alliances is that they are "agreements between two or more separate firms that involve ongoing resource contributions from each to create joint value" (p. 12).

The literature provides some alternate terms related to partnership, alliances, and strategic alliances. Bennett and Jayes (1998) used the term "partnering" (p. ii) which they defined as "a set of strategic actions which embody the mutual objectives of a number of firms achieved by cooperative decision making aimed at using feedback to continuously improve their joint performance" (chapter. 1, p. 4). The creation of the verb, partnering, conveys the idea of a process of partnership, rather than an outcome or entity (which uses the word as a noun). It conveys the flexibility which is required in partnership activities.

Gomes-Casseres (1996) referred to alliances as "the mortar" (p. 35), which keeps organizations together. Unfortunately, this analogy is limited given the flexibility which seems to be needed by both the people and the organizations involved in partnerships. However, the analogy does convey the idea that, in a partnership, organizations are very much connected but do retain their separateness.

Alter and Hage (1993) have developed their theory of systemic interorganizational networks, which, in their view, is the "new institutional form [which] will increasingly replace both markets and hierarchies as a governance mechanism" (p. 13). More specifically, Alter and Hage (1993) defined interorganizational networks as "multilateral arrangements among diverse organizations that band together to produce a single product" (pp. 6, 7). Alter

and Hage (1993) cited some of the examples of bilateral relationships between organizations, specifically joint ventures and strategic alliances, as only a partial shift toward their concept.

Some other unique terms describing partnership-like arrangements stem from the emphasis on collaboration and cooperation in modern-day business. Bleeke and Ernst (1993b) defined collaboration, in the context of business, as "the negotiation and arbitrage of skills, access, and capital" (p. 5). Ward (2001) used the term, "cooperative advantage" (p. 6) to label the achievements which organizations intend from partnerships. This term represents the apparent contrast in thinking from the time when business strategies focused exclusively on competitive advantage. Ward (2001) also used the term "co-opetition "(p. 5) meaning "co-operating with the competition" (p. 5). Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a) used that term and described a similar meaning.

In their description of alliances, Doz and Hamel (1998) used the terms "co-option" (p. 4) and "cospecialization" (p. 5). The first term refers to cooperation between competing organizations (Doz & Hamel, 1998), and the second term reflects that organizations, and the people in them, can benefit by combining unique skill sets and learning from each other.

Doz and Hamel (1998) spent considerable effort distinguishing between joint ventures and strategic alliances. They noted that joint ventures have often been bilateral activities which were designed to "obtain economies of scale and scope in marginal but well-known market segments" (Doz & Hamel, 1998, p. 6) with "known resources and most often shared known risks" (p. 6).

For the purposes of this study, the generic definition of the term partnership which was provided above as "an agreement to undertake activities

of mutual benefit while remaining separate entities" will be used. Where specific authors use terms describing forms of partnerships with other labels, their terms will be used. Where there are legal terms for partnership arrangements, those legal terms will be used.

The Context of Business Partnerships

In contemplating the use and potential mechanisms for partnerships in post-secondary education, it is useful to consider perspectives about, and experiences of, partnerships in the business world.

There appear to be a number of contextual factors which have contributed to the importance of partnerships as described in the academic literature of business. The literature explored to date has characterized recent changes that have caused this. Ward's (2001) description of a study of four major corporations completed for the Conference Board of Canada identified "four main factors driving alliances: intense competition, globalization, rapid technological innovation and disenchantment with the alternatives" (p. 7).

According to authors in the literature of business, technological advances have created new, and often previously unimaginable products for the marketplace. Leadbeater (1999) described "'knowledge capitalism': the drive to generate new ideas and turn them into commercial products and services which consumers want" (p. 8). Globalization has both allowed the sharing of knowledge, which has fostered new technology and created the need for new technology throughout the world. It appears that this will be ongoing and will continue to change our daily lives substantially. Based on recent experience, changes will continue to happen quickly. Doz and Hamel (1998) described the

changes as "a new industrial revolution: an information and communication age driven by technological breakthroughs that have spawned entirely new industries" (p. 2). Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003a) described a "blurring of industry boundaries" (p. 77). These characteristics have resulted in a pressure for flexibility and "increased customization of products and individualization of services" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 21) around the world.

It appears that, together, technology and globalization have added considerable complexity, created new markets, changed patterns of demand for goods and services, created different expectations regarding flexibility and response time, and created the potential for new ways of doing business.

One way of doing business that seems to have shown promise in the current context is cooperation. In writing about alliances between international organizations, Ohmae (1993) stated that "no one player can master everything. Thus, operating globally means operating with partners" (p. 39). Of course, the business section of the daily newspaper allows us to observe that alliances are not the only way to do business – mergers and acquisitions still take place.

However, a range of other authors would appear to agree with Ohmae's (1993) assessment. Kuglin (2002), in the introduction to his book which addresses strategic alliances in a range of industries, stated "In a world moving at Internet speed, fewer and fewer companies can survive and thrive by being all things to all people" (p. 21). Gerybadze (1994) predicted that, "Many economic, ecological and social problems and challenges ... will increasingly demand cooperative solutions" (p. 267). Leadbeater (1999) stated that, "Successful economies are underpinned by social relationships which help people to collaborate" (p. 11). Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) said that organizations in the high-tech

industry are more interested in alliances than they once were because of "increasing development costs and shortening life-cycles" (p. 56).

As a consequence of all this, there has been some rethinking of economic fundamentals in recent decades. In the past, "economists have seen the firm and the market as the two principal mechanisms for governing the allocation of resources" (Gomes-Casseres, 1996, p. 33) with the market being important in determining price or value.

The firm has been seen as an entity which could function and grow in capability, assets and influence, generally single-handedly through its own internal activities, or by mergers and acquisitions in the marketplace (Gomes-Casseres, 1996). Firms intended to grow ever larger and were managed centrally, relying on their internal hierarchies for direction (Alter & Hage, 1993).

Gerybadze (1994) identified that, historically, firms might have used the option of contracting specific functions in the market. Or, firms could develop their own capabilities internally, or seek ownership of the resources they needed to the exclusion of others. Gerybadze (1994) noted that a new "*third* way of securing access to specialized skills and assets involves cooperation between two or more independent firms" (p. 14).

Historically, the motive of "suppression of competition" (Gomes-Casseres, 1996, p. 1) was in operation. In other words, organizations "won" by eliminating other organizations (Alter & Hage, 1993). According to Ohmae (1993), "sustainable competitive advantage [was achieved] by establishing dominance in all your business system's critical areas" (p. 39).

Gerybadze (1994) indicated that there has been a change in understanding economics. Apparently, "neo-institutional economists emphasize a *project*

orientation as opposed to the entity orientation" (p. 5). Thus, there has been a shift from viewing firms as the entities that were the unit of economic analysis to a "focus on transactions or projects as basic units of analysis"(p. 5). Out of this, according to Gerybadze (1994), "an economic theory of cooperation" (p. 6) has evolved.

Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003b) reflected on the change in thinking having noted that the concept of alliances has "moved from [sic] periphery to [sic] center of corporate strategy" (p. 1).

Gomes-Casseres (1996), writing about the high-technology industry, characterized alliances as "constellations" (p. 6). Any one constellation will "behave differently from single firms" (Gomes-Casseres, 1996, p. 6) or other constellations because it has a unique set of capabilities and decision-making processes. The "competitive behavior" (Gomes-Casseres, 1996, p. 6) of the collective (the constellation), no matter how loosely or tightly defined, is different in the market than the competitive behavior of a single firm. The act of creating a constellation of two firms also changes the context.

It is, therefore, understandable that Alter and Hage (1993) suggested that "evidence is mounting that institutions other than markets are coordinating and controlling the economies" (p. 1) of the industrialized world. The authors proposed that, "it is the systemic network that offers the greatest competitive advantages in a global economy" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 1).

Svendsen, Boutilier, and Wheeler (2003), in writing about their concept of social capital, made the comment, "technology and globalization are making networks of relationships a decisive business asset" (p. 5). The thesis of Svendsen et al. (2003) was that the development of "social capital" (p. 2) leads to positive

outcomes for the business involved. According to Leadbeater (1999), "Networks of social relationships create social capital" (p. 11). Thus, Svendsen et al. noted that "positive relationships are necessary to transform an intangible asset (knowledge) into a tangible one (new processes, products and services)" (p. 5).

Writing about high-tech industries, Gomes-Casseres (1996) argued that modern-day alliances "do not so much suppress business rivalry as transform it" (p. 1). Gomes-Casseres (1996) proposed that the rising prevalence of the phenomenon of collaboration between businesses creates the potential for "collective competition" (p. 2). This places competition between groups of collaborating organizations, rather than between individual firms. The nature of the rivalry in the corporate world has fundamentally changed. Alter and Hage (1993) noted that now, business are "accomplishing through voluntary alliances what formerly was achieved through combat" (p. 3). Bleeke and Ernst (1993b) stated that in the global business context, "it makes no sense to have a traditional competitive stance" (p. 2). The reasons for this are, as explained above, that it is almost impossible for one company to single-handedly, and in a cost-effective and timely manner which meets market requirements, develop or purchase the complete range of capabilities and access to markets needed to succeed (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993b).

Another way of thinking about the role of alliances in achieving business objectives in the current context is what Gerybadze (1994) described as a continuum of opportunities based on the "extent of integration" (p. 74) created between/among organizations. At the low integration end of the continuum is the "market solution" (Gerybadze, 1994, p. 74), which does not require organizations to merge in any way, although contracts for resources and services

are in place. At the high integration end of the continuum is the "integrated solution" (Gerybadze, 1994, p. 74) in which organizations may integrate themselves as entities, even to the extent of merging. Gerybadze (1994) proposes the "cooperative solution" (p. 74) in the middle of the integration continuum. Organizations may have very significant interactions and exchanges of resources but remain autonomous organizations. According to Gerybadze (1994), cooperative agreements are more restricting than market exchange, but less restricting and may have fewer risks than the type of arrangement referred to as an "integrated solution" (p. 74). In these respects perhaps, partnerships are a moderate middle strategy.

Doz and Hamel (1998) described the current situation in business as being that there are now "two competitive races: one for the world and the other for the future" (p. xiii). It would appear that the first race is due to globalization as new markets have become available (Doz & Hamel, 1998). The second race is due to the availability of, and/or the ability to create, new approaches to many kinds of problems and needs. Based on the literature, it would appear that large corporations which are managed exclusively from above and/or centrally may not be able to be sufficiently adroit to respond flexibly to the demand.

Purposes and Functions of Business Partnerships

If partnerships are intended to lead to mutual benefit, then what specific purposes and functions do partnerships have? What constitutes mutual benefit? The purposes and functions of partnerships cited by authors who have written about the experience of large corporations are provided below. The main purpose of partnership seems to be increasing the value, both tangible and

intangible, of each partner organization. Managing risk is a strategy for at least retaining the value of a business. These are described below.

Increasing Business Value

Increasing the value of both organizations in a partnership is the commonly cited purpose of establishing such a relationship. Ward (2001) reported on a study by the Conference Board of Canada to review the partnership activities of four large and influential corporations, cites increasing value as the purpose. Ward (2001) described the very tangible types of value which may be sought as including, "equity, intellectual property, access to markets, technology, products and, most importantly, shareholder and customer value" (p. 3). Given the context of modern-day business described in the previous section of this document, these functions make sense. Ernst (2003) provided a quite similar list of "how alliances capture value" (p 20).

Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003b) also characterized the purpose of an alliance strategy as being the creation of "joint value" (p. 12). Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003a) stated that the traditional reasons for collaboration with competitors or "co-opetition" (p. 78), or "co-option" (Doz & Hamel, 1998, p. 4)], which still have credibility, are "setting standards, sharing; and entering emerging markets" (Bamford et al., 2003a, p. 79). Additional, and more modern reasons for alliances include "expanding product lines, reducing costs, gaining market share, and creating new skills" (Bamford et al., p. 79). Kuglin (2002) cited the technical and economic functions of alliances as being, "to quick-start sales through accessing new markets and solutions, reduce costs through strategic relationships matching core

competencies, leverage fixed assets through shared services, accelerate working capital turns through supply chain and financial alliances, and lower effective tax rates" (p. xiii).

Ohmae's (1993) view was that alliances are "a lot like a marriage .... Both partners bring to an alliance a faith that they will be stronger together than either would be separately. Both believe that each has unique skills and functional abilities the other lacks" (p. 49). Bleeke and Ernst (1993a) stated that "Alliance partners should be complementary in the products, geographic presence or functional skills that they bring to the venture" (p. 14). This complementarity is described by Doz and Hamel (1998) as "co-option" (p. 4). Doz and Hamel (1998) also described "cospecialization ... the synergistic value creation that results from the combining of previously separate resources, positions, skills, and knowledge sources"(p. 5). Gomes-Casseres (1996) informed us that, "each partner in an alliance specializes in what it does best, thus making the collective more competitive than the members would be by themselves" (p. 2).

Similarly, Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) made the claim that alliances enable organizations "to harness the capabilities and the dynamism of a wide range of players in order to do things it would be hard to do alone" (p. 56).

For Bleeke and Ernst (1993c), success in the marketplace with appropriate and sufficient benefits to the participating parties is the goal of collaboration. Gerybadze (1994) specifically described the goals of cooperation as being:

- the access or greater penetration of a particular market or customer group;
- the access of a new technology or knowledge base;
- the achievement of a greater (joint) degree of efficiency;
- as well as the pursuance of a joint political or social goal. (p. 16)

The last goal of cooperation in Gerybadze 's (1994) list is an example of one of the intangible, or less measurable, functions of a partnership. Another less tangible purpose is cited by Ward (2001) as being the potential, and likelihood, that the people involved as representatives of their organizations in a strategic alliance "learn from each other by continually sharing insights and knowledge about products, markets and technology" (p. 6). Doz and Hamel (1998) referred to this as the "learning and internalization" (p. 5) of new knowledge and skills from the partner.

Managing Risk

Some partnerships are established with a primary goal of reducing the risk of a new direction. Partnerships can spread the risk and the consequences of risk. Due to that function, a partnership, according to Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003c), allows the partners to work together to "make incremental commitments to an unfolding strategy" (p. 37) which they could not do alone. This seems particularly useful in finding a business response to the rapid changes of modern-day business.

The section later in this chapter entitled *Public-Private Partnerships* describes risk management in those unique partnerships.

The topic of risk should not be closed without some acknowledgement that, perversely, partnerships create risks. Roussel (2003) pointed out that "certain alliance types create value in one industry but not in another" (p. 32). Also, takeovers between partners have not been unknown as an unexpected outcome of partnerships. A poorly managed partnership, or a partnership with a mismatch of partners and/or management style, may not produce the intended

result. Bery and Bowers (1993) made reference to the potential for structural and communication problems which may have a negative impact. Ohmae (1993) cited potential relationship issues.

To succeed, partnerships demand attention and resources. Bery and Bowers (1993) noted that "Keeping an alliance alive requires a flexible structure that permits continuous evaluation of products, technology, scope, and ownership" (p. 67).

Features of Business Partnerships

The literature provides evidence that there are many variations of partnerships. Each partnership is unique and has different goals and forms. Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) listed many different types of alliances, ranging from outright acquisition to development licenses (p. 60). Kuglin (2002) described five types of business partnerships including "sales, solution-specific, geographic-specific, investment, and joint venture" (p. x).

There should be no expectation that all partnerships are the same. Ward (2001) described that an "alliance continuum" (p. 3), or a range of partnership possibilities, exists. For Ward (2001), alliances in the corporate world can range "from transactional arrangements such as licensing agreements to more permanent arrangements including mergers and acquisitions" (p. 3) with varying commitments by the parties involved.

Structure

The literature of business does not prescribe any particular approach to structuring a partnership for any given purpose. In fact, based on a Conference Board of Canada study of the partnership activities of four large organizations, Ward (2001) observed that, "The partners in successful alliances create a structure that fosters connections between both organizations and individuals" (Executive Summary). Exactly what that structure should be is determined by the partners at the beginning of the partnership through a planning process and over the life of the project. Ward (2001) emphasized that partners should expect to have a "dynamic relationship" (p. 5). In other words, organizations in a partnership can expect ongoing change in structure and relationships as a natural feature of the process. It appears that Doz and Hamel (1998) would have agreed with Ward (2001), citing the "dynamism" (p. xv) of strategic alliances and noting that "managing the alliance relationship over time is usually more important than crafting the initial formal design" (p. xv). The structure of a collective (partnership) is, according to Gomes-Casseres (1996), influenced by the variables of "*market*" (p. 47), "*technological*" (p. 47), and "*competitive*"(p. 47) environments. Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) proposed that the choice of structure for a particular collaboration is dependent on the goals.

In considering the structure of partnerships, it appears that flexibility, allowing for an ability to respond to external environmental variables, is a key requirement (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres & Robinson, 2003d; Bleeke & Ernst, 1993c). Considering that many of the authors wrote from the perspective of the rapidly changing global business environment, this is not surprising. Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) noted that there may be a need to redefine the scope of a

collaboration as events progress and ongoing change occurs in the environment in which the collaboration is embedded. Bery and Bowers (1993) stated that "If an alliance is to survive and bring profits to both partners, it must be able to manage change and to accept change in itself" (p. 67). Thus, as Bery and Bowers (1993) pointed out, "Keeping an alliance alive requires a flexible structure that permits continuous evaluation of products, technology, scope, and ownership" (p. 67). Doz and Hamel (1998) described the problem of balance for a partnership which, on the one hand exists to seek innovation, and the other sufficient stability to operate. It seems that an "alliance faces a trade-off between too much rigidity—where design becomes a straightjacket—and too much flexibility—which may cause loss of direction or balance" (Doz & Hamel, 1998, p. 16).

Bennett and Jayes (1998) described the "Seven Pillars" of partnering (p. ii) which have been developed through the efforts of the British construction industry intent on reducing costs and increasing performance on projects. A pillar, in the context of partnerships between firms, is defined as "a set of management actions" (Bennett & Jayes, 1998, p. ii), which are fundamentals to be used by teams in individual projects. The seven pillars described by Bennett and Jayes (1998) are: strategy, membership, equity, integration, benchmarks, project processes, and feedback. The pillar, strategy, refers to "developing the client's objectives"(Bennett & Jayes, 1998, chap. 1, p. 4) and how to meet them. Membership refers to ensuring that partners with the right skills are involved. Equity refers to ensuring that all parties receive appropriate compensation. Integration refers to "improving the way the firms involved work together by using cooperation and building trust" (Bennett & Jayes, 1998, chap. 1, p. 4). Benchmarks are the incremental targets to be met. Project processes are the

"standards and processes that embody best practice" (Bennett & Jayes, 1998, chap. 1, p. 4). Feedback is the process of "capturing lessons from projects and task forces" (Bennett & Jayes, 1998, chap. 1, p. 4).

One potential problem with the approach described is that it is difficult to understand who the partner is in the "pillar" approach – is it the client or the workers? In addition, this approach seems to be a rather top-down approach to partnerships, particularly since Bennett and Jayes (1998) noted that the use of the pillars allows "the Strategic Team to search systematically for ever better designs and ways of working" (chap. 1, page 4). It is also difficult to understand how the pillars contribute to the goal of "breaking free of an over emphasis on projects" (Bennett & Jayes, 1998, chap. 1, page 4). Nevertheless, Bennett and Jayes (1998) reported that the outcomes of using the interrelated pillars have been positive and productive for the British construction industry.

Ward (2001) stated that, based on the Conference Board of Canada study of four large organizations, an "alliance strategy" (p. 10) or approach has the following components:

1. Leaders mould the alliance culture
2. There is an organizational strategy around alliances
3. A road map of interlinked processes supports the alliance journey
4. Structures are created that foster connections
5. Performance is measured
6. The potential for conflict and failure is acknowledged
7. Alliance relations are managed. (p. 10)

In order to put these components in place, Ward (2001) said that an organization must have "established a clear foundation that supports seeking and developing strategic alliances as a means of competitive advantage" (p. 14).

Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003b), in their description of alliance strategy, included four closely linked elements, based on the foundation of how a particular business is organized and the general strategy of that business. According to Bamford et al., (2003b), the elements of an alliance strategy are: "alliance design, alliance management, using a constellation of alliances, and building an internal alliance capability" (p. 10).

The authors provide detailed descriptions of each of these elements, citing alliance design and alliance management as being most important. Alliance design is based on the intended "role of the alliance in the business strategy" (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003b, p. 4) of the organization, the scope, criteria and mechanisms for partner selection, and the structure (Bamford, et al., 2003b, p. 3). Alliance management is about the relationship between the parties, including how decisions will be made.

Kuglin (2002) stated that two critical features of an alliance are having an appropriate written agreement and a carefully chosen partner. Kuglin (2002) provided detailed advice about creating a written agreement but emphasizes that planning is the key to any alliance. Ward (2001) also emphasized the need for a written agreement.

Control and Decision-Making Processes

If an alliance operates on the basis of an "open-ended agreement" (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003d, p. 70) because all future variables could not possibly be envisioned at the time of writing and signature, then Bamford et al., (2003d) advised that it is crucial that the alliance receives

"effective governance of the 'open end'" (p. 71). This means that ongoing and detailed attention to the partnership is required.

Thus, a challenging matter in partnerships is that of control and making decisions about both broad directions and day-to-day minutiae. For Ohmae (1993), "alliances mean sharing control" (p. 35) in a way which would not be the case in other business arrangements. Gomes-Casseres (1996) stated that, from the perspective of economics, "Alliances resemble firms in that the parties agree to coordinate their actions and participate in joint decision making" (p. 35) for the purposes of the alliance. However, making two or more previously separate organizations act as one for the purposes of the partnership, while avoiding merger, is a challenge which none of the authors provide much specific advice about. The view of Bleeke and Ernst (1993b) was that in order to be successful, organizations must be "willing to share ownership with and learn from companies much *different* from their own" (p. 5).

Evidently, partnerships are not necessarily simple solutions to modern challenges. After explaining their synthesis of concepts derived from "interorganizational relations theory, population-ecology theory, and rational choice theory" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 22), Alter and Hage (1993) concluded that collaboration between organizations requires: "the willingness to collaborate, the need for expertise, the need for funds, and the need for adaptive efficiency" (p. 42). Adaptive efficiency is defined as "the length of time needed to develop a new product, times the amount of effort needed" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39). These characteristics are not easy for an organization to achieve.

Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) recommended that in a partnership it is important to be able to address problems and find solutions with "no carpet

sweeping" (p. 62). Presumably, both the speed and the integrity of decision-making are important in the current environment.

Given the global environment, partnerships can never be assumed to have reached a steady state. Doz and Hamel (1998) noted that "instability is endemic to alliances that aim to create the future. It is more natural for them to come apart than to stay together" (p. 16). The statement of Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003d) that, "alliances are a means to an end, never an end in themselves" (p. 73), is consistent. Therefore, a partnership is expendable if the goals have been achieved or if circumstances change. Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) commented that, where and when it is appropriate, it is acceptable to either change or terminate an alliance. "Permanence does not matter" (Krubasik & Lautenschlager, 1993, p. 65) if the alliance has accomplished the goal intended. However, Doz and Hamel (1998) pointed out that, "In most successful alliances, value creation is the work of a decade or more" (p. xi). It is interesting to note that some of the forces that Doz and Hamel (1998) listed as having the potential to destabilize an alliance, specifically new markets and new technologies, are also the forces which stimulate their creation.

Culture and People Management Processes

Partnerships require particular attention to the organizational environment being created and the people involved. It would appear that each partnership creates a unique internal environment and a set of values and operating principles, in essence, its own culture. The culture of the partnership is influenced by the interaction of the cultures of the organizations, which are embarking on the partnership as well as the people involved.

Ward (2001) referred to the important task, which organizations with partnerships have in creating an "alliance culture" (p. 10). Ward (2001) defined an alliance culture as "a state that embodies the organization's beliefs, values and norms around alliances" (p. 10). Unfortunately, that definition could mean that the prevailing culture is either for, against, or neutral about, alliances. Fortunately, Ward (2001) further specified that an alliance culture is "a culture of collaboration" (p. 10), one which supports the cooperative attitudes and processes required for alliances to be successful. Therefore, Ward's (2001) original definition of an alliance culture could be reworded as, "a state that embodies the organization's beliefs, values and norms in support of collaborative activities."

Most of the authors cited in this document make claims about the importance of people and their relationships with each other across organizational boundaries in partnerships. Ward (2001) claimed, "the essence of alliances is people" (p. 14). The key words Ward (2001) used in describing relationships in partnerships are "trust" (p. 34), "communication" (p. 34), "commitment" (p. 35), and "integrity" (p. 36). Hagel III and Brown (2005) stressed the necessity of "shared meaning and trust" (p. 89). Kuglin (2002) stated "Alliances are also all about relationships" (p. 34). Kuglin (2002) emphasized the importance of this by recommending training so that people can recognize various personality types and the "social styles" (p. 123) of the partner organization and thus learn how to influence the behavior of people in the partnership from the other organization. Kuglin's (2002) ideas suggested that the adaptation of the concept of "*emotional* intelligence" (Coleman, 1995, p. 28) to partnership activities might be useful. Bennett and Jayes (1998) described an

organization's "only sustainable competitive advantage" (chap. 1, p. 2) as being "to enable your people to deliver what they are capable of" (chap. 1, p. 2). In order for this to take place, people must have a sense of belonging or identification with the partnership.

However, there is also some evidence that people working in partnerships may need an opportunity to develop some new capabilities. Alter and Hage (1993) advised that, to function in our networked economy, individual people must develop "complex cognitive processes" (p. 18). In other words, people must be capable of creativity, be able to visualize networks and how to function within them, and become "people who can tolerate ambiguity and paradox, problem solve at different levels of intra- and interorganizational structures, manage rapid technological change, and solve its complicated problems" (Alter & Hage, 1993, pp. 19, 20).

The literature also indicates that people in organizations embarking on a partnership cannot be expected to instantly shift to a collaborative attitude, even if they are willing to do so. Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) indicated that employees may need time and assistance to become engaged with the activity.

In many respects, partnerships require the social capital which Svendsen, Boutilier, and Wheeler (2003) described from their research in three corporations in which they demonstrated that social capital contributes to the business value of an organization. Svendsen et al. (2003) define social capital as "the goodwill available to individuals or groups" (p. 13) or, more abstractly, as the "goodwill available to actors within social networks" (p. 12). In the model which Svendsen

et al. provided, social capital has positive outcomes for business which include:

1. information sharing
2. exerting influence on behalf of another person.
3. adhering to group norms/solidarity. (p. 17)

According to Svendsen, Boutilier, and Wheeler (2003), it is the three characteristics or "dimensions" (p. 14) of relationships that build the social capital which is so important in partnerships. The dimensions listed were:

1. Structural dimension: the structure of the networks in which the relationship is embedded;
2. Relational dimension: trust and reciprocity; and
3. Cognitive dimension: mutual understanding. (p. 14)

Leadership of Partnership Activities

Ward (2001) noted that, based on the Conference Board of Canada research of four large corporations successfully engaged in partnership activities, leaders and the organizations which reflect an alliance culture possess:

- a natural ability to look outward for opportunities;
- the capacity to manage ambiguity;
- a willingness to commit resources to support alliances, and
- an ability to focus on interpersonal relationships in alliances. (p. 11)

Krubasik and Lautenschlager (1993) indicated that alliances must have leadership situated at both the top of the organizations and at the level of the alliance activity itself.

Larger corporations tend to reassign suitable people from other activities into new partnerships being established. Depending on the circumstances, it is acceptable for leaders of specific partnerships to "build employee loyalty to the joint venture rather than to the parent companies" (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993c, p. 25).

In launching partnerships, leaders must be prepared to "mould the alliance culture" (Ward, 2001, p. 10) inside their organization in a positive way. In order to do this, they themselves must have considerable credibility and excellent communication skills (Ward, 2001).

Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) indicated that, in their view, the best way to achieve success in an alliance is, having assured the appropriate resources are available, to "put someone they trust in charge, and leave him or her alone to do the job" (p. 26). However, it appears that leaders of organizations should not underestimate the resources required to support a partnership. Bennett and Jayes (1998) commented that "partnering requires commitment, effort and a big investment in time" (chap. 2, p. 8). Corporate leaders should expect to pay ongoing attention to the partnerships their organization is involved in. Based on the research about partnerships reported by Bennett and Jayes (1998), "Partnering works best when there is somebody – frequently the client – who constantly encourages the project team to set itself tough targets" (chap 2. p. 9). Evidently, building and maintaining an effective partnership is not an "off-the-side-of-the-desk" activity. Partnerships cannot be put in place and then ignored by any of the participants.

Conflict Resolution and Problem-Solving Processes

Not surprisingly, there is the potential for conflict in partnerships (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993b; Ohmae, 1993; Ward, 2001). Bleeke and Ernst (1993b) advised that it is important to create conflict-resolution mechanisms to manage the inevitable tensions in the collaborative activity. According to Bleeke and Ernst (1993b),

leaders at the corporate level "need to be absolutely clear on where cooperation is expected—and where the 'old rules' of competition will apply" (p.8).

Alter and Hage (1993) advised that when organizations are working together in a long-term partnership arrangement, such as systemic interorganizational networks, "Problem-solving occurs across organizational boundaries" (p. 8). Alter and Hage (1993) gave the example of Japanese production processes and compares them to some American production processes.

Management of Conflict of Interest

Partnerships and/or alliances may be between more than two organizations and any one organization may have partnerships with multiple organizations simultaneously. Attention needs to be paid to issues of actual and potential conflict of interest. Doz and Hamel (1998) asked "How will each partner manage its growing web of alliances?" (p. 9).

In large corporations, partnerships may be managed as separate businesses, possibly aside from the main body of the corporation. Issues of primary loyalty can arise if leaders are assigned to manage their partnerships as entities separate from the main corporate body.

Risk

There are always risks when business is being conducted. This is unavoidable.

Partnerships can reduce risk from external sources by virtue of two organizations combining forces and capabilities for a common purpose (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003c). The complementarity of skills and assets mentioned earlier (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a) helps to mitigate risk in this way.

Organizations should be aware of the risks created through partnerships with competing organizations, no matter how good the intentions are (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a). These risks include: ponderous processes for making decisions which lead to delays and conflicts; immediate or subsequent loss of customers due to customer contact with the competitor; "technology leakage" (Bamford et al., 2003a, p. 82); loss of proprietary information through inappropriate information flow about broader company processes and future business intentions; loss of the entire business or portion of the business represented in the alliance to the partner/competitor (Bamford et al., 2003a); and, loss of business value (Roussel, 2003). All of these potential risks are very significant.

Choosing the wrong partner is also a risk (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003c). In addition, the authors note that "the risk of conflict is high in alliances between rivals" (Bamford, et al., 2003c, p. 43).

Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003c) indicated that the choice of partners is important but that, once a partnership is established, the partners should "not trust trust" (p. 42). Trusting relationships and trusting the partner is not a substitute for clarity of purpose (Bamford et al., 2003c), attention to initial planning, solid written agreements, and the maintenance of interpersonal relationships (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003d) within the

partnership. Svendsen, Boutilier, and Wheeler (2003) stated that interpersonal relationships are "crucial for managing risk in the short term and for maintaining a social license to operate in the longer term" (p. 5).

Not all partnerships prosper and achieve their intended purposes. Partnerships can create risks of their own. Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003c) recommended that, for the purposes of an alliance, it is important to "Define the scope carefully" (p. 43). The literature reveals that risks can arise from changes, or lack of clarity, in the environment external to the alliance (Bamford et al., 2003c), and inside the alliance itself.

Roussel (2003) reminded potential alliance participants that "being good at one kind of alliance doesn't mean being good at another" (p. 32). Roussel (2003) provides examples of large corporations which have experienced difficulties when creating partnerships in a different context from one in which they were successful.

Roussel (2003) also noted that it is possible for partnerships to "destroy value" (p. 31) for businesses and create loss for a partner. According to Kuglin (2002) partnerships can also fail with negative consequences for both parties.

Public-Private Partnerships

As described earlier, our world has become more complex and simple solutions are less likely. With organizations being increasingly interested in new activities and with an increasingly educated public, a different awareness of, and less satisfaction with, government services has evolved (Gerybadze, 1994). Governments too have been reassessing what goals it is reasonable and feasible to expect the public purse to meet (Gerybadze, 1994; Poschmann, 2003), how the

goals desired by the public can best be reached, and where the expertise for goal-related activities is. In a circumstance of seemingly perpetually limited funds, governments have questioned whether they too should change their approach. As a consequence, government too has begun to examine collaborative possibilities. The era of public-private partnerships has begun.

Terminology

The writers of documents addressing public-private partnerships tend to use that term exclusively. The alternate terms described earlier in this chapter are not typically used.

The Partners in Public-Private Partnerships

In the majority of the literature about public-private partnerships, the public partner is government (Poschmann, 2003), not a publicly funded organization such as a high school or university.

There may be a large power differential between government and a private partner. Government is usually the more powerful partner in terms of overall societal influence. This could have two significant effects. There may be a perception that the government partner can ultimately either overrule the non-governmental partner should the desire to do so arise, or bail-out the non-governmental partner.

The non-government partner chosen by government will probably not have as much power in terms of size or societal influence. The non-government partner may or may not have considerable influence in their industry.

One element that is missing or different in public-private partnerships, as opposed to other types of partnerships, is that the partners are not necessarily competitors. Usually, government tenders work to be done. Unlike corporate partnerships in which the two partners may be in competition in one or more of their lines of work outside of the partnership, government does not compete with others. In fact, government creates the competition between private companies when it tenders work as only one will be chosen.

Goals of Public-Private Partnerships

Government and a private partner have different goals when they are contemplating or proposing a partnership. When private organizations/industry enter a public-private partnership (i.e., in this literature, a government-private partnership) , they generally have the tangible goal of reaching a suitable profit margin, and adding value to their organization in that way. In some cases, a company may want the opportunity to reach a less tangible goal, such as undertaking a certain type of work or building a reputation, and may forego a larger profit, but not cost-recovery considerations.

Generally, both government and the private sector partner want cost-effectiveness. The private sector partner does not want its profit margin eroded by unnecessary costs as this effects its owners and, potentially, those being paid from the endeavour.

The government partner wants to be able to report to the public that the public purse is well-spent through the partnership in addition to providing what the public wants or is judged as needing. Ultimately, government wants to be re-elected.

In this regard, public-private partnerships have sometimes been seen by the public and some sub-groups as being anti-union and as a first step to privatization (Poschmann, 2003, p. 1). Bettignies and Ross (2004) stated that public-private partnerships "lie somewhere between simple *contracting-out* and a *fully private market* in the spectrum of private versus public involvement" (p. 138). Earlier, Alan (1999) had provided a similar assessment.

Written Agreements in Public-Private Partnerships

The contracts associated with public-private partnerships are more visible than partnerships involving only private sector partners. The information in these contracts must often be made available for public scrutiny to the limits of protecting certain proprietary information (Poschmann, 2003, p. 2). The public is often interested in how much projects on their behalf are going to cost.

It would appear from the literature of business that many business partnerships are thought of, and managed, as projects. In the literature reviewed to date regarding public-private partnerships, it seems that authors are even more likely to describe those types of partnerships as projects. Public-private partnerships seem to have limited duration or a well-defined ongoing relationship (e.g. road building followed by road maintenance in exchange for toll fees for a specified number of years).

Financing and Risk Management in Public-Private Partnerships

According to Bettignies and Ross (2004), it is not always the case that it is best for government to fully fund activities in the production of goods and services for the public. The authors (Bettignies & Ross, 2004) pointed out it is

entirely possible that "with a solid, long-term contract from a government buyer a private borrower can most likely secure a very good rate from private lenders" (p. 147). Also, the private partner may be able to obtain some tax relief if it undertakes an activity in a contracted partnership.

Many government activities are self-insuring with regard to risk because government finances are sufficiently massive to cover any negative contingencies that may arise. However, this doesn't mean that government is not generally interested in reducing it's costs, reducing risk and costs associated with the risks when possible. By working with a private sector partner which is responsible for their work as specified in a written agreement, government is, in effect, leveraging public money to create something the public wants or needs.

By establishing a partnership with a qualified private organization with specific related expertise, government is managing its risk by buying expertise. Poschmann (2003) explained this by noting that for public-private partnerships, "when private agents pledge their own resources, they have a strong incentive to closely monitor project management" (p. 2). Private organizations are interested in taking on certain tasks to which they can apply their specific expertise and assume some risk with a large potential for gain. This natural "incentive" serves to reduce the risk of failure.

Alan (1999), Bettignies and Ross (2004), and Poschmann (2003) documented business risks which may be encountered in public-private partnerships.

Culture and People in Public-Private Partnerships

Clearly, government, other publicly funded institutions, and private organizations operate differently. Rosenau (2000) described the different orientations and interests of the public and private sectors (p. 229). In some cases, government personnel are not sufficient in number or appropriately skilled to manage public good development projects themselves (e.g., building highways). Rather than hire a sufficient number of people who do have the expertise, or contract out the entire task, government will enter into a partnership with a skilled private provider.

In most cases, this leaves the government employees to manage the partnership. There is some concern that government employees do not have the skills to do this, but "are expected to become more like their business counterparts" (Linder, 2000, p. 26). Although public-private partnerships may provide solutions to complex problems, they have their own problems. According to Gerybadze (1994), "coordination and management is even more difficult due to different incentive structures and liabilities"(p. 279).

Insights About Public-Private Partnerships

The public-private partnerships described in the academic literature of business are not an exact match to the type of partnerships which might exist between government-funded public and independent private post-secondary education institution. The relationship between government and industry is quite different than in a partnership of the type described above. Even when a government appoints an intermediary organization to act as its agent in a

partnership, the partnership relationship seems to be more of a contractor arrangement with government possessing the most control.

The motivation for entering into partnerships in the post-secondary context is consistent with the motivation for partnerships in business which are designed to make "the collective more competitive" (Gomes-Casseres, 1996, p. 2) with benefits to both parties who are better able to meet the ultimate goals of increasing business value and decreasing risk.

Although the public post-secondary institution may be larger and more powerful than the private partner, it is not as large as government, and the power it possesses would be used differently in a partnership. Public-private partnerships between post-secondary institutions are probably not as subject to public scrutiny as partnerships which establish a direct relationship between government and industry.

Thus, the literature of business about government-based public/private partnerships may not be not completely applicable to partnerships between private and public post-secondary institutions. However, many of the features of business partnerships described in the academic literature about partnerships in general apply to the special case of public-private partnerships in which government is one of the partners. This literature is, therefore, useful for consideration in this study.

Considerations for This Study

The purpose of this section is to analyze how the findings from the literature of business regarding partnerships and public-private partnerships might be applied to the topic of this study.

Organizations Involved

The literature of business regarding partnerships which has been reviewed to date tends to address the experience of large organizations and corporate entities which operate internationally and have multiple partnerships simultaneously. In that context, any one partnership may be a relatively small commitment for the large organizations. Presumably, the importance of any one partnership commitment to a large corporation will vary. The scale of the partnership may also be larger.

Given that most public or private post-secondary educational institutions are much smaller, the question which arises for this study is how much of what is described in the literature of business is useful in thinking about potential partnerships between public and private institutions.

Partnership/Project Management

Many of the partnerships in the larger business organizations described in the literature seem to be handled as projects, even in some cases to the extent of separating themselves quite distinctly from the main corporation. The size differential of the partner organizations may not be that significant. Project management processes are similar for large or small projects in large or small organizations.

The government-industry public-private partnerships described in the literature are clearly handled as unique projects, some very long-term (e.g. road maintenance and collection of toll charges after highway construction).

On the other hand, projects which are also partnerships have a different tone and possibly, function, for the organizations involved. The primary difference is that the partnership handled as a project has the added element of being in a sharing mode with an external organization. In large corporations, the sharing may be quite deliberately limited, given proprietary considerations. Individuals in educational institutions, and particularly those in health sciences, may be more accustomed to sharing than many other groups of people and may not see their work as being as proprietary. Training for teamwork is typically a component of education for health sciences occupations.

Another difference that may immediately emerge, however, is that whereas in a corporation the person assigned to lead the partnership is likely to have business or at least project management experience, this may not always be the case in post-secondary institutions. Either the initial or longer-term management of a partnership in a public post-secondary educational institution may be primarily, or after initial set-up, in the hands of a practitioner in an specific field, albeit someone with significant expertise, but who may or may not have training or experience with either projects or partnerships. Institutions vary enormously but this could be true in either public or private educational institutions. Staff members with the range of expertise which is needed may be limited in number in the majority of educational institutions.

Context

Post-secondary educational institutions, particularly publicly funded post-secondary education institutions, are not exposed to all of the realities of the business world. Government and government policies have provided the buffer.

For example, public post-secondary education institutions get grants for core activities directly from government. A significant proportion of their revenue base is predictable. The buffer has also been embodied in the traditional autonomy allowed post-secondary education institutions and especially universities, more than other publicly funded organizations and, particularly in universities, the freedoms accorded to faculty (Richardson, Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1999). However, trends in business sooner or later have an impact on activities in post-secondary education.

Governments increasingly view post-secondary educational institutions as important participants in the economy. There is a distinct trend to manage them as businesses at some level (Lenington, 1996). In B.C., although government is giving more latitude to publicly funded post-secondary institutions in managing their affairs, including the ability to expand their revenue bases in numerous ways, accountability measures are changing. In B.C., government is removing some barriers to participation by private post-secondary institutions (e.g., for-profit institutions being granted approval to offer degree programs). Post-secondary institutions often look to business relationships with other organizations to meet a variety of goals.

Goals of Partnerships

The literature about partnerships indicates that the goal of corporations in partnerships is increasing the value of their respective organizations. The goals for partnerships, as expressed in the literature about partnerships include seeking financial gain, but may be strategic in other ways, for example, accessing new markets or speeding innovation. The goals of government as described in

the literature about public-private partnerships are financial but not so much intended to generate a profit as to commit public funds to leverage resources outside of government.

It would seem that partnerships between public and private educational institutions may be less likely to be of a purely financial nature, although cost-recovery would probably always be a minimum requirement. Increasing the value of an post-secondary educational institution may be thought of in terms of different variables such as: increasing numbers of students; accessing different student groups, such as international students; providing different services or programs to students; staff/faculty development; and/or increasing and improving basic and applied research capabilities and activities.

Credibility Issues

As in business partnerships, post-secondary institutions will be concerned about credibility being gained or lost in a partnership, either through project activities directly or by association with the partner. Concerns over credibility may include credibility in the eyes of existing students, potential future students, employer groups, and other educational institutions.

As a former public institution administrator, I have observed that there are questions regarding the credibility of private institutions on the part of public institutions. In part, this may be because private institutions are the unknown to the public institutions.

Faculty may be concerned about credibility also. For example, faculty in private institutions may be concerned that public institutions will not be adept at handling their student/clients if, for example, they are from different ethnic

groups. Post-secondary faculty may have a bias or have limited information about the knowledge base and professional preparation of instructors in private institutions.

Financial Resources and Expectations

Although none surpass government, the organizations described in the literature about partnerships are typically much larger than most public or private post-secondary institutions in B.C. and have immense resources, including those which can be devoted to contingencies. What those large organizations have in common with some private post-secondary institutions in B.C. is the need to report positive financial outcomes, including profits, to owners and shareholders beyond meeting payroll and other obligations for operational costs. Public institutions are not permitted to run a deficit from one year to the next, and would, in most cases, even have difficulty covering an unexpected loss in one area of operation or one project. Large corporations may continue to operate with budget deficits in a project or partnership although there would be longer-term consequences for this.

Project and People Management, and Leadership

As described in the literature of business, representatives of the organizations in the partnerships must work to reach positive ends for their respective organizations as well as for the partnership. It is possible that issues of primary loyalty will surface. If participants, such as administrators and faculty in post-secondary institutions are inexperienced with partnerships, are they

prepared to recognize and handle these issues in a constructive manner? Are the designated leaders at the working level prepared to address the complex and unique issues associated with projects, which are partnerships?

In the case of a partnership between a public and a private post-secondary educational institution, will the staff/faculty members who must work together during the partnership be able to understand and accept the differences between the two organizations and find common and acceptable purpose in the partnership? This will, of course, be dependent on the nature and the purpose of the partnership and, to some extent, the type of activities which staff/faculty in the two organizations must accomplish together. It may also be dependent on the knowledge of the staff/faculty members of each other and their respective organizations. It will also depend on the perceptions, based in reality or not, that the staff/faculty members have about each other's institutions. Unfortunately, there are questions about the credibility of some activities of private post-secondary institutions and some public post-secondary institutions. These questions must be addressed as any partnership is considered.

Partnering with Competitors and Choosing Partners

The idea of establishing partnerships with competitors has been anathema or "previously unthinkable" (Goldsmith, 2003, p. 7) in the business world. On a practical note, some of the reasons are evident. Bleeke and Ernst (1993a) reported, "The lowest success rate for alliances is when two partners bring competing products to the same shared distribution channel" (p. 15) and that "strong overlapping geographic markets frequently suggest trouble for alliances: The overlap creates the potential for conflict" (p. 14).

On the other hand, Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003a) reported that there are situations in which collaboration among competitors can be useful. These include the more traditional situations in which there is a need for "setting standards, sharing risks, and entering emerging markets" (Bamford et al., 2003a, p. 79) as well as new situations in today's economy, including, "expanding product lines, reducing costs, gaining market share, and creating new skills" (Bamford et al, p. 79).

Bleeke and Ernst (1993a) recommended, "Alliance partners should be complementary in the products, geographic presence or functional skills that they bring to the venture" (p. 14).

In addition to the need for complementarity among partners, however, Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) provided a warning that, "Alliances between strong and weak companies rarely work. They do not provide the missing skills needed for growth, and they lead to mediocre performance" (p. 18).

The other perspective on partnering with a competitor that potential partners should remember is that, "When today's competitors may become tomorrow's customers, the definition of 'winning' changes. As people have memories, unfairly 'bashing' competitors or striving to ruin their business could have harmful long-term consequences" (Goldsmith, 2003, pp. 7, 8). The loss of social capital that could result from that behavior could be devastating in terms of loss of business value.

Finding appropriate partners is a challenging endeavour in any case; finding partners among competitors is even more challenging.

Summary

This literature review indicates that partnerships are an important business strategy (Gerybadze, 1994; Krubasik & Lautenschlager, 1993; Kuglin, 2002) for the modern-day world. The underlying purposes of partnership activities are to increase business value (Roussel, 2003; Ward, 2001) and to manage risk (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson, 2003c). Forms of increasing business value include the development of "equity, intellectual property, access to markets, technology, products and, most importantly, shareholder and customer value" (Ward, 2001, p. 3). Increasing business value through partnerships may also be derived from "setting standards, sharing; and entering emerging markets" (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a, p. 79), as well as expanding the range of products offered, minimizing business costs and improving efficiency (Bamford et al., 2003a; Gerybadze, 1994; Kuglin, 2002).

The literature indicates that partnerships succeed, at least in part, on the complementarity of the skills of partners (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003d; Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a). There are many potential formats and structures for developing effective partnerships, depending on the purpose and context of the partnership (Gomes-Casseres, 1996; Ward, 2001).

Based on the literature, it appears that creating a "culture of collaboration" (Ward, 2001, p. 10) seems to be the key to partnerships. Such a culture requires effective communication skills (Ward, 2001), "goodwill" (Svendsen, Boutilier, & Wheeler, 2003, p. 13), "willingness to collaborate" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 42), commitment to being in a partnership (Bennett & Jayes, 1998), flexibility (Alter & Hage, 1993; Bleeke & Ernst, 1993c; Rosenau, 2000), trust in the other and mutual

credibility, generation of social capital (Leadbeater, 1999; Svendson et al., 2003, p. 12), appropriate leadership (Ward, 2001), appropriate decision-making processes (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a, 2003b), and skill development on many levels (Kuglin, 2002; Linder, 2000).

For partnerships to flourish, supportive administrative and policy environments must be provided at institutional and governmental levels. Institutions must be flexible and have the ability to support change (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003d; Bery & Bowers, 1993) and innovation, exhibiting "adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 42). Leaders in institutions must understand the concepts and realities of both risks and incentives and their applications in partnerships (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a; Gerybadze, 1994; Poschmann, 2003). Institutions must be prepared to provide resources for skill development related to management of partnerships. Most importantly, institutions must be prepared to seek and respond to new opportunities (Ward, 2001).

This review of the academic literature about business partnerships described the context and features of such partnerships, including the special case of public-private partnerships. This perspective may be important to potential partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions in BC offering health programs.

Chapter Three addresses the academic literature about public and private post-secondary education.

CHAPTER THREE: PUBLIC AND PRIVATE POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION

Introduction

This chapter examines the academic literature of post-secondary education with a focus on the purposes of the enterprise, broad contextual challenges, private institutions and privatization, and the organization of post-secondary education, with particular attention to Canada. Public and private post-secondary institutions are juxtaposed. The categories of distinctions between public and private institutions to some extent parallel the features of partnerships described in Chapter Two. The concept of boundaries between public and private institutions is developed.

Literature About the Topic of This Thesis

The academic literature about post-secondary education does not significantly address partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions related to health programs.

There is a small body of literature from the United States which reports on some collaborative activities between private post-secondary institutions in different countries in which linkages are established between private institutions in the Northern hemisphere and private universities in the Southern hemisphere (Altbach, 1999a). Altbach (1999a) referred to this as the "multinationalization of private higher education" (p. 10) which allows rapid deployment of new programs of study in the universities in the host country. Altbach (1999a) questioned the extent to which these activities are actually collaborative and not just the wholesale, rapid, and expedient import of an existing curriculum.

Altbach (1999a) did not go so far as characterizing this as the "sale" of curriculum.

Levine (2001) challenged public sector higher education institutions to consider "the desirability" (p. 146) and "the consequences" (Levine, 2001, p. 146) of partnerships with *non-academic* private sector organizations that are already active in higher education or are moving into that sphere. The author's view seems to be that partnerships may be more constructive than either of the alternatives of being left out of some important opportunities in higher education or trying to compete with some subsectors of the private sector in higher education (Levine, 2001). This has not been fully explored in the literature.

Kinser and Levy (2005) briefly refer to the existence of formal articulation agreements in the United States "between the for-profit and public sectors to funnel graduates of two-year programs of one sector into the four-year degree programs of the other sector" (p. 13). No details are provided.

Despite the limitations of the academic literature, there is some work which addresses the purposes, context, and organization of post-secondary education and the characteristics of public and private post-secondary educational institutions, particularly in Canada and the United States, and provides helpful insights which assist in understanding the possibilities for partnerships.

The Extent and Nature of the Literature About Private Post-Secondary Education

Private post-secondary education has received only very modest attention in the academic literature of Canadian post-secondary education. One reason

may be the lack of research about private education in Canada. This is a common theme in publications from the 1990s: Sweet (1993) stated that "there is no adequate body of research on this sector that would inform educational decisions" (p. 37); Sweet (1996a) states that proprietary schools are "not adequately recognized in policy documents or academic analyses" (p. 31); Sweet and Gallagher (1999), describing the results of their analysis of data from the 1993 Statistics Canada Survey of Private Training Schools about "alternative providers of adult training" (p. 54), noted that, "the activities of proprietary schools continue to attract limited scholarly and policy attention" (p. 55); Maher (1998), summarizing a study in a Canadian context, notes that, with regard to privatization in post-secondary education, "little research has actually been done on the subject" (p. 3). More recently, Li (2006) referred to private colleges in Canada as "the lesser known players in post-secondary education" (p. 1). Adamuti-Trache and Sweet (2008) note the limited research about the "career colleges" (p. 168).

As far as the nature of the literature that does exist, Sweet (1996b), writing about Canadian proprietary institutions, commented that "accounts of proprietary school training are almost exclusively descriptions of institutions rather than analyzes [sic] of student characteristics or perceptions" (p. 67). More recently, Li (2006) prefaced the results of a study of data from a Canadian Survey of Labour and Income Dynamics by echoing publications from the 1990s, stating, generally, that "there is little information on the size and composition of the enrolment in these [private] colleges, or on the labour market outcomes of graduates" (p. 3).

This is an interesting observation given statements about the apparent growth of private sector post-secondary education in the 1990s: Dennison (1997) referred to the "rapidly expanding number of private institutions" (p. 54) in Canada; Gallagher and Sweet (1997) indicated that, in Canada, "both public and private training institutions have become major players in the intermediate skill training enterprise" (p. 200). It would have been logical to think that a growth area would attract greater scholarly attention.

Even more broadly, Altbach (1999b) pointed out, "Private higher education is perhaps, the fastest-growing segment of postsecondary education worldwide, yet it is little understood" (p. vii). Although it is "a growing phenomenon even where it has not previously been in the mainstream" (Altbach, 1999b, p. 4), the literature has not kept up. Altbach (1999b) described the situation as being "The large majority of the literature in the field deals with public higher education" (p. vii).

There is more literature regarding private post-secondary education in the United States, and in the many other countries in which private education is more prominent, than in Canada (Altbach, 1999a; Geiger, 1986, 1987). *The* literature from the United States is larger both in volume and detail than that from Canadian sources about Canada. There is a vast amount of research about American post-secondary education (Clark, 2000), including its private sector. Literature comparing the Canadian and American systems of post-secondary education has also been almost non-existent (Skolnik & Jones, 1992).

It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to examine the American system of post-secondary education in its entirety or to compare Canadian and American systems. There are also significant differences between Canada and the

United States which limit the usefulness of the examination. According to Clark (2000), "the American system of higher education is a highly deviant one. It is extremely large and extremely decentralized and institutionally differentiated. It is very competitive, taking up a position closest to the market extreme in an international triangle of major forms of coordination" (p. 34). Skolnik and Jones (1992) describe a difference in the two countries in the "degree of involvement of government" (p. 124). Eckel and King (2006) describe higher education in the United States as reflecting the ideals of "limited government, ... capitalism and belief in the rationality of markets" (p. 1035).

On the other hand, Galan (2001), writing about the Canadian scene, notes that, in fact, "the bulk of education-market activity [in Canada} currently originates in the US [sic)" (p. 11). Kinser and Levy (2005) note that, in the U.S., "nonprofit private higher education is extensive and often prestigious" (p. 2). The authors (Kinser & Levy, 2005) also note that "for-profit higher education is larger and more developed in the U.S. than elsewhere" (p. 2). As a consequence, given the limited Canadian literature about private post-secondary education, some American literature is referred to in this study.

Some Canadian information about private post-secondary education is embedded in books which primarily focus on public post-secondary education. Examples of these books include Dennison's (1995a) *Challenge and Opportunity: Canada's Community Colleges at the Crossroads;* Doherty-Delorme, and Shaker's (2002) *Missing Pieces III: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education.*

Worldwide, the existing literature about private post-secondary education is often, but not exclusively, comparative in one or two ways. Some works, either explicitly or not, compare the structure and function of private post-secondary

education across jurisdictions, such as Canadian provinces (Dennison, 1995b; Dennison & Schuetze, 2004), the states of the United States (Richardson, Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1999), or countries (Altbach, 1999a; Clark, 1986; Geiger, 1986), and/or, secondly, compare private post-secondary education with public post-secondary education on some set of parameters (Hearn, 2002; Lechuga, 2006; Ruch, 2001). This second type of comparison may be quite instinctive because, as Geiger (1986) pointed out, "A private sector thus implies the existence of a public one" (p. 7). In an increasingly competitive post-secondary education environment (Galan, 2001), comparison is not surprising.

In many of the works, the comparison extends to the broad organization of post-secondary education in various countries (Altbach, 1999a; Geiger, 1986). The place and impact/influence of private post-secondary education in the various contexts is included. There may also be a comparison of some form of the realities and roles which differentiate public and private post-secondary education institutions in those contexts.

Some literature which focuses exclusively on subsectors of private post-secondary education, for example, for-profit institutions (Bok, 2003; Ruch, 2001), and Canadian institutions which offer "vocational" programs (Sweet, 1996a, 1996b; Gallagher & Sweet, 1997; Sweet & Gallagher, 1999).

Levy's (1999) assessment was that, generally, "the international private higher education literature suffers from a severe imbalance. Few works go much beyond a description of recent trends or a repetitive recitation of normative purpose. Few works engage in analysis integrally linked to worthwhile social science concepts" (p. 18).

Reflections on the available Canadian academic literature result in similar conclusions: Private education has received little attention. This is not altogether surprising as, according to Dennison (1996), even the activities of the publicly funded community colleges in Canada have not been proportionately represented in the research-based literature of post-secondary education. These are the types of public post-secondary institutions that probably have the most in common with private institutions. Dennison (1996) provided evidence of this based on a review of the first 25 years of publication of *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education*. Reasons proposed by Dennison (1996) as to why this is the case include that, fundamentally, "colleges are teaching institutions" (p. 3) and that college faculty have not been required to do research, or publish, about their work. Dennison (1996) also points out that, with few exceptions, "most of the writing has been the work of university scholars, rather than college practitioners" (p. 3). Dennison (1996), referring to the publicly funded colleges, offers that community colleges suffer from a "lack of a clear identity, particularly from a national perspective" (p. 3). This may make it difficult for faculty within them to write about more broadly applicable matters.

Given some of the similarities between private post-secondary institutions and publicly funded community colleges and universities, at least in the American context (Levy, 1999), which are described later in this chapter, perhaps some of the reasons Dennison (1996) postulated would also apply to the literature about private institutions. In addition, what appear to be the dominant, and unfortunately, rather negative, attitudes in the publicly funded post-secondary sector about for-profit private institutions, for example, as described

in the American literature (Ruch, 2001), may not lend themselves to an expansion of a research-based focus on the activities of private institutions.

Potential researchers may find that access to either data (Sweet & Gallagher, 1999) or practice sites, for the purpose of research about private post-secondary education in Canada, is a barrier. If, as appears to be case in Canada, it is the scholars of publicly funded universities (Dennison, 1996) who do this type of research, then the first challenge in the research process is access to the field of private post-secondary education - the sector they don't work in. The type of comprehensive data about private post-secondary education that Galan (2001) describes as being "widely available" (p. 11) in the United States does not seem to exist in Canada.

Purposes of Post-Secondary Education

A theme that arises frequently in the literature of post-secondary education, and particularly where there is any mention of private post-secondary education, is, "Who is being served by post-secondary education?" (Altbach, 1998, 1999a). This is an important question because the answer relates to questions about the source of resources to support post-secondary education, both public and private.

Altbach (1999a) advised that there has been a shift in how post-secondary education, and particularly that provided in universities, is viewed: "The idea of an academic degree as a 'private good' that benefits the individual rather than a 'public good' for society is now widely accepted" (p. 1). This seems to apply across post-secondary education. Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) refer to a college education in this way (p. 5). Specifically, the benefits to an individual of

post-secondary education are seen as being personal financial gain and well being (Altbach, 1999a, pp. 10, 11). The benefit to the "public," or to society, is believed to be economic growth with positive outcomes for all through an appropriate supply of human resources to support the economy (Altbach, 1999a, p. 10). Skolnik (2006), however, pointed out that the public good should not be defined just in economic terms. Wolf (2002) wrote about the "cultural, moral, and intellectual purposes of education" (p. 254), and the contribution that people who have been educated can make to society. [In the B.C. context, Plant (2007) echoes these ideas when he describes the problems associated with viewing "learners narrowly as economic objects and inputs, rather than as citizens" (p. 9).]

In many respects, post-secondary education credentials and, in particular, a university education have undergone "commodification" (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006, p. 86). This process places a university degree, or any other educational credential, in the marketplace. Zemsky et al. (2006) stated their view that institutions of higher education are becoming "less places of public purpose" (p. 4) in response to market pressure.

In Canada, governments provide some support for post-secondary education to meet public outcomes (Fisher, Rubenson, & Schuetze, 1994). However, the reality is that it is difficult to label the benefits of modern-day post-secondary education as being exclusively public or private.

Thinking about the outcomes of post-secondary education is further complicated when consideration is given to a potential third beneficiary, the private providers of post-secondary education, and, particularly, for-profit providers. These providers are seen as receiving financial benefits from the act of

providing post-secondary education and being able to carefully select and limit what they offer to ensure that financial benefit. Galan (2001) highlighted the issue regarding private institutions in the statement, "As private firms, they are not required to provide broad-based course offerings to serve the interest of the public good, leaving them free to hone in on lucrative niche markets" (p. 23). Of course, it should be noted that for-profit private post-secondary institutions might very well be creating public benefits through their work, even if that is not their first priority (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006, p. 185).

Galan (2001) described post-secondary education as being seen as an attractive industry for investment purposes. Apparently, for the investor, this relatively new industry is attractive because it has significant revenues, an obvious market in the form of adults throughout the span of their careers, and new technologies allowing different forms of customer service (Galan, 2001). Levine (2001) indicated that higher education is attractive as a business because it is "countercyclical" (p. 142), it already has a "'brand' in the field of education" (p. 144), it has a product, that being, "authorization to provide education—accreditation, certification, and licensure" (p. 144), and it possesses a wealth of "content" (p. 144). The example of shares of the University of Phoenix now trading on an American stock exchange has been highlighted in the literature by more than one author (Altbach, 1999a; Lechuga, 2006; Ruch, 2001, p. 46; Winston, 1999). The evolution of these circumstances in post-secondary education is linked to some important contextual changes, including information technologies.

However, Katz (1999a) says that "colleges and universities are not businesses in the ordinary sense" (p. 27). Lechuga (2006), writing about the American situation, echoes this assessment (p. 1). Duderstadt and Womack

(2003), also writing about the American situation, note that "particularly the public university – operates under constraints that would be unthinkable for the private sector" (p. 15).

Contextual Changes Effecting Post-Secondary Education

The literature reviewed for this study provides evidence that the context of the practice of post-secondary education has been significantly altered by the inter-related factors of globalization, developments in information and communications technologies, and related changes in the economy.

Fisher, Rubenson, and Schuetze (1994) defined globalization as a process "whereby national economies, once fairly separate, are increasingly interrelated and economically interdependent" (pp. viii,ix). This "economic" definition is consistent with an earlier definition provided by Robertson (1992) who states that, "Globalization is a concept that refers to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole" (p.8). In essence, our economic neighbours are closer than they once were. Currie (1998b) proposed another definition as being, "A market ideology with a corresponding material set of practices drawn from the world of business" (p. 1).

Rubenson and Schuetze (2000) referred to changes in the economic order such that we now have a "knowledge society" (p. xi)", in which "knowledge and information are becoming the foundation of the organization and development of economic and social activity" (p. xi). Leadbeater (1999) referred to this new economic paradigm as the "knowledge economy" (p. viii). Wolfe (2000) offered the term, "learning economy" (p. 148), because of the focus on "the building of

new competencies and the acquisition of new skills, not just gaining access to information" (p. 148), i.e., using knowledge, not just acquiring it.

However this new economy is labeled, it requires lifelong learning and related educational opportunities for people of all ages. Having experienced an industrial revolution, it seems that humanity is now experiencing a learning revolution with some fundamental changes in society. Lewis, Massey, and Smith (2001b) referred to "the education revolution" (p. ix) as "a small but vitally important part of the information revolution" (p. ix).

It is not entirely clear from the literature exactly how the new economic order evolved and which elements appeared first. That is not a central issue in this study. However, several authors, writing about post-secondary education, report consistently on its elements. Lewis, Massey, and Smith (2001a) cited information technologies as "one of the chief enablers and facilitators of the movement toward global markets for people and things" (p. 4). Rubenson and Schuetze (2000) described "information and communication technologies (ICTs) and the [resultant] growth of global competition" (p. xi) as the impetus. Wolfe (2000) cited the "new integrated sets of information technologies that integrate computers, telecommunications, and media together in digital form" (p. 147), as critical elements. For Katz (1999a), it is this "convergence" (p. 33) of information technologies that will have the greatest impact. It seems logical to think that globalization could not have occurred without the elements, including technologies, noted above.

Of importance to this study is the impact of these contextual changes on post-secondary institutions. Lewis, Massey, and Smith (2001b) stated that post-secondary education in Canada exists in "a competitive and increasingly

fragmented education 'marketplace'" (p. x). That post-secondary education is now considered to be in a marketplace where goods and services are exchanged is very significant.

Lewis, Massey, and Smith (2001b) pointed out, "Technological change in the educational process appears to have interfered with the balance of power that for centuries has placed the university at the centre of the learning process" (p. 9). Duderstadt (2000) predicted that, in particular, universities, "will have to learn to cope with the competitive pressures of this marketplace while preserving the most important of their traditional values and character" (p. 39). Altbach (1999a) noted that the "values of the corporation and the marketplace are to some extent at odds with the traditional values of the university" (p. 13).

Two examples of the pressure described by Lewis, Massey, and Smith (2001b) are the rise of for-profit private post-secondary educational institutions and online universities. Keller (2001) cited four contextual changes that have created an audience for the for-profit institutions: the knowledge-based economy, the growth in the volume of education for adults, the new technologies which can be applied to the education enterprise, and the need for changes in the financial management of public post-secondary institutions. Katz (1999b) noted that convergence allows a different response to the demands of the education marketplace. Katz (1999a) stated a belief that the "new competition, enabled by information technology, will 'cherry pick' those offerings that subsidize much of the academy" (p. 36).

Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier (1999) indicated that the sources of the "new competition" (p. 51), include "new delivery mechanisms" (p. 51), "corporate universities" (p. 51), and "for-profit educational institutions" (p. 51).

Currie (1998b) focused further on the implications of globalization and related changes for universities and the academics that work in them (p. 1). Of greatest concern to Currie (1998b) was the anticipated negative impact of the business values reflected in the market-based practices of globalization, those being "managerialism, accountability, and privatization" (p. 1), applied in an academic setting. The negative impacts are described by Currie (1998b) as being losses in traditional collegial relationships, community, "curiousity-driven research" (p. 4), and "commodification of knowledge" (p. 5). It would appear that almost every facet of what has traditionally been academic life could be affected by this phenomenon.

Slaughter (1998) cited four impacts of globalization for post-secondary education:

> First is the constriction of monies available for discretionary activities, such as postsecondary education. Second is the growing importance of technoscience and fields closely involved with markets, particularly international markets. Third is the tightening relationship between multinational corporations and state agencies concerned with product development and innovation. Fourth is the increased focus of multinationals and established industrial countries on global intellectual property strategies. (p. 55)

How exactly does globalization move post-secondary education into the marketplace? Several authors have provided some additional explanation. With regard to the technoscience component, Slaughter (1998) explained that, "Technoscience is at once science and product. It collapses the distinction

between knowledge and commodity: Knowledge becomes commodity" (p. 56). This evokes the "knowledge capitalism" (Leadbeater, 1999, p. 9) of the new economy. With regard to "global intellectual property strategies" (Slaughter, 1998, p. 55), if knowledge is a commodity to be owned and traded, then it's worth must be assigned and the owner identified. Post-secondary education institutions, particularly in the form of universities, have historically been places where knowledge has been generated through research activities. In today's world, it is easy to understand why governments and companies are eager to fund research, for selected purposes, in universities, when there is so much potential for economic gain.

Privatization in Post-Secondary Education

The leap from globalization to privatization is not large. If the marketplace as described above is operating and an individual or organization wants the beneficial outcomes of postsecondary education in order to increase their own or their organization's value in the marketplace, then the view becomes that they, and not the public, as has been the tradition in Canada (Dennison, 1995), should pay for it. Geiger (1987) defined privatization as "the net addition of private resources for higher education or the substitution of private resources for public ones" (p. 7). Conceivably, the "private resources" referred to could take several forms, including the resources of individual students paying a greater proportion of actual costs at public institutions; the payment of total costs for programs offered by private post-secondary institutions, and; the insertion of funds by private businesses in a funding arrangement with a public post-secondary institution for services rendered. Altbach (1998) described privatization in post-

secondary education a bit more narrowly as the trend by government, which has traditionally provided a large proportion of the cost of post-secondary education, "to devolve a significant part of the cost of instruction to the student and to ask the institution to develop other revenue-producing strategies" (p. xxv). More recently, Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) described the situation in which universities use monies from their entrepreneurial activities to support core activities (p.9).

Dennison (1995b) predicted that "Inevitably, the issue of privatization will become more and more prominent in the lexicon of college education" (p. 8). This is certainly the case in universities for the reasons described, although the underlying issues related to the purposes of colleges in serving the population of "those who could not be accommodated either financially or academically by universities" (McWilliam, 1996, p. 73), are different.

There are concerns about privatization. Fisher, Rubenson, and Schuetze (1994) indicated that "privatization and its advocacy of market discipline may run counter to the mission of [public] institutions of higher education as the market encourages short-term thinking and immediate returns" (p. 38). Fears of warped thinking are certainly understandable. On the other hand, Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) described that, if used carefully and with awareness of the pitfalls, the earnings from entrepreneurial, "market-smart" (p. 9), private, for-profit-style activities can be used to support the core mission of a public institution, thus allowing it to continue to be "mission-centered" (p. 9).

It is in this broad and emerging context that post-secondary institutions operate and which the potential for partnerships between public and private institutions might exist.

The Organization of Post-Secondary Education

Any realistic consideration of partnerships between public and private post-secondary educational institutions requires knowledge of the potential partners and the environments in which the partners function. This includes the goals or mandates/purposes of the partners and some information about how they operate. It is also important to consider the relationships between post-secondary institutions in what may, in some cases, be a system of post-secondary education. The effects of globalization and trends to privatization should be considered. The next sections attempt these tasks.

As noted earlier, more information about the mandates/purposes, operations, and inter-institutional relationships of publicly funded institutions has been documented in the academic literature than about private post-secondary institutions. However, it is evident that, by their nature, private institutions have much more latitude in manipulating these features of institutional existence than public institutions do.

Purposes of Post-Secondary Institutions

Historically, publicly-funded post-secondary institutions have had reasonably clear, albeit broadly-defined, purposes, such that potential students could differentiate, in a general way, between what universities, colleges, and, possibly, institutes of technology, particularly in their own regions. Of course, students would probably not be aware of the details of different institutional mandates as described in the academic literature. A review of the literature demonstrates that publicly funded institutions increasingly have some purposes

in common. Consider the public institutions in British Columbia where there have been, simultaneously, colleges, universities, and university colleges, all of which are degree-granting (Dennison, 2006). Mount and Belanger (2001) note that "universities are becoming more like colleges and vice versa (p. 142). Fisher and Rubenson (1998) referred to a phenomena of "academic drift, as colleges become more like universities"(p. 94). Orton (2003) states that, "As the postsecondary world evolves, the grey zone between universities and colleges grows" (p. 9). Nevertheless. an examination of the purposes of these institutions, in a general way, is useful.

Public Universities

The literature provides many similar, but not identical, descriptions of the purposes of public universities. Duderstadt and Womack (2003) provided a classic statement of the purposes of a university when they referred to universities as having the "triad mission of teaching, research, and service" (p. 184). Levine (2001) stated, "Colleges and universities engage in three activities: teaching, research, and service" (p. 147). Auld (1996) provided a statement of purpose that is more limited, to the effect that, "A university has two primary purposes: to educate people and to conduct research" (p. 15). Auld (1996) differentiated between education and teaching. Dennison and Gallagher (1986) did not make that differentiation when they compared the purposes of universities and Canada's community colleges. They stated that "The historic purposes of the university, simply put, are research, teaching, and education for the professions" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 150).

Ruch (2001) reported that, particularly for the established, and public, universities, "the generation, dissemination, and advancement of knowledge are core values that are protected by academic freedom" (p. 18). These values have historically translated into the very significant research function of faculty in traditional universities, which have not been as important in either public or private colleges.

In contrast to the statement of purpose of Duderstadt and Womack (2003), Trow (1996) noted that universities have not always been institutions that conduct research. Apparently, that function has been added in the last two centuries and has "added evidence to faith and reason as a basis for certifying knowledge" (Trow, 1996, p. 24). Fisher, Rubenson, and Schuetze (1994) noted that "the rise of the research university in the nineteenth century has been attributed to the growing need for scientific and technical knowledge and the professionalization of industrial society" (p. viii). Universities "create new knowledge" (Auld, 1996, p. 15) through research. Related to this, Dennison and Gallagher (1986) observed that, in a university, "the scholar's primary allegiance is to a discipline (p. 151).

Altbach (1998) describes public universities as being "deeply embedded in their societies" (p. 3), having both political and cultural functions (Lewis, Massey, & Smith, 2001b). On the other hand, Dennsion and Gallagher (1986) advised that one of the important distinctions between public universities and other types of post-secondary institutions is that "the university is quite rightly and in subtle ways separate from larger society because the university has a clear and historic role as social critic" (p. 145). According to the authors, this gives universities "inherent value in their own right" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p

84). Auld (1996) acknowledged that a university may also provide consultation services, training for professionals, and "contribute to the broader social agenda" (p. 15), i.e., the community service agenda, but states that, those functions "are not what a university was originally designed to do" (p. 15). It is also the opinion of Dennison and Gallagher (1986) that the community service activities of universities have taken them beyond their original mandate.

With the contextual changes related to globalization described earlier, there have been reports of related pressures on and changes within public universities. Fisher, Rubenson, and Schuetze (1994) have noted that "universities have become symbols of the tension between the entrepreneurial and professional ideals in society because these institutions increasingly try to propagate both" (p. 31). This is not surprising in times of funding challenges for public universities. The professoriate is filled with talented individuals, with some proportion having entrepreneurial tendencies, who have research skills and are primed to produce the innovation being sought by industry to increase the value of their businesses in the marketplace through research and development. Fisher and Rubenson (1998) noted that "the trend toward sale of services and profit-taking is clear and consistent" (p. 92) in universities.

One problem is that these money-making activities may pull faculty away from what have been considered to be core functions of education and research (Auld, 1996). According to Fisher and Rubenson (1998), the balance of these functions of universities is in flux in our increasingly entrepreneurial environment as teaching is a "load" (p. 86) and research is an "opportunity" (p. 86).

A proposed revised mission for public universities in the new economic order is "learning, discovery, and engagement" (Duderstadt and Womack, 2003, p. 185). Based on the work of Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006), one wonders if another mission of a public university is to make a profit in some of its activities. in order to support its core mission.

Public Colleges and Institutes of Technology

Dennison and Levin (1996) found, through their study of the roles of public community colleges as described by senior college administrators and government, that the goals of those institutions are seen as being to "expand accessibility to post-secondary education, to train for employment, and to incorporate an educational component into the curriculum" (p. 34). Dennison and Gallagher (1986) indicated that Canada's publicly funded community colleges are "teaching institutions" (p. 229) but that to limit the role to teaching undervalues their mandate. Accordingly, the authors state that, in a community college, the "real institutional emphasis ought to be on the individual student and the personal learning objectives of the student" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 151).

Institutes of technology are typically seen as being involved in training but Dennison and Gallagher (1986) cautioned that this a simplistic view and that all three of the major types of public post-secondary institutions in Canada (universities, colleges, and institutes of technology), should attend to all three of the functions of teaching, training, and research. According to Dennison, Forrester, and Jones (1996), although a community college was "originally designed as an institution for college age students to begin university level

study, it has become a multi-purpose educational resource for a wide segment of society" (p. 7), including mature learners. The new economy demanded this.

Owen (1995) summarized the roles of colleges and institutes of technology:

> Institutes of technology.... share with colleges the ideals of institutional adaptability and high-quality instruction. Both types of institution are responsive to the demands of employers and to government priorities. Institutes of technology, however, are highly specialized. (p. 145)

In recent years in B.C., both colleges and the B.C. Institute of Technology have been permitted the opportunity of granting degrees in some format, with the colleges being restricted to applied degrees.

Variations in Public Post-Secondary Educational Institutions

Some literature (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004) has described several other types of publicly funded post-secondary education institutions in Canada, the CEGEPs, or Colleges d'enseignement general et professionnel/Colleges of General and Vocational Education of Quebec, and Ontario's Colleges of Applied Arts and Technology. Although different in label, it appears that there are significant similarities of purpose and process with these and colleges in post-secondary systems in other provinces. B.C. has had university colleges, a "hybrid" (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004, p. 18) institution, although that type of institution has been eliminated in the province.

Private Institutions

As Altbach (1999a) pointed out, "Private higher education is difficult to characterize" (p. 13). Private institutions are possibly more diverse in types and activities than their public counterparts. There is also some variation in their purposes. Orton (2003) distinguished between "for profit" (p. 12) and "not-for-profit" (p. 12) private institutions. Sweet (1996a) noted, in reference to proprietary schools in Canada, that while "profit may appear as their defining characteristic; it is obviously essential to their continued operation" (p. 32). Sweet (1993) also noted, however, that "the defining characteristic of this industry may not be the profit motive but rather a more general entrepreneurial attitude which views the student as a consumer" (p. 47). Specific types of private institutions in the United States and Canada are described later in this chapter.

In some contrast to the broad purposes of public universities, Altbach (1999a) noted, "The majority of private universities and postsecondary institutions worldwide provide training and credentials in their areas of expertise, but little else" (p. 11). Typically, there have been neither research activities nor attention to the type of "social responsibility" (Altbach, 1999a, p. 11) that public institutions may respond to. Levine (2001) reported that "the private sector is competing [with public institutions] in the one profitable area—that is, teaching" (p. 147). Levine (2001) predicted that this trend could lead to the "unbundling" of the traditional purposes of higher education. In reporting about the for-profit universities of the United States, Ruch (2001) noted that those institutions "do not have as their primary mission the shaping of a more informed citizenry, or creating a more cultured population, or helping young people understand their heritage, their society, and its values" (p. 73). Ruch

(2001) describes the view of some that what the for-profit private institutions "provide to students is employability, and not necessarily education" (p. 7).

In Grenier's (1995) review of Canadian data from 1992, the author noted that most private vocational training schools were "private businesses whose primary activity was providing training" (p. 58).

Systems of Post-Secondary Institutions

Superimposed on the purposes of the various types of institutions may be the requirements of a broader system of post-secondary education in which they operate. In considering partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions, it is apparent that the demands of a broader post-secondary education system could have a significant impact depending on the parameters of operation that the system manages.

The word "system" in reference to post-secondary education should be used advisedly. Systems of higher education are defined by Dennison (1995c) as being the collectives in which institutions operate as "an integrated organizational unit with a single governing body, which would assign specific responsibility for aspects of education and training to each component part of the organization" (p. 21). Dennison (1995c) concluded from his review of the organization and function of postsecondary education across Canada, that what exists are a variety of "quasi-systems" (p. 121) in individual provincial and territorial jurisdictions. There is no national system of post-secondary education in Canada (Marshall, 2004).

Richardson, Bracco, Callen, and Finney (1999), in a detailed study of higher education systems in seven of the United States, stated that it would be

appropriate to "define a state system of higher education to include the public and private postsecondary institutions within a state as well as the arrangements for regulating, coordinating, and funding them" (p. viii). Richardson, Bracco, Callen, and Finney (1999) indicated that state systems can create structures for governance and develop work processes, such as how institutions will articulate and manage information, as well as determining missions, capacity, and budgets, among other focuses.

According to Dennison (1995b), Canada, as a country, does not have a coordinated approach to post-secondary education. Gallagher (1995) and Jones (1997) echoed this assessment. This has not changed in the intervening years.

This is because, in Canada, responsibility for post-secondary education falls primarily to provincial governments (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004; Marshall, 2004). Dennison and Schuetze (2004) noted that there is no national policy about post-secondary education and the federal government has a very limited role. Although the federal government provides some targeted funding for post-secondary education, it is the assessment of Fisher and Rubenson (1998) that Canada has a "soft federalism" (p. 77) approach to post-secondary education in which federal control is limited. From a constitutional perspective, the provinces are responsible for education.

The outcome, documented in detail by Dennison (1995c), is that provinces make different arrangements for publicly funded post-secondary education. A diversity of models exists across the country (Dennison, 1995c). Quebec, Ontario, and B.C. have had the most distinctively structured systems within their respective provincial jurisdictions (Dennison, 1995c, 2006).

Skolnik (2006) pointed out that, historically, public post-secondary systems have typically had a university sector and an "other sector" (p. 2) which encompasses all the other types of institutions and their activities. As described above, in many jurisdictions, there are many variations.

At the level of the provinces, there are also no notable systems that include both public and private institutions. Paquet (1990) referred to the broad range of post-secondary education providers acting outside of the traditional publicly funded post-secondary education system in Canada as a "shadow higher education system" (p. 190). Private educational providers of the type addressed in this study would have been included in that group. Almost a decade later, Gallagher and Sweet (1997), in describing the era of the federal government's Canadian Job Strategy's funding in the 1980s in B.C., stated that, for the duration, "the private training institutions came to form a second, parallel publicly subsidized system" (p. 189). Dennison and Schuetze (2004) highlight that policies during that period fostered the growth of a "sizable private training sector" (p. 30). As recently as 2006, a provincial government representative in B.C. publicly stated that the province had "both public and private post-secondary education and training systems" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2006, p. 6). However, private institutions have not had a significant role in provincial planning in B.C.

Other Distinctions Between Public and Private Institutions

The academic literature describes some other significant differences between public and private institutions. Orton's (2003) detailed description of a proposed typology of post-secondary institutions in Canada distinguished

between public, private not-for-profit, and the private for-profit sectors. According to Orton's (2003) typology of institutions, universities and degree-granting institutions, may exist in all three sectors. The institutional type labeled, colleges and institutes, may be in the public and not-for-profit sectors, and the "career college" would only be in the for-profit sector.

The categories of distinctions between public and private institutions described in this chapter to some extent parallel the features of functional partnerships described in Chapter Two.

Values

According to Dennison (2006), publicly funded Canadian universities have historically had "a strong emphasis on academic and institutional autonomy, selectivity in student admissions, a curriculum planned on a large theoretical basis, participatory governance in a bicameral format, and their role as critics of conventional wisdom" (p. 108). These values have a long tradition in universities worldwide.

Altbach (1999a) noted that the "values of the corporation and the marketplace are to some extent at odds with the traditional values of the university" (p. 13). Ruch (2001) observed that "There is also a lingering belief, deep in the consciousness of the traditional academy, that profits and the market generally are fundamentally antithetical to serving the needs of society and of students" (p. 8). Ruch (2001) stated that the academics in the public sector cannot see "how the profit motive could properly coexist with an educational mission" (p. 1). Interestingly enough, however, Ruch (2001) noted that, in the eyes of at

least the American public, "the profit motive seems to have lost some of its association with evil intent" (p. 5) even with regard to post-secondary education.

Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) added that, "When universities are wholly dominated by market interests, there is a notable abridgement of their roles as public agencies—and a diminution of their capacity to provide public venues for testing ideas and creeds as well as agendas of public action" (p. 7).

In college settings, teaching seems to have been a more singular value. According to Dennison (2006), the values of publicly funded community colleges in Canada, in their relatively short histories, have been "comprehensiveness of curriculum.... open access, a focus on teaching rather than research, and a strong community orientation" (p. 110). Public community colleges were originally created "to widen access to university degrees by offering two-year 'academic transfer' programs" (Dennison, 2006, p. 108) as well as, more recently, helping people prepare for employment.

With regard to private institutions in Canada, particularly private vocational training institutions, Sweet (1996a) noted that those institutions must attend to the matter of making a profit because "it is obviously essential to their continued operation" (p. 32). It could be added however, that the realities of managing a business do not preclude the existence of the value of providing a service to people who wish to learn.

Accountabilities

Dennison and Gallagher (1986) reported that Canadian publicly funded colleges "were originally established unequivocally as publicly supported and publicly accountable" (pp. 144-145). Colleges retained their community and/or

regional focus. In their respective communities, their accountability was described as "service to citizens and to society" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 145). The expectations of their performance were high and they were expected, by their many stakeholders, to respond to a wide variety of real and perceived needs and to explain their decisions not to do so.

In contrast, private post-secondary institutions are able to identify needs and choose to respond to them if a viable financial position can be found for doing so. The public's expectations of them is limited, not to offering particular programs, but to ensuring that complete programs are offered and that program graduates can be successful in the workplace.

Even as public colleges, at least in B.C., take on more provincial, in addition to regional, roles, their local publics still have significant expectations of them. Public institutions are accountable to a variety of stakeholders, including government.

For-profit private institutions are ultimately accountable to investors. The smaller private proprietary institutions have individual owners with expectations as to their livelihood.

"System Governance" (Institutional Autonomy)

Skolnik (2006) indicated that there are two types of governance in post-secondary education, internal and external. These are also referred to as "institutional and system governance" (Skolnik, 2006, p. 14). In the paragraphs below, first, system governance, and then, institutional governance, are examined.

According to Altbach (1999a), private institutions have had much more autonomy as institutions although, depending on the jurisdiction they are in, they are subject to external program accreditation mechanisms. However, their autonomy is limited by the balance sheet for their institutions and parameters established by government in their respective jurisdictions. Schuetze and Day (2001) have noted that although the private, or what they term the "non-public" (p. 12) sector in post-secondary education, " is in many respects independent of government policy and planning, it depends crucially on the regulatory environment" (p. 12) provided by government.

Among public institutions in Canada, public universities have "a very large measure of autonomy by statute that allows them to ignore, co-operate, or compete with sister institutions" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 145). It would seem that, unless a university could see a very clear strategic benefit from a partnership with a private institution, no activity would emerge.

Public colleges are much more closely linked to government. Gallagher (1995), described the situation, stating that the public "college systems were expected to serve as instruments for the implementation of provincial or territorial economic or social policy" (p. 258).

"Institutional Governance" (Management/Decision-Making/Faculty Authority)

Decision-making processes vary significantly between public and private institutions (Lechuga, 2006). Public institutions are typically much larger institutions, with an attendant bureaucracy and decision-making filtered through multiple levels.

Private institutions in Canada have tended to be much smaller (Sweet, 1996a). An exception is the private college chains with multiple sites. However, even these are managed locally, particularly when local sites are franchises of a larger organization.

Gallagher and Sweet (1997), reported on skills training in B.C., and used the phrase, "large, apparently cumbersome, institutions" (p. 203) to describe how employers see the responsiveness of public institutions in comparison. According to Ruch (2001), the "emphasis on participation and inclusion of everyone who has a stake in the [public] institution" (p. 14) has precluded "quick, effective decision making" (p. 14).

Ruch (2001) noted that the internal management processes of the for-profit institutions in the United States allowed for clear accountabilities and lines of authority in a hierarchy of decision-making. Excepting the personal variation of managers, this makes much of the decision-making in the for-profit institutions much more expedient. Lechuga's (2006) research consisting of case-studies of four for-profit universities in the United States, refers to the relative rapidity of centralized decision-making in those institutions. Similarly, in the smaller proprietary private institutions in which there is no hierarchy, an owner or manager can make decisions very quickly. Sweet and Gallagher (1999), in their analysis of data about Canadian Private Vocational Training Schools (PVTS) from a 1993 Statistics Canada survey, indicated that the PVTS are small and managed by the owner/manager with the consequence that "a decision to modify a program to suit a particular training need can be made quickly and easily" (p. 62). Sweet (1996a) referred to Canadian private vocational training schools as having "greater flexibility in programming, and therefore greater

responsiveness to the changing skill demands of business and industry" (p. 35). Sweet (1996a) attributes this to the "small size and a narrow curricular focus" (p. 35) which are a characteristic of the population of institutions in the study.

Typically, in public universities, there has been a bicameral institutional governance model. In this model, faculty have considerable power through the senates of the universities. In addition, the concept of academic freedom has been upheld by the reality of tenure (Dennison, 2006). A "collegial model" (Mount & Belanger, 2001, p. 143) of institutional governance has been in place, although the authors say this is changing.

With regard to management of post-secondary institutions, Weingartner (1999) noted, "The vast majority of persons holding academic administrative posts are then professionals in other subjects, but not in academic administration" (p. 37). In contrast, Ruch (2000), writing about for-profit institutions in the United States, reports that many leaders in those institutions have corporate backgrounds.

Skolnik (2006) pointed out that, as public institutions pursue activities to move into and serve new markets, perhaps outside of existing decision pathways due to the need to be responsive, there is an impact on faculty. Faculty may be "confused about the scope of their authority and powerless to control things that are happening on the expanding and increasingly important periphery of the institution" (Skolnik, 2006, p. 25). Earlier, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) described this, related to the concept of academic capitalism, as being associated with "a loss to the concept of the university as a community" (p. 22). Mount and Belanger (2001) reported that some university faculty "feel that there has been a corporatization of universities that makes the collegial model increasingly

peripheral to the decision-making process of their own institutions.... and their control over their institutions has become minimal" (p. 143).

In contrast, historically in public colleges, "faculty and staff involvement in decision making has been generally restricted to an advisory capacity" (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004, p. 28). Owen (1995) stated that, "the tradition of faculty authority has no status in [public] Canadian community colleges" (p. 144). However, this situation has changed, at least in B.C., with the establishment of Education Councils in colleges, in which faculty are involved in ways similar to university senates in academic/curriculum decision-making (Dennison & Scheutze, 2004, pp. 28, 29).

Private institutions tend to have management structures reflecting their purposes (i.e., for-profit, non-profit), not governance structures. The decision-making structures in private institutions may not lend themselves to faculty involvement. In fact, use of the term "faculty" may be inappropriate with reference to some private institutions, particularly in Canadian proprietary college-like institutions. The Canadian literature about these institutions has used terminology such as "teachers" (Grenier, 1995, p. 56; Sweet and Gallagher, 1999, p. 59), "instructors" (Grenier, 1995; Sweet, 1996a) as well as "faculty" (Sweet, 1996a).

A former faculty member of a public Canadian college/university described the experience of working in a private university in the United States (Hearn, 2002). Hearn (2002) described this university as "a corporation plain and simple. A board of 22 'executives' and the president make all major decisions. There are at least 28 deans and associate deans, the majority of whom are professional administrators, not academics" (p. 35) In this institution, according

to Hearn (2002), "the faculty senate has ample representation for administrators, but none for students or staff. It is advisory to the president" (p. 35).

Faculty Autonomy

Historically, faculty members at traditional public universities have had considerable latitude in their research interests and their opinions by virtue of tenure and academic freedom. Dennison (1991) spoke of "the freedom to teach, to publish, to research, to govern and to monitor within the academic tradition" (p. 4) as being essential to universities. As Slaughter and Leslie (1997) have indicated that, in traditional institutions, "the social contract between professors and society suggests that if professors altruistically serve the public good rather than their own special interests, then in return they receive a monopoly of practice which ensures them a decent livelihood as well as social respect" (p. 206). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) indicated that, at large research universities, "faculty historically have been more insulated from the market than have other professionals" (p. 5) and have been able to conduct research as they saw fit.

Weingartner (1999) described the role of academic administrators with regard to their institutions and the faculty respectively as "both to do and to let be" (p. 88). In other words, while administrators have the responsibility to ensure that the institution somehow reaches its goals, they do so through faculty who are self-governing and have considerable independence.

As "research that intersected with the market"" (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997, p. 8) has been encouraged, faculty in research areas which have been particularly marketable began to interact in the market. However, Slaughter & Leslie (1997) point that "faculty did not think that creating knowledge for profit contradicted

their commitment to altruism and public service. Instead, they saw the market as a mechanism for distributing their discoveries to society" (p. 183). If they and the university benefited financially, so much the better. However, this has left faculty in disciplines in which research is less favored by the market out in the cold in some ways. Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) make reference to anger among faculty in American institutions at some of the related changes.

Typically, faculty of the larger for-profit institutions do not have academic freedom or tenure (Ruch, 2001) as faculty in public universities do. It is understandable how, according to Ruch (2001), this "changes the balance of power between the faculty member (employee) and the institution (employer)" (p. 15).

Attitudes and Culture

The academic literature provides unbalanced insight into how those working in and responsible for public and private institutions view each other.

Given their own historic purposes and different roles in terms of social responsibilities and serving the needs of student, it is not surprising that there is a rejection of the profit motive by those in public institutions (Ruch, 2001). Keller (2001) indicated that, in the United States, faculty of public institutions tend to see the for-profit institutions as a "crass intrusion, a sudden sprouting of coarse dandelions on the manicured lawns of higher learning"(p. ix) into the realm of post-secondary education. Ruch (2001) described the concerns among the academics of public institutions that profits are made "off the backs of … students" (p. 106) in the for-profit private institutions. This is seen as particularly

reprehensible where questions about the quality of education offered at private institutions arise.

It is possible, however, that the other source of the attitude to private institutions is concern about quality. Marshall (2004) referred, in a rather deprecating tone, to the "diplomas of various hues" (p. 74) offered by private institutions which are "supposedly ministry approved and inspected" (p. 75).

Based on work experiences in both public and private post-secondary education institutions, Ruch (2001) summarized the organizational culture in the for-profit universities in the United States as being, "the blending of business management with academic pursuits, the shift in the balance of power toward students and away from faculty, and the absence of tenure and its affect on academic freedom" (p. 108).

Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) described that, in American universities, "few presidents or provosts are troubled by the juxtaposition of mission and market, no doubt because they spend so much of their time striving to balance the traditions of the academy against the demands of the market" (p. 51). This has resulted in a cultural shift of sorts. Zemsky et al. (2006) reported that there are, in fact, "academic entrepreneurs" (p. 51) in the public sector, particularly those in "popular" areas of research, who see the potential of, seek, and enjoy the new roles they design for themselves, including the financial benefits that may accrue for some.

Some downsides to this have become evident. One is that entrepreneurial faculty members can become "increasingly detached from the life of their universities" (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006, p. 28). These individuals "enjoy expanding horizons" (Zemsky et al., 2006, p. 55).

Another downside is that not all faculty agree with the direction, or have any desire to be, entrepreneurial. Some faculty may be "discomforted—and in some cases, offended—by linking academic and commercial pursuits" (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006, p. 51). It is also entirely possible that a "sour grapes" attitude may emerge in those faculties whose discipline may not be as marketable.

In addition, it is apparent (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006) that some disciplines provide more fertile ground for entrepreneurial activities than others. And the research function, as opposed to teaching, may garner more entrepreneurial productivity back to the institution.

More broadly, Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) indicated that, in public institutions that have practiced academic capitalism, the bottom line can be difficult to assess and analysis may show that net returns are negligible. Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) noted that, even in the face of substantial revenue generation, "the opportunities must be reasonably well aligned with the university's mission itself" (p. 60), or the potential for harm to the institution exists in the form of loss of focus on the original institutional mission, and greater costs related to generating the revenue. Zemsky et al. (2006) cautioned that public institutions responding to the market to gain revenue should think of it as "a means to an end rather than an end in itself" (p. 60).

In addition, as Skolnik (2006) pointed out, as public institutions pursue activities to move into and serve new markets, perhaps outside of existing decision pathways due to the need to be responsive, there is an impact on faculty. Faculty may be "confused about the scope of their authority and

powerless to control things that are happening on the expanding and increasingly important periphery of the institution" (Skolnik, 2006, p. 25).

Leadership

Sweet (1993) reported that, as many private institutions in Canada are so small, owners may also be instructors. Thus, "the style of management necessarily is very 'hands on' and most owners are directly involved in all aspects of the training and administration of the school" (Sweet, 1993, p. 53). In this study of Canadian data, Sweet (1993) also noted the "innovative spirit which is consistent with the need for institutional responsiveness" (p. 59) which exists in the private sector. In earlier years, Wilms (1987), in a study of the owners and managers of private schools in the United States, indicated that they "share some basic qualities that set them apart from traditional educators: a libertarian outlook, a belief in the profit motive, an entrepreneurial spirit, a belief in the free market, and a distrust of public planning" (p. 16). Hearn (2002), using a distinctly negative tone, described the implications of being in a private institution in the United States that has professional administrators to manage it.

Apparently, the leadership of public colleges and universities has changed in recent decades. Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) indicated that, "The better-managed institution has become the one with a significant number of senior managers who, precisely because they have broad experience both within and beyond the academy, know what it means to be both mission centered and market smart" (p. 206).

Describing the American experience, Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006) indicated that in the 1970s, most institutions "were still being shaped by

entrenched bureaucracies that saw their principal task as the enforcement of regulations designed to keep students in check, faculty in their offices, and entrepreneurs out of sight" (p. 53). However, Weingartner (1999) reported, "Academic institutions are not well served by an administrative style that, in the conventional sense, runs a tight ship" (p. 85) in which faculty are not able to be independent professionals.

Faculty Arrangements

Based on his research into private vocational training schools in Canada, Sweet (1993) noted that many of the teachers are part-time and that they are also employed in the field about which they teach. This is in contrast to the often lengthy and full-time employment of public sector teachers/faculty who rarely have an opportunity to return to work in their discipline (Sweet, 1993).

Sweet (1993) noted a difference between the public and private schools in the credentials of the teachers. The emphasis in hiring in the private institutions seems to be on "teaching effectiveness" (p. 53) as it is that, rather than academic credentials, which are seen as being central to the long-term health of the operation in offering an up-to-date program.

Funding Sources

Both public and private institutions seek and use multiple funding sources. Publicly funded institutions seek funding from a variety of sources for diverse activities. Ruch (2001) noted that the administrators of today's public universities must be involved in the acquisition of financial resources in a variety

of ways. These include maintaining enrollments to sustain or increase tuition income, acquire donations, seek grants, and raise money for projects.

It appears that the private for-profit institutions in the United States use tuition as the main revenue source "to support current operations and generate profitability" (Ruch, 2001, p. 99) and do not necessarily have to solicit funds from other sources. Ruch (2001) highlights that for-profit institutions must pay taxes, an expense that public institutions do not have in the same way. Some non-profit private institutions in the United States have endowments in addition to other funding sources.

Niches Served

Describing the Canadian situation, Skolnik (2006) noted that private institutions tend to move into niche markets in education that are not being addressed by public institutions. This makes sense from a business perspective. For Skolnik (2006) there appears to be "excess demand for occupation-specific programs that are delivered on a fast track to adults, in imaginative and flexible space-time configurations, employing learner-centered pedagogies, and using faculty who are not expected to do research" (p. 19). This is the direction taken by private institutions. In this regard, private institutions can be opportunistic.

Programs Offered and Institutional Size

Gallagher and Sweet (1997) characterized the differences in program offerings at public and private institutions, at least for B.C., in their statement that "the public colleges offer a wide range of programs that differ widely in

enrolment levels, but that most private institutions enroll less than 100 FTE students annually, usually in very few programs (p. 193).

Orton (2003) noted, based on Canadian data, that "private institutions vary tremendously in size. They may be as large as some universities or very small, with just one program" (p. 9). Grenier (1995) reported that, based on 1992 Statistics Canada data about individual private vocational training schools "Just over half of the schools surveyed had an enrollment of less than 100, and three-quarters had less than 250" (p. 57).

Auld (2005) found that programs at private colleges in Canada "are shorter in duration than those at community colleges: the curriculum is more basic, with less breadth and depth of subject matter" (p. 6). Sweet (1996b) found, from Manitoba data that, "intensive programming is characteristic of the PVTS approach to instruction in all fields" (p. 74). This does not seem to have changed.

Growing Similarities between Public and Private Institutions

It seems that the differences between public and private institutions are diminishing, at least in the American context (Levy, 1999). Altbach (1999a), referring to rising tuition fees worldwide and in both public and private sectors, made the claim that public and private post-secondary education institutions around the world "look more and more similar" (p. 1). Related to this, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) commented that, "If the state share of public university funding continues to decline, at some point the universities will become de facto independent or private, if they are not already" (p. 239).

For Canadian researchers Sweet and Gallagher (1999), the distribution of federal funding for vocational training directed at private institutions in the

1980s, made the sectors less distinct (p. 70). The authors note that the "PVTS [Private Vocational Training Schools] in Canada—collectively if not individually—have become, as their public sector counterparts have been for decades, a substantial resource responding to public need, sustained in no small measure by public funds" (Sweet & Gallagher, 1999, p. 72). The view of Gallagher and Sweet (1997) was that, in that era, "the federal government effectively co-opted a proprietary sector which no longer remained private; rather, the private training institutions came to form a second, parallel publicly subsidized system that differed from the official 'public' system only to the extent that different regulations and processes for access to public funding applied to the different sectors" (p. 189).

Further, the two types of institutions, may "organize their curricula and instruction in similar ways. And the content of their programs—offered to much the same student market—also is similar. In fact, many of their programs and services overlap rather than complement each other" (Sweet & Gallagher, 1999, p. 71). Although Dennison and Schuetze (2004) indicated that private institutions in Canada "seek to offer niche programmes to people unable to enroll in traditional programmes" (p. 34), public institutions also try to make themselves attractive to learners with programs addressing very specific markets.

Similarly, Schuetze and Day (2001) commented that "the distinction between public and private provision of post-secondary education is somewhat blurred since many 'private' institutions receive substantial funding from public sources" (p. 4). One area in which there is no argument about the similarities between public and private institutions is in fundraising and/or profit-making activities (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2006). Both public and private institutions,

and particularly for-profit institutions, engage in these activities which, in both cases but for different reasons, seem to be so central to their ongoing existence. Public institutions in Canada are showing no compunction in consistently, actively and, often, rather aggressively pursuing "private patronage" (Geiger, 1987, p. 7) from a variety of non-governmental and other sources, including individual philanthropists, families of students, alumni, private organizations which exist to provide grants (Rae, 1996), and corporations/industry groups which have an interest in funding education. In addition, public institutions choose to label some of their programs as cost-recovery or for-profit and offer them through, for example, continuing education or other department, with the intention of returning either overhead and/or a "profit" to the parent organization to support core functions. (One caveat here is the extent to which the entrepreneurial activities in public and not-for-profit institutions actually accomplish the purpose of generating funds for redistribution within the institution. Some of these entrepreneurial activities develop a "life of their own" within the institution, including to the extent of drawing funds from the parent institution. It is not easy for one department to make an "authentic" profit to support activities in another department in the same institution when all overheads are considered.)

Kinser and Levy (2005), describing the situation in the United States, noted the importance of these "for-profit elements of either nonprofit or public institutions" (p. 2). However, there may be a point at which such a low percentage of funding of a public institution comes regularly from the public purse that the institution should no longer be considered to be a "public" institution. This phenomena seems to be a component of the privatization of

post-secondary education institutions described by Geiger (1987) as "the net addition of private resources for higher education, or the substitution of private resources for public ones" (p. 7). Describing the Canadian situation overall, Orton (2003) stated,

> The distinction between *public* and *private* is not an easy one to make. All users would agree that an institution that is owned and operated by an individual for a profit is private. Beyond that, the distinction is often unclear because users apply different variables either separately or in combination. Sources of funding, who appoints the Board of Governors or Directors and the legal basis of incorporation are among the criteria sometimes cited, and there are different understandings of the importance of each criterion. (p. 9)

Writing about post-secondary education in the global context, Kinser and Levy (2005) describe the difficulty in differentiating between types of institutions and the "blurry lines between for-profit and nonprofit institutions (and even sometimes public ones)" (p. 3). As an example, Kinser and Levy (2005) point to: "The general legal delineation suggests that only for-profit institutions may distribute profits to owners, although the precise nature of' 'profits' and 'owners' is elusive in a global analysis" (p. 6). Kinser and Levy note that not-for-profit and for-profit institutions are not so much distinguished "by making money or 'profit', but by what they are able to do with that money" (p. 7).

Levy (1999) used the concept of isomorphism in his analysis of private education institutions to demonstrate that at times of growth of private higher education, the causes are often "undistinctive" (p. 29). According to Levy (1999), private institutions tend to present themselves as being very similar to public institutions "while asserting distinctiveness on just one or a few counts" (p. 33). Presumably, being similar to public institutions makes the private institution

more acceptable, while doing activities that are somewhat different justifies their existence.

Discussion of the growing similarities of public and private institutions, perhaps more evident at the college level, raises questions about the possibility for partnerships. If the two types of institution are so similar and are doing similar things, can they be sufficiently complementary to justify a partnership relationship?

Private Post-Secondary Education in Canada

As noted earlier, the academic literature about Canadian private post-secondary institutions is far less well-developed than the literature about the same topic in the the United States.

Types of Institutions

There are a variety of private post-secondary institutions in Canada. Unlike the United States, the academic literature about private post-secondary education in Canada does not particularly note any truly dominant or prestigious private post-secondary education institutions. There is also no literature that indicates that the private post-secondary institutions operating in Canada are supported by significant endowments. However, in some provincial/territorial jurisdictions, there are some private institutions of note.

Orton (2003) distinguishes between for-profit and not-for-profit sectors among private institutions in Canada. In considering for-profit or proprietary institutions for the purpose of this study, it may be useful to distinguish between

two types. There are the local sites of "corporate" private institution, which are overseen by a larger company either directly or through a franchise arrangement with an individual owner/manager. The connections between the corporation and the local office vary.

The other type of for-profit institution is the "independent" private institution which is owned and operated by an individual. There are numerous proprietary institutions of this type in Canada.

Private post-secondary education in Canada includes a significant American influence as a number of institutions from the United States function in Canada. These include the University of Phoenix, DeVry Institutes, Corinthian Colleges, Academy of Learning, and the Art Institutes (Galan, 2001). Some of them are the corporate-type for-profit institutions. Some would not be immediately recognizable to the public or to educators as being American. For example, the institution known as CDI in Canada has the name Corinthian Colleges, Inc. in the United States.

Canada has some denominational private institutions (Marshall, 2004; Mayer, 1998). It also has some purpose-specific private not-for-profit institutions. Private aboriginal colleges are one example. In B.C., the Native Education College is a not-for-profit private college managed by an exclusively aboriginal Board.

Numbers of Institutions and Enrollments

It is difficult to get a clear picture of the size and impact of the private post-secondary education sector in Canada. This seems to be because of limited collection of related data (Orton, 2003), limited access to that data, and significant

definitional problems (Orton, 2003), all of which make comparisons difficult. Nevertheless, some statistics which have been reported in the literature are instructive regarding the size of the industry. They also illustrate the problem of attempting to quantify information about the sector.

Dennison and Schuetze (2004) and Sweet (1993) highlighted that there was rapid growth of private vocational training institutions in response to federal government funding in the 1980s. Sweet (1993) documented that "Canadian proprietary schools in 1989 recorded 190,000 enrollments" (p. 37) in 1,062 institutions (p. 40). There were 450 such institutions in B.C. at that time (Sweet, 1993, p. 40). According to Sweet (1993), the provinces of Ontario and B.C. had the largest numbers of schools. In that regard, Sweet (1993), cautioned that, for B.C., this may have been because of the broad definition for private institutions. In B.C., the definition has changed periodically.

Gallagher and Sweet (1997) compared "intermediate skill" (p. 181) training in public college/institute and private vocational training school (PVTS) numbers in B.C. in 1992. They indicated that there were 20 public institutions and 358 PVTS which managed 33,840 FTEs and 48,844 FTEs respectively (p. 193). In Canada, there is a much more limited range of private institutions. Sweet (1996a) indicated that there were 1,738 proprietary vocational skills training institutions in Canada in 1992 (p. 31). Marshall (2004), using Statistics Canada data from 2003, stated that there are more than 1,000 such institutions in Canada.

Li (2006) summarized a study comparing Canadian data about private colleges from 1993 and 2003, by stating that, during that decade, private colleges "lost ground" (p. 3) in terms of the number of graduates in the age group 25 to 34. Specifically, "In 1993, private college graduates (with no other postsecondary

qualifications) aged 25 to 34 accounted for 6.3% of the total in this age group who had some form of postsecondary education. By 2003, this had been cut by almost one-half to only 3.7%" (Li, 2006, p. 4). Based on his analysis, Li (2006) attributed this to a reduction in the number of women enrollees in "secretarial sciences" (p. 7). It is interesting that Auld's (2005) research also suggests that both total enrollments and the number of private colleges has declined in recent years (p. 4).

Boundaries

A number of significant differences separate public and private post-secondary institutions. These are not simply barriers erected by external forces. Based on the review of the literature, these differences are more fundamental and complex. For the purposes of this study, the term "boundary" will be applied to these differences and will be defined as "the location of a change of context".

Although it is not central to their work, Slaughter and Leslie (1997) and Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) have used the term "boundaries" in regard to "academic capitalism" in post-secondary education, and in particular, in research universities. Slaughter and Leslie (1997) define academic capitalism as "institutional and professorial market or marketlike efforts to secure external moneys" (p. 8). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) made reference to the problems of language to use to "address changes that blur the customary boundaries between private and public sectors" (p. 9). They (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997) also mentioned the "increasingly permeable boundaries between the research university and its workforce and the world outside the academy" (p. 5). Slaughter and Rhoades

(2004) indicate that their more recent analysis of academic capitalism "focuses on the blurring of boundaries among markets, states, and higher education" (p. 11).

The academic literature identifies where marketplace-based or entrepreneurial activities are taking place in public institutions. Zemsky, Wegner, and Massy (2006), writing about the American context, noted, "In public institutions, growth along the perimeter accelerated the process of privatization, particularly among the nation's more entrepreneurial public universities" (p. 56). Slaughter and Leslie (1997) identified the location of entrepreneurial activities in research as being "on the perimeter of the university" (p. 2). This is not limited to research universities. Skolnik (2006) pointed out that public institutions are pursuing activities to move into and serve new markets "on the expanding and increasingly important periphery of the institution" (p. 25).

There seem to be multiple boundaries, or subboundaries, in the public-private divide. It would appear that, in the context of partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions, the idea of boundaries is a concept which can be explored further. Some boundaries between public and private post-secondary institutions, which are either evident in the literature, or extrapolated from it, are described below.

Philosophy

The matter of who benefits from the activities of post-secondary education institutions (Altbach, 1998, 1999a) is a critical boundary between public and private institutions. Currently, potential beneficiaries are society, the individual student, and, in the case of some private education institutions, the shareholders and owners. Ideas behind the consideration of education as a

business (Lenington, 1996) and the implications of privatization (Fisher, Rubenson, & Schuetze, 1994) are significant in terms of the purpose of post-secondary education, and the ability of the two types of institutions to work together.

Culture and Attitudes

The literature provides examples of the concerns and negative attitudes that public sector post-secondary educators have about post-secondary education in private institutions (Keller, 2001; Ruch, 2001). The language used in the literature tends to personalize the concerns. For example, Keller (2001) referred to the perspective of public sector educators that private institutions are a "crass intrusion" (p. ix). This statement speaks volumes about the attitudes of public educators. These attitudes could easily influence any consideration of partnerships between the two types of institutions.

The current culture of public post-secondary education institutions may not lend itself to partnership activities with private sector educational institutions. If, as Alter and Hage (1993) indicated, a "willingness to collaborate" (p. 39) is important to collaborative activities, then change may be required. A willingness to collaborate in a partnership with another organization must surely involve shared values and positive attitudes with regard to the partnering institution.

Another essential aspect of a willingness to collaborate to increase business value and reduce risk is a positive belief about the ability of the partner's capabilities. Ruch (2001) cited the existence, in the public sector in the United States, that one of the long-held "myths" (p. 7) about for-profit

educational institutions is "that they generally offer a poor-quality education to students" (p. 7).

Private post-secondary institutions, as described in the literature, may perceive the culture of shared governance of public post-secondary education institutions as a threat to partnerships with them. This is a significant consideration.

Accountabilities

Linked to considerations about the philosophy and beliefs about post-secondary education is the practical matter of the differing accountabilities of public and private institutions and their implications for partnerships.

A consideration of philosophy and accountabilities leads to the dimension of the differences in the historical mandate of universities, to function as "social critic" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 145), "to educate people and to conduct research" (Auld, 1996, p. 15) and the assigned/self-assigned mandates of other public and private post-secondary institutions. This is most pronounced when there is any consideration of partnerships between publicly funded comprehensive universities and private institutions.

Administration/Management

The literature of business advises that partnerships and/or related collaborative activities have certain requirements in order to begin and be sustained successfully. In general, the literature of business indicates that organizations need to have flexible structures that can respond to ongoing

change across the life of a partnership, mechanisms for control and decision-making which are responsive, multilevel leadership, and sound processes for conflict resolution and decision-making. Alter and Hage (1993) were a bit more specific about this. Their proposal for systemic networks as the best response to the global economy indicates that, to succeed, collaboration between organizations requires "the willingness to collaborate, the need for expertise, the need for funds, and the need for adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 42).

It is clear that public and private institutions have different modes of operation that would have to be considered in any potential partnerships. The literature describes the differences in management and decision-making processes at public and private institutions. The shared governance (Dennison, 1995), and related processes, of some public institutions, contrasts with the top-down decision-making structures of many private institutions (Levin, 1995). Ruch (2001) noted that the internal management processes of the for-profit institutions allow for clear accountabilities and lines of authority in a hierarchy of decision-making. This makes much of the decision-making in the for-profit institutions much more expedient. Similarly, in the smaller proprietary private institutions, in which there is no hierarchy, an owner or manager can make decisions very quickly.

On the other hand, Blustain, Goldstein, and Lozier (1999) note that in the public institutions, "Traditional multiyear planning and decision-making timetables will not be sustainable" (p. 69). Also, it is significant that public universities have considerable autonomy as institutions that "allows them to ignore, co-operate, or compete with sister institutions" (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986, p. 145) or not.

Education Versus Training

In their assessment of possible solutions to the need for training services in B.C., Gallagher and Sweet (1997) noted that if training became the responsibility of business and industry, "the public universities and colleges would be able to do what most of them claim they do best: educate rather than train" (p. 203). The authors (Gallagher & Sweet, 1997) note, however, that there could be disadvantages to handing training to the private sector, one of them being that it "could also intensify class status differentials within the province, and leave the issues of access and equity to market forces" (p. 204). With regard to vocational training in universities, Fisher, Rubenson, and Schuetze (1994) referred to "the permeability of the boundary within the universities that has traditionally separated its education and training functions (p. 31).

Culture and People Management

In Dennison and Gallagher's (1986) history of community college development in Canada in the period from the 1960s to the 1980s, the authors noted that public colleges tended to borrow management and administrative structures from the public universities or from school boards (p. 144), in other words, from institutions with which they were already familiar. Although the mandates of colleges have evolved over the years, these traditional structures have been retained.

Some of the literature from the United States describes various aspects of management of people in private institutions in that country (Bok, 2003; Hearn (2002; Ruch 2001).

Another Perspective on Inter-Institutional Cooperation

In the literature of post-secondary education, an article about mergers between public institutions provides an opportunity to consider inter-institutional cooperation from a different perspective. Writing primarily about public colleges and universities, Lang (2002) indicates that they "are attracted to inter-institutional co-operation in order to do things that they cannot do individually, usually because of a lack of wherewithal" (p. 17). However, Lang notes that "Co-operation among colleges and universities occurs neither spontaneously nor naturally. It is, instead, the result of carefully considered, conscious, and deliberate choices" (p. 18).

Lang (2002) presents a model which has five elements: scale, breadth, quality, distribution, and, economy and efficiency (p. 18). In the model, inter-institutional cooperation may occur if it is seen as resulting in a circumstance in which the first four elements correlate positively with cost and the last negatively with cost.

Lang (2002) indicates that institutions in a post-secondary education system are most interested in some form of inter-institutional cooperation when "cut-backs in public funding" (p. 23) are added to the need to achieve the elements listed above. Lang (2002) indicates that this may happen when an educational "system is not large and diverse, or the system is saturated to the point that every institution is at its capacity" (p. 23) and there is a need for alternative ways to meet social demands. In this type of scenario then, "the motivating factors are mainly external" (p. 24).

Lang (2002) also describes a paradigm of inter-institutional co-operation which is entirely motivated by the urge to "gain competitive advantage in an educational marketplace. That advantage might take the form of lower costs, new programs, new modes of delivering programs, and opportunities for growth" (p. 24).

Although the focus of the article is mergers of publicly funded post-secondary education institutions, Lang (2002) proposes four forms of "inter-institutional combination" (p. 11), including one labelled "the paradigm of the continuum" (p. 24). This paradigm has a range of inter-institutional cooperative possibilities based on institutional autonomy and varying from program closure to mergers of institutions, and including management by contract, consortia, federation, and affiliation.

Lang's (2002) description of affiliation, in the continuum paradigm, has some characteristics in common with partnerships as described in the literature of business reviewed earlier. An affiliation in the context of post-secondary education is described by Lang (2002) as "a division of specialised labour among two institutions to deliver a particular program or service" (p. 30). According to Lang (2002), "affiliations do not affect the autonomy of participating institutions" (p. 30). Lang (2002) acknowledges that institutions may, at any given time, be part of more than one affiliation. Lang (2002) singles out affiliation as a "frequent means of bridging the gap between secular public institutions and sectarian private institutions" (p. 30). This may be because the institutions are allowed to retain their unique identities and their autonomy. The affiliations Lang (2002) describes are loose.

Where Lang's (2002) conceptualization of an affiliation differs from the business perspective on partnerships is in the allocation of resources. Lang (2002) states that affiliations do not "involve any reallocation of resources, either physical or financial" (p. 30). This is different from the business perspective on a partnership in which some resources are shared, albeit limited in terms of the total resources of the organization. The affiliations described by Lang (2002) are looser.

Lang (2002) postulates that the competitive instinct which exists in all colleges and universities is an innate barrier to cooperation. In his words, "colleges and universities are as inclined to compete with one another as to co-operate with one another" (Lang, 2002, p. 17). The instinct of most institutions is to be complete in themselves.

Although the relationships Lang (2002) describe are not partnerships per se, and caution must certainly be used in their application to other types of relationships and boundaries between public and private institutions, there are some features that merit consideration.

Summary

In this chapter it became evident that there is no particularly comprehensive, or clearly defined or significant, body of research or literature from which to draw information about private post-secondary in British Columbia or, for that matter, in Canada. There is a potpourri of information from a relatively small number of sources. In contrast, in the United States and in

many other countries, the subject of private post-secondary education has caught the attention of a larger cadre of researchers in public institutions.

This chapter examined the purposes of post-secondary education and the significance of the shift to thinking about it as a private good. The chapter also examined the contextual changes that are effecting post-secondary education generally, including those brought about through the trend to privatization, the knowledge economy, information technology, and globalization.

The chapter described the types of institutions in public and private post-secondary education and the systems of education in Canada. Institutions in the public and private sectors were compared on the basis of the values from which they operate, the accountabilities required of them, their governance mechanisms, their internal structures, the role of faculty, attitudes and culture, leadership, funding, niches served, and programs offered. Observations were made about the growing similarities between public and private post-secondary institutions.

This examination of the literature of post-secondary education proposes that there are some significant boundaries between public and private institutions. The boundaries are related to philosophy, culture and attitudes, administration/management, accountabilities, and education versus training.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONTEXT OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The development of a framework for understanding partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions offering health programs in British Columbia, as described in Chapter One, requires some understanding about the nature of those institutions as prospective partners and the context in which they operate.

This chapter provides some background information about post-secondary education institutions in B.C. This background information includes the type of information that is not typically found in the academic literature, and which is available from non-academic sources, but which has significance with regard to this study of partnerships. The context of post-secondary education created by the B.C. government and some features of the post-secondary "system" in B.C. are described.

This study began in 2005. As the report of the study was completed in 2008, this chapter provides a limited comparison of the context of the study as it was in the intervening years.

Context and Arrangements for Post-Secondary Education in B.C.

Examining the context and arrangements for post-secondary education in B.C. is particularly important to this study given provincial variations in public post-secondary education (Dennison, 1995b). B.C.'s public post-secondary environment has had some unique features (Dennison, 1995b; Plant, 2007, p. 17; Skolnik, 2006). The collection of types of publicly funded institutions, including

universities, university colleges, community colleges, provincial institutes, and the Open Learning Agency, that B.C. has had in the years leading up to 2008, has certainly made it diverse. In addition, as noted in Chapter Three, given the very independent nature of private post-secondary institutions, it is probably not appropriate to apply the term "system" to them in B.C., at least not in relation to public institutions.

Difficulties Obtaining Information About B.C.

Just as there is limited research about private post-secondary education in the academic literature of Canada (Sweet, 1996a; Mayer, 1998; Sweet & Gallagher, 1999), obtaining information about the operations of private post-secondary education in B.C. is challenging.

In fact, bringing together information about either public or private post-secondary education in the province is difficult. Despite the mass of information collected about public institutions, *Campus 2020: Thinking Ahead: The Report* (Plant, 2007), the B.C. government's report about the future of post-secondary education, indicates that "A comprehensive data base containing current and historic information on post-secondary education in B.C. does not exist" (p. 29). One reason cited is that, on the public side, information comparing universities and other institutions is collected and reported separately (Plant, 2007, p. 29).

As described below, there are few mechanisms for collection of data about the private sector. Data comparing individual private institutions or a comparison of public and private institutions is also limited or non-existent. The Centre for Education Statistics of Statistics Canada has proposed an approach to

data collection (Orton, 2003) which may assist with this in the future for some types of data.

There are, of course, several possible reasons for the lack of information, particularly about private institutions. One reason is that collecting information, and creating and maintaining databases of accurate and current information is costly. For the public institutions, there is a requirement for accountability to the public and to government because tax dollars are being spent. This type of accountability is not similarly applicable to private institutions, either individually or as a group.

Another reason for the lack of information is that there may have been no perceived need on the part of private institutions to either gather the information or make it available. With no perceived need, no resources are devoted to this type of activity.

Another possible reason may be the proprietary and increasingly competitive nature of post-secondary education within both public and private institutional sectors and between those sectors. There may be a competitive advantage in not, for example, making course and program completion rates or rates of employment of graduates available. In such listings and comparisons, it is difficult to avoid ranking; if one institution is cited as being at the top, there is always an institution occupying a bottom position. No enterprise which intends to continue its existence wants to be at the bottom, particularly a private for-profit business.

Some might also surmise that private institutions may be reluctant to share information about their operations and outcomes because they are of poor quality. This cannot be substantiated.

Given the historically limited interactions between the public and private institutions, the lack of comparative data is not surprising. Perversely, the lack of information may contribute to the lack of interaction between public and private institutions in B.C.

Availability of Information About Private Institutions

Sources of detailed information about private post-secondary institutions are limited almost entirely to the institutions themselves. The web sites of private institutions are highly variable in the type and quantity of information they provide whereas the web sites for public institutions provide greater masses of information in multiple layers, including their educational and administrative plans. In many cases, web sites for private institutions provide less information than those of their public counterparts and may or may not cite the institution's mandate, start dates for programs, length of programs, or tuition fees. Unlike the public institutions, the private institutions almost never indicate contact names of administrators, faculty names, or faculty qualifications.

The academic calendars of private institutions are often much less substantial documents that those of most public institutions, particularly in the case of the multitude of private proprietary colleges. This is less so with regard to private universities which tend to be larger institutions.

It is even more difficult to obtain information about the day-to-day activities of private institutions. It appears that the best source of comprehensive, current, and reliable information about college-type private post-secondary education institutions in B.C. is the web site of the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), the self-

regulatory/registration/accreditation body for some types of private institutions. These institutions are required to provide information about their types of programs, locations of sites, and qualifications of instructors. This information appears on the PCTIA web site. The PCTIA web site provides information about the categories of institutions designated by PCTIA – registered, accredited, and suspended. On an annual basis, these institutions also provide enrollment data but this information is considered confidential and is used primarily to calculate the required amounts of institutional financial deposits with PCTIA. PCTIA publishes an annual report about the private institutions but this is considered confidential to the institutions as a group. Aggregate PCTIA data about enrollments is reported to the B.C. government.

The web site of the B.C. Council on Admissions & Transfer provides some biographical information about private institutions which are formally associated with the B.C. transfer system.

Availability of Information About Public Institutions

Information about public institutions is more readily available through institutional reports, such as institutional Annual Reports, and provincial government reports. The B.C. provincial government places major data gathering and reporting requirements on the public post-secondary education institutions. The data the public institutions are required to gather is primarily related to outcomes. Data includes measures of student satisfaction with programs and teaching, attrition and graduation rate for programs, and success in obtaining employment. The nature and collection of data has been standardized by government. Some of this data is used for institutional comparisons by

government, institutions themselves, and is available to the public in reports published annually by the government. The Ministry's Data Warehouse has data collected from all public institutions except five universities (Plant, 2007, p. 29).

Other Sources of Information

Public and private institutions which seek program accreditation/approval for their health programs from licensing bodies for health professionals must submit detailed reports about their institutions and programs to the respective licensing bodies. However, these reports are considered confidential and only the accreditation/approval status which is the outcome of the accreditation/approval process is made public. Understandably, these types of reports are not released to third parties even by the institutions themselves, either public or private. Many of the health programs offered by the private institutions are not of the type that require accreditation/approval/recognition processes so this type of information is never collected.

The other sources of information regarding post-secondary education in B.C. tend to focus on broader policy issues, and do not identify individual institutions. The only exceptions to this would be the minutes of provincial academic discipline Program Articulation Committees, which are mandated by government to create opportunities for transfer credit by having those responsible for particular types of programs meet together. Some of these Committees have informal agreements requesting that participating institutions submit detailed reports of enrollments into and graduation from their programs, for circulation with their minutes. However, these reports are limited in value

because not all Program Articulation Committees have this practice, not all Committees have a standard format for submission of information, not all institutions submit reports, and private institutions do not consistently and/or individually participate in the Committees. Thus, the minutes and reports are of limited usefulness as they may not provide reliably comprehensive information.

Baseline Information about Post-Secondary Institutions in B.C.

Some of the more readily available general information about the operations of public and private institutions, primarily as groups, is provided below and is important to have collected as it provides a foundation for later consideration of the findings of the study. This information is taken from non-academic sources, not journals, but the publications and websites of government, institutions, and a variety of organizations.

Types and Numbers of Institutions

In 2005, when this study began, the province of B.C. was particularly unique in the diversity of its public post-secondary education institutions although other provinces, such as Ontario and Quebec, also had multiple, unique types of institutions in their post-secondary education systems (Dennison, 1995b, 2006). In B.C., the 26 public institutions at that time included comprehensive universities, a special purpose university (Thompson Rivers University), university colleges, community colleges, and provincial institutes (Appendix A).

At that point, one particular source of institutional diversity in the public system was the "hybrid" (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004, p. 18) institutions - the five university colleges. Started in the 1990s, these former community colleges

served specific regions of the province and fulfilled their mandate by offering traditional college programming as well as degree programs.

In addition, in 2003, the B.C. government announced its intention to support the policy of providing students with choices in seeking education and creating additional opportunities for access, by passing the Degree Authorization Act, which allowed both private colleges and out-of-province institutions to obtain approval to offer degree programs, and which was also used to approve new degree programs at traditional universities, and to approve applied baccalaureate degrees to be offered by B.C.'s public colleges, and applied master's degree programs to be offered by B.C.'s university colleges (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004b; BCCAT, 2008a, p.2; Dennison & Schuetze, 2004).

By 2007, the government document, *Campus 2020: Thinking Ahead: The Report* (Plant, 2007), which provided a review of the post-secondary system, called for a reduction of the mandate of the colleges so that they would no longer be able to offer applied degrees. This did not take place in the face of objections by the colleges.

By June 2008, the total number of publicly funded institutions was 25 and the names of five institutions had recently been changed by government (Appendix A) through the process of one college, one institute, and three university colleges being granted university status. Of the other two university colleges, one had been partially absorbed by the University of British Columbia and the other had become Thompson Rivers University (TRU), which evolved from the University College of the Cariboo [UCC] with the addition of the distance education programs of the (former) Open Learning Agency. Thus, in

2008, the province had 11 universities (one of those being a polytechnic university), three institutes, and 11 colleges. The university college, although successful in many ways (Evans, 2006), had become extinct in B.C. in 2008.

As of February, 2005, 23 of the public institutions (Appendix A) offered programs which were considered to be health programs for the purpose of this study. In 2008, the same number of public institutions offered those types of health programs.

With the many changes in the public system over the last few years, and the focus of most colleges and university colleges having been on degree-granting in some format, it is logical to conclude that the focus on the college portion of the mandate of these public institutions has been reduced. Given that the private system in B.C. offers primarily college-level programs, it is interesting to speculate on the implications for market share that could result.

The private institutions in B.C. are also diverse. The institutions range from Trinity Western University, a not-for-profit institution with a denominational base which offers a nursing degree program, to for-profit corporate entities, such as CDI and the University of Phoenix, which have a number of local offices in B.C. monitored by a parent company in the United States, to much smaller, for-profit, proprietary institutions with local owners/operators. The latter type of institutions form the bulk of the private institutions in the province. The private institutions which offered health programs, as defined for this study, as of February 2005, are listed in Appendix B.

In B.C., private educational institutions could be categorized as existing

under three different administrative arrangements. The majority, and typically, the small proprietary institutions must be registered with the government-mandated, self-regulatory monitoring organization of private institutions , the Private Career Training Institution's Agency (PCTIA), if they "offer career-related programs with at least 40 hours of instruction and with at least $1,000 in tuition" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005c, p. 1). Second, there are the institutions with programs which do not meet the above-stated criteria for programs and operate without reference to PCTIA as the accrediting organization. Typically, these are English language schools which offer short programs. Finally, there are 16 private degree-granting institutions (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, June 2008), some of which were established under their own legislation, with the remainder being given approval to grant particular degrees through a different mechanism established by the B.C. government.

On February 15, 2005, there were 627 private post-secondary education institutions registered with the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA, 2005b). On June 24, 2008, there were 424 private institutions registered with PCTIA (PCTIA, 2008). The reduction in numbers of private institutions is primarily related to a change of definition regarding which institutions need to be registered with PCTIA. Nevertheless, this seems to be a large number in a province with the current population of B.C.

Enrollments and FTEs

An environmental scan completed by the B.C. government in May 2008 (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008k) reported that B.C.'s public post-

secondary system enrolled "approximately 430,000 students and 163,000 student FTEs in the 2006/07 academic year" (p. 62).

The environmental scan released by the B.C. government in May 2008 reported that B.C.'s private career training institutions enrolled "approximately 40,900 students in 2006 and awarded 29,800 credentials" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008k, p. 68). The original source of this statistic was an annual report of PCTIA for the year 2006 (Siblock, 2007) and so was limited to institutions registered with PCTIA. As private institutions offering English preparation did not have to be registered with PCTIA at that time, the total number of students in B.C. would actually have been larger.

In addition, the B.C. government (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008k, p. 68) reported that, as of January, 2008, 3,700 students were enrolled in 16 private and/or out-of-province public institutions which were authorized to offer degree programs in the province.

Beyond those figures, Watson (2008) reported in his government-mandated review of the Private Career Training Institutions Act that "an estimated 100,000 students attend approximately 150 to 200 private English as a Second Language (ESL) institutions" (p. 4) annually. Watson (2008) did not cite his source for the ESL-related statistic and it would be difficult to validate it as those private schools are not regulated in any way.

Taking the statistics about private institutions together, and acknowledging that there are definitional inconsistencies associated with them, they provide a gross estimate that approximately 145,000 students participated in private post-secondary institutions in the province in 2008.

Financial Intent

Private post-secondary educational institutions which were seeking or had received Ministerial approval to offer one or more degree programs in B.C. in July 2008 are listed in Appendix C. These include institutions which may have been registered or accredited with PCTIA. The institutions vary as to their financial intent. They include public and private, and for-profit or not-for-profit institutions. The majority are not- for-profit.

In the private degree-granting arena in B.C in 2008, eight of the 14 private institutions which may grant degrees are not-for-profit (Appendix C). These include Trinity Western University and Quest University Canada (formerly Sea-to-Sky University). The remainder of the private universities which may grant degrees are for-profit, with a well-known example being the University of Phoenix (Appendix C).

There are various financial arrangements among the for-profit universities and other for-profit institutions in B.C., most of the latter being colleges. Some are the local operations of larger organizations. Examples include: University Canada West, a division of the Canadian company LearningWise Inc. or LINC, and Sprott-Shaw Community College which has recently been purchased by CBIT with a central office in China (Career College Central, 2007). The offices of CDI College of Business, Technology and Health Care in Canada are operatives of Corinthian Colleges in the United States. Vancouver Career College is part of the Star Enimata Group. The different offices of the Academy of Learning throughout the province are actually franchises with individual owner/operators with a head office in Toronto. The Art Institutes operating in Vancouver are part of a system of 40 such institutes in North America under the

parent company, Education Management Corporation, which itself has 89 other locations in North America (Education Management Corporation, 2009).

There are a number of not-for-profit colleges and organizations on the PCTIA list of registered institutions. Examples include such institutions as the Native Education College, the Victoria Read Society, and the North East Native Advancing Society.

Funding

Historically in B.C., a number of the post-secondary institutions, including the traditional universities (The University of British Columbia, Simon Fraser University, and University of Victoria), Royal Roads University, the institutes, and the one agency (closed in 2005) had received block funding from government. Block funding has meant that, whereas the government has a vested interest in the range of programming offered by institutions, it allowed institutions to be quite autonomous, and would not intervene directly with the distribution of programs offered.

In the past, colleges had line-by-line base funding for programs with details negotiated annually with the Ministry. The line-by-line funding approach allowed government to control numbers of student spaces in particular programs in particular areas and, thus, across the province, based on labour market information. This was seen to be particularly important for college programming which led directly to jobs.

Now, colleges receive block funding with more freedom to decide how they will reach their programmatic goals but, of course, retaining accountability for outcomes. The ability to begin to offer and grant applied degrees (although

with approval requirements) is one more freedom which government has accorded to the publicly funded colleges in the name of student access and choice.

Public institutions also seek funding from other sources, including tuition fees from students, contracts for the services of various institutional personnel, research grants, donations, trust funds from alumni and benefactors, and cost-recovery continuing education activities.

For the most part, health programs in the publicly funded institutions are heavily subsidized. Although tuition fees are rising in most publicly funded institutions, the tuition fees paid by students in those institutions are a fraction of the real cost. This is particularly true for health programs which have added expenses such as labs and clinical instruction.

Private institutions provide programming that is financially viable for the institution either through elevated tuition fees relative to the public sector, or through a combination of tuition fees and other funding sources, often related to the ideology represented by the institution, for example, a denominational university.

To date, the provincial government does not provide direct funding to private institutions. One private aboriginal college receives public funding through an affiliation agreement with a public college. Some public administrators would say, however, that allowing students receiving student loans to register in accredited private institutions is equivalent to funding those private institutions.

Both public and private institutions have other options in terms of seeking funding from a variety of sources.

Workforce Arrangements

B.C.'s public post-secondary education system is heavily unionized. Staff and faculty belong to collective bargaining organizations which act on their behalf with regard to working conditions, salaries, and benefits.

As public post-secondary institutions consider changes, including entrepreneurial activities, they may need to consider the positions of, and/or consult with, the collective bargaining agents and their members. Depending on their unique collective agreements, there may be considerably less freedom to make changes in a unionized environment and this can significantly effect an institution's flexibility.

The majority of public institutions in the college sector in B.C. have staff whose collective bargaining agent is the Federation of Post-Secondary Educators (FPSE). The majority of FPSE locals are in the public post-secondary system although there are a few in the private sector as well. Overall, the private sector is significantly less unionized. In 2004, a limited number of private institutions had unionized workers. At that time, three private institutions had instructors who were members of FPSE (FPSE, 2004). As of June 2008, FPSE had 17 locals with 17 separate institutions in the public sector and one local in the private sector (FPSE, 2008).

A small number of both public (e.g. Northern Lights College) and private (e.g. NEC Native Education College) institutions belong to the British Columbia Government Employees Union (BCGEU) , a large and diverse union with 500 bargaining units (BCGEU, 2008). BCGEU tends to serve employees with job descriptions that are quite different from the job descriptions of faculty in post-secondary institutions.

Some public institutions are serviced by two separate bargaining units for professional staff. For example, Okanagan College and BCIT each have their own Faculty Association which represents a proportion of faculty, in addition to BCGEU, which represents other instructors.

The public universities tend to have their own faculty associations.

Governance

B. C.'s public post-secondary education institutions are governed by government-appointed boards. All of these institutions have a management structure that includes a President who reports to the Board. Publicly funded post-secondary institutions in B.C. operate on a bicameral basis with a Board which makes administrative decisions and an Education Council which makes academic decisions about programs to be offered.

Private post-secondary education institutions in B.C. are owned by individuals or groups, some in the province of British Columbia only, some in Canada, and some elsewhere. CDI College (originally, the Career Data Institute) is an example of a private institution with many sites here in B.C. and a corporate office in California. Another example is Discovery Community College with multiple sites in B.C. and its main office in this province. Structures vary widely.

In most cases, faculty are not involved in the governance structure of private institutions.

Institutional Stability

B.C.'s publicly funded post-secondary education institutions have been subject to rapid changes mandated by government in the last decade. There has

not been much of a status quo in the recent history of many of the publicly funded post-secondary education institutions in the province. Several examples are provided below and are referenced in Appendix A.

One example is the Open Learning Agency which was created by government in 1978, merged with the Knowledge Network of the West in 1984, and then was absorbed in 2005, with some of its programs being continued, into a new university in the province, the Thompson Rivers University (TRU), in Kamloops. TRU replaces the University College of the Cariboo (UCC) which operated in the same facilities. The new institution is referred to as a "special purpose university" (University College of the Cariboo, 2005, p. 1). In 2008, the Knowledge Network became a Crown corporation.

Another example of institutional instability is the experience of the Technical University of B.C. in Surrey which was established and abolished within a five year period with its programs and students being transferred to SFU.

A third example is the five university colleges which were established in the 1990. These institutions had originally been community colleges, later became university colleges, and were converted to universities or other types of institutions. These transitions were described earlier in this chapter and information about them is provided in Appendix A.

In addition, a new organization, BCcampus, was established in 2003. The role of BCcampus was to manage distance education on behalf of many of the other public institutions in the province. It provides an important service in the province.

Taken together, these were significant changes, in both number and impact. What was a system of only 26 institutions in April 1, 2005, was reduced to 25 institutions by June 2008. The distribution of types of institutions changed considerably.

Private institutions in B.C. are free to establish themselves in any location at any time and that is exactly what they do. This is especially true of the private sector college-level institutions. It appears that the initial establishment and ongoing existence of private institutions is subject only to the market factors which may affect them.

There is no doubt that private institutions are dynamic in terms of their existence. There are many examples of this dynamism among those institutions in B.C. which offer health programs. From one location in 2005, Discovery Community College had 12 sites by 2008. CDI had seven locations in 2005, and four in 2008, having closed its locations in Victoria and Port Coquitlam in the interim. The 24 locations of the various franchises of the Academy of Learning in 2005 increased to 26 locations by 2008. A private institution with a self-reported 100-year history in B.C., Sprott-Shaw Community College, was sold in 2007 by its owner/operator to an internationally active education management company with headquarters in China, CIBT Education Group (Career College Central, 2007).

Shifts in Mandates

To the casual observer, it may seem that public post-secondary institutions rarely have changes of mandates that haven't been planned many years in advance. The provincial government decision in 2008 to create "new"

universities (Appendix A) from a former college, an institute, and three university colleges, although previously unanticipated as happening that quickly, if ever, follow more than a decade of collaboration between senior degree-granting institutions and university colleges, a college, and an institute. Of course, it could be argued that the change is entirely a government response to the international market for higher education which did not understand the concept of a university college (Annadale, 2008; Plant, 2007).

The traditional comprehensive universities (Simon Fraser University, The University of British Columbia, and the University of Victoria), Royal Roads University, the institutes, and the former Open Learning Agency, always had provincial mandates, meaning they served the entire province. The last three university colleges to become universities have responsibilities as "regional" universities (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, 2009a).

In the past, colleges and university colleges have serviced specified catchment areas. The mandate to serve a specific area minimized competition between the colleges and the university colleges because their energies were focused on meeting the needs of their own communities.

With changes in accountability to government, colleges and other institutions are increasingly operating outside what used to be considered their areas. In addition, government has permitted the establishment of applied degree programs in colleges. Many traditional colleges have participated in collaborative degree programs with the universities of the province for many years and have been anxious to establish their own degree programs (e.g., Douglas College and nursing degree).

In these recent changes, it appears that the university mandate within the province has progressed, albeit becoming much more diffuse with its expansion to new institutions. The publicly funded colleges which currently offer health programs may now independently offer applied degree programs.

As noted earlier, it appears that the college mandate in the province has received less attention than in the past. The focus in many public institutions has been on changes toward offering degree programs.

Private institutions provide programming that is consistent with the purpose for which the institution was established and the market place. Private institutions are each free to determine their own mandate and change it at will. For example, Sprott-Shaw Community College has received approval to offer a degree program in the province of British Columbia.

Institutional Affiliations

There are several organizations which public and private institutions may join with the purpose of enhancing their institutions. Opportunities for enhancement may take the form of conferences and related professional development for staff, increased institutional profile, institutional and system advocacy, and participation in sector studies and international work.

Private colleges may join the British Columbia Community College Association (BCCCA), an umbrella group of private institutions which has the goal "to promote and support those involved in private post-secondary education" (BCCCA, 2009, p. 1). Not all private institutions choose to belong to the BCCCA. On July 12, 2004, the BCCCA web site indicated that the organization had only 115 members (BCCCA, 2005) at about the same time as

PCTIA had over 600 registering institutions (PCTIA, 2005b). Each individual college campus location is considered to be a member of BCCCA. The web site as of February, 2009, gives no indication of the total number of members (BCCCA, 2009).

The members of the Association of Community Colleges of Canada (ACCC) are public and private community colleges, institutes, CEGEPs, and university colleges. The members from B.C. as of August 2, 2004, are listed in Appendix D. Only one private college in B.C., Columbia College, an institution of long-standing in the province, is a member of ACCC.

Institutions which seek recognition of their university status may belong to the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC). Both public and private not-for-profit universities belong to AUCC. B.C. members of AUCC as of August 2, 2004, and July 29, 2008, are listed in Appendix E. Trinity Western University is the only private university in B.C. which belongs to AUCC.

With the exception of degree-granting institutions which have, in the past, voluntarily sought recognition through the national organization, the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), public post-secondary institutions are not subject to external institutional accreditation processes. The AUCC does not claim to be an accrediting organization (AUCC, 2004). AUCC has criteria which institutions must meet in order to qualify for membership.

Private institutions have some other organizations to which they may choose to belong. One is the National Association of Career Colleges (NACC). The purpose of this Canadian organization is stated as being "to encourage excellence in the private training sector and to promote the interests of its

members" (NACC, 2004, p. 1). The NACC website (NACC, 2004) showed that, as of July 12, 2004, it had over 100 members from the province of B.C. By 2008, this number had increased to 128 (NACC, 2008). Some of the institutions offer health programs.

No information about the numbers of private institutions which are members in two other organizations, the Career Trainers Association of Canada (CTAC) and the Association of Service Programs for Employment and Training (ASPECT), was immediately available.

As noted earlier in this chapter, the public institutions in B.C. with newly acquired degree-granting authority were mentored by, and formally affiliated with, "senior" universities in time-limited collaborative relationships as they began to develop degree programs. It is noteworthy that no such quality measure is being applied to private institutions, or for that matter, the public colleges, which are offering degree programs independently for the first time.

Programs of Study

Although detailed information is limited, public and private institutions in B.C. can be compared, at least grossly, on the basis of length of programs. Both public and private institutions may offer a range of programs which include short programs of a few weeks or months, and longer programs, some requiring years of study. However, a meticulous review of the web sites on the list of PCTIA-accredited private institutions compared with the calendar and web sites of public institutions shows that, generally, the private institutions offer the types of health programs which are shorter than the types of health programs offered by the public institutions.

Public institutions typically offer a range of more lengthy programs which are considered to be among the core programs of the institution. These programs are typically offered year after year and are listed in the "regular" institutional calendar which has, historically, been published annually. This is changing with the advent of web sites as the official "calendar" of many institutions.

Most public institutions may also offer courses and programs of a continuing education/professional development nature, often through a separate Continuing Education department, and may have a separate calendar for continuing education offerings. These offerings tend to be of shorter duration, are more likely to be courses than programs, and, in many of the public institutions, are rapidly cancelled should there be insufficient enrollments. In limited cases, the same program may be offered as a regular program and as a Continuing Education program simultaneously in the same institution.

Typically, the smaller, independent, private institutions tend to offer a limited number of programs. Larger private institutions tend to offer programs in more than one discipline, such as programs of computer training, business training, or training for cosmetologists. It is well-known that public institutions generally offer a large number of programs within any one discipline, and have clusters of programs for many different disciplines.

Program Stability

In their regular daytime program offerings, public post-secondary education institutions generally establish programs that operate for many years. The costs and collective institutional effort associated with establishing a new program or closing and later reopening an existing program in a public

institution mean that there has been considerable commitment to any one program that is unlikely to change except in extreme circumstances. An institution offering health programs must make large commitments in terms of arranging the availability of suitable lab space and equipment, clinical placements, and, in many cases, individual program accreditation by an external licensing body. Of course, the Continuing Education departments of these same institutions are able to mount new programs much more quickly. However, externally-accredited health programs, such as those contemplated in this study, are not likely to be offered through Continuing Education departments, primarily due to the costs and challenges of accreditation as well as rivalries internal to colleges between base-funded program areas and Continuing Education departments.

Many of those private institutions which offer health programs appear to be well-established. They vary in size.

Government as a Contextual Element for Post-Secondary Education in B.C.

There is no doubt that the government of B.C. controls many elements related to post-secondary education offerings in the province. Some of the actions of government, and the systems it has put in place, are related to controlling the quality of education. Whether intended or not, some of the actions also influence the amount of interaction and integration between public and private institutions, and, thus, influences the possibilities for partnerships.

Sweet (1993), referring to post-secondary education in Canada in the 1990s, stated that, "government continues to shape the relationship between public and private education sectors" (p. 58). Sweet (1993) went as far as saying

that "to the extent government policies promote diversity among Canada's training institutions, a complementary role for the PVTS [Private Vocational Training Schools] and colleges likely will emerge" (p. 59). However, Sweet (1993) was concerned that the current model of complementarity between public and private institutions continues the "mental-menial division" (p. 59) of the labour force itself and impacts the status of private education.

Perspectives of B.C. Ministry

For this study, the perspectives about post-secondary education in B.C. of the Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development are critical. In past years, there was some evidence that the B.C. government saw public and private institutions as being quite separate in their work providing education programs. In 2004, the Ministry (2004d) referred to the public post-secondary system as "a collaborative effort between the Ministry and the province's [public] post-secondary institutions" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004d, p. 1). In the same document, the Ministry referred to a separate "private system" (p. 1) of post-secondary education. However, the Ministry did not provide any justification for the use of the term "system" or any explanation as to how private institutions were coordinated as one might expect of a system, albeit separate from a public one. The Ministry's (2004d) vision statement for 2004 that "all British Columbians have affordable access to the best possible, technologically advanced, integrated and accountable post-secondary education system" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004d, p. 1) did not provide clarity as to whether this is a reference to a combined system of public and private institutions.

By 2007, the report a comprehensive review of post-secondary education in B.C. commissioned by the B.C. government, made reference to a vision for "a collaborative, coordinated system of post-secondary institutions" (Plant, 2007, p. 46). However, it is difficult to understand, by reading some related statements in the report, whether private institutions were included or not. The report lacks precision in this regard. For example, at one point the author (Plant, 2007) states that, "Our goal for BC should be a range of different institutions serving different purposes working together to form an integrated and coherent system across a comprehensive learning landscape" (p. 64). It is not entirely clear whether the author is referring to a system which includes both public and private institutions.

Some of the clear recommendations of the author of *Campus 2020* (Plant, 2007) for inclusion of the private sector in a broader post-secondary system have not been implemented by the end of 2008. For example, Plant (2007) recommended that private degree-granting institutions and two representatives of the private training sector be included with the public degree-granting institutions in a new structure entitled the Higher Education Presidents' Council (p. 28). The Council was to have "the collective responsibility for delivering the system results required by government" (Plant, 2007, p. 26) from post-secondary education. In addition, the author (Plant, 2007) recommended that both public and private post-secondary institutions participate in another proposed new structure, the Regional Planning Councils.

In another recommendation, Plant (2007) states that BCcampus, which is "presently organized as a consortium of public institutions" (p. 47), should "become a source of information, resources and, where appropriate, services on

behalf of the private post-secondary sector as well" (p. 47). By the end of the year 2008, this had not taken place.

Another part of the provincial government, the B.C. Ministry of Health, also has a stake in the outcomes of activities in health programs at public and private institutions. For that Ministry, post-secondary education institutions are, ultimately, significant suppliers of employees. The B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development receives information about labour market needs in the health care sector from the B.C. Ministry of Health.

General Influence on Public Institutions

The B.C. government manages the provincial public post-secondary education system and stated that it "provides leadership and direction, establishes policy and accountability, and provides the majority of the funding" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004b, p. 1) for public post-secondary education institutions. Its control extends to establishing, changing the mandates of, changing the names of, providing annual budgets for, stating the expectations of, and closing, public institutions. The Ministry may advise public institutions of a labour market need for a new programs and provide funding in some way. The Ministry also requires that public institutions conduct regular program reviews and student and graduate follow-up activities as a quality assessment mechanism.

Of the variety of institutions for which the B.C. government was responsible, it had the least power in controlling the activities of universities, particularly the larger and most long-standing ones. Dennison (1995c) observed that, given the historical autonomy of universities, and because education is

provincial rather than federal, colleges have "tended to sustain a closer relationship with government than have universities" (p. 121). It remains to be seen how much influence the Ministry will have with regard to the colleges which have become degree-granting.

Although the ability of government to influence public institutions is, in principle, absolute, it is limited in reality despite the power it possesses by virtue of funding. A recent example is the matter of the applied degrees being offered by B.C. colleges. In 2004, the B.C. government gave the public community colleges the opportunity to offer applied degrees. At that time, the government indicated that, "The purpose of applied degrees is to prepare students for employment upon graduation and provide a way to respond to evolving industry driven career preparation needs as the demand for advanced knowledge and technical skills grows" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004b, p. 1). In its action in 2008 to establish new regional universities and other institutions, the Ministry also stated its intention to remove the ability to grant applied degrees from those community colleges which had established them (Plant, 2007, p. 73). However, system politics won the argument and community colleges continue to offer applied degrees.

General Influence on Private Institutions

The private institutions typically operate as the independent entities which they are. Although the government certainly has an interest in quality control, the B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development does not provide direction to the efforts of private institutions with regard to day-to-day activities, including which programs are offered or at what

site they are offered. Decisions of this type are left completely to the private institutions and the market forces which influence them.

The B.C. government has two mechanisms which directly relate to the quality of offerings by private institutions. These mechanisms are in the form of two entities, the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), and the Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB). DQAB reviews proposals for new degree programs, including those from private institutions. Both of these entities are described later in this chapter.

Aside from quality considerations regarding private institutions, Dennison and Schuetze (2004) contend that, by the nature of the mandate established for DQAB, the B.C. government has broken "the monopoly of public higher education" (p. 35). This is interpreted as a "move to the market" (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004, p. 35).

It appears that the Ministry does not attempt to significantly integrate the activities of the public system and the private institutions, although several organizations that government has put in place, the Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB), the British Columbia Commission on Admissions & Transfer (BCCAT) and the British Columbia Academic Health Council (BCAHC), have some role in this regard, as described briefly in Chapter One and later in this chapter.

The B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development does not document the activities of, or maintain records about, private post-secondary education institutions with the exception of the Native Education College, which receives some public funds.

Mechanisms of Influence

Aside from budgetary control of the public institutions, the provincial government has created several mechanisms which influence the activities of either public or private post-secondary institutions, or both. Some of these mechanisms result in integration of the activities of public and private institutions. The mechanisms are, more or less, at arms-length from government. Some of the mechanisms are designed to ensure greater quality in some form, including the quality of programs, and the quality of processes.

Other than with regard to the topic of transfer of credit, the Ministry has not made its expectations known regarding interactions and relationships, if any, between public and private post-secondary education institutions, such as partnerships.

Approval of New Non-Degree Programs

In 2003, the B.C. government revised the process that publicly funded institutions were expected to use when proposing new non-degree programs. At that point, the process did not apply to private institutions.

The process required that the public institutions place their proposals on a Ministry website which was accessible only by the Ministry and a single designate from each public post-secondary institution by password. Institutions had a 30-day window of opportunity in which to comment to each other about the merits, or otherwise, of the proposals. The focus of the proposals was intended to be needs assessment for new programs or for programs offered by more than one institution. Regardless of the feedback received about a particular proposal, the Ministry no longer approved public institutions to offer particular

non-degree programs as it has done in the past. If a public institution decided to offer a particular non-degree program, it could do so – even at its own peril. The Ministry could make comment to an institution about a new program but that would have been the extent of its involvement. The B.C. government continued to hold its public post-secondary institutions accountable for financial, enrollment, and graduation targets, and for the quality of programs and services to students through a number of evaluation mechanisms, including regular program review processes.

Being the first to reveal concrete plans to offer a particular program of study may be as important in establishing market share for public institutions as it is for private institutions. The intention was that the one individual at each public institution would share proposals as needed with departments within the institution which have the expertise to comment. However, the effect was a perceived and actual barrier to obtaining information, even inside and among public institutions.

Private institutions had no access to the proposals of the public institutions for non-degree programs. They were not required to prepare or share proposals for new non-degree programs with public institutions.

Approval of New Degree Programs (DQAB)

The B.C. government developed a process for authorizing new degree programs to be offered by public and private institutions (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004c). The degree approval process makes use of the government-appointed Degree Quality Assessment Board (DQAB) (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004a, p, 1), established under the Degree Authorization

Act which was introduced in the B.C. legislature on April 11, 2002 (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, 2008a, p. 7). Generally, public and private institutions wanting to offer a particular degree program, must receive approval from DQAB, followed by, in all cases, approval from the Minister of Advanced Education.

The process no longer required an act of the legislature for each private institution as was the case in the past, e.g., as for TWU when it became a degree-granting institution. Although the process always applied to public institutions, in January, 2005, the B.C. government announced that, under that Degree Authorization Act, "private post-secondary institutions may now apply for ministerial consent to offer and advertise degree programs, grant degrees, and use the word 'university' in the province" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005d p. 1), using the same process. All out-of-province institutions, either public or private, must also go through the process in order to grant degrees. This is a quality control mechanism for all institutions. There are serious consequences for institutions which do not continue to meet the standards once approval to grant a particular degree is given.

At the time it was originally established, the activities of the DQAB were monitored by the *Private Institutions and Developmental Programs Branch* of the (then) Ministry of Advanced Education, a Branch that was considered quite unusual when it was established. At that time, the Branch was "responsible for the regulatory framework governing private post-secondary institutions" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004f, p. 1). That Branch is no longer exists. DQAB now reports to the *Policy and System Quality Branch.*

Since the establishment of DQAB, 115 degree programs in 20 public institutions have been approved by the Minister of Advanced Education (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008j). In the same period, 37 degree programs in 14 private institutions, of which eight are from out-of-province (Appendix C), have gone through the process and subsequently received Ministerial consent (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008j). One request for a degree program from an out-of-province, private, not-for-profit, institution was denied. After Sprott-Shaw Community College, a private institution that was purchased in 2007 by a private international education group with a head office outside of Canada, was added to the list, degree-granting approval had been given to 11 out-of-province institutions, some public and some private.

Since 2004, the handful of private institutions located within the province which were granted consent to offer particular degrees were Trinity Western University, Sprott-Shaw Community College, Quest University Canada, University Canada West (LearningWise Inc.), Columbia College, and Alexander College (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008). Of these, only Trinity Western and Quest University Canada are not-for-profit. Several of these institutions, TWU and Columbia College, are of longstanding in the province.

Other private degree-granting institutions are newer. Quest University Canada, formerly Sea-to-Sky University, as named in the act of the legislature by which it was established in 2002, describes itself as a "private, secular, and not-for-profit university" (Quest University Canada, 2006, p. 1) focusing on "undergraduate liberal arts and sciences" (p. 1). Its founder is a former President of the publicly funded institution, the University of British Columbia.

University Canada West is another new private university. Unlike Quest University Canada, it is a for-profit institution offering Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Commerce undergraduate degree programs. It is interesting that its founder is a former President of the University of Victoria, also a publicly funded institution.

The DQAB process provides a modest opportunity for public and private institutions to learn about each other. There is a 30-day peer-public review period during which all proposals are posted on the Ministry website (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, 2008). The impact in terms of institutions learning about each other is limited, however. There is no notification process such that either public or private institutions would necessarily even be aware of degree submissions from other institutions.

As early as 2004, two DQAB members were from private institutions. This representation of private institutions on DQAB has continued.

In some respects, the application of the DQAB process to private institutions makes it easier for a private institution to offer degree programs than has historically been the case. This increases the competition between public and private institutions in this area. Dennison and Schuetze (2004) saw the move in B.C. as the action of a "pro-market" (p. 15) government interested in creating "a private higher education sector to complement and compete with the public sector" (p. 35).

Accreditation of Private Institutions (PCTIA)

Each province in Canada is responsible for establishing the standard and/or specific quality assurance mechanisms for the institutions it funds. In

B.C., there is no accreditation mechanism for public post-secondary institutions (BCCAT, 2004a). However, the government of British Columbia expects that public institutions will maintain and document the quality of their activities through self-initiated and self-managed program and institutional evaluation protocols as well as accountability reports to government.

The B.C. government has created a mechanism for assuring, to some extent, the accountability and quality of private post-secondary institutions. The mechanism currently in place is arms-length from government. It does not create any significant opportunities for integration of public and private institutions or interaction between them. In fact, it does not even require interaction between the private institutions themselves. However, the mechanism does provide some level of assurance of quality among private institutions which may legitimize private institutions as partners in the eyes of public institutions.

The mechanism is the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA). When the B.C. government established a *Private Institutions and Developmental Programs Branch* within the Ministry of Advanced Education (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004c) in 2004, it made the new Branch "responsible for the regulatory framework governing private post-secondary institutions" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004e, p.1) and for "a variety of private post-secondary education and training issues" (p. 1). To fulfill a portion of this mandate, the B.C. government established the self-regulating Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA) in 2004 to oversee private institutions in a nominal way (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005d) but with particular attention to the financial protection of the consumer (i.e., the students).

PCTIA replaced the Private Post-Secondary Education Commission of (PPSEC) of B.C., which was a government agency originally established in 1992 under the Private Post-Secondary Education Act (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005d) and which had similar, but not identical, functions. An immediately obvious difference between PPSEC and PCTIA is a reduced mandate for PCTIA, in terms of the number and type of institutions monitored. The PCTIA was responsible for registering and accrediting private post-secondary institutions, just as PPSEC was. Unlike PPSEC, however, only those institutions which offered "career-related training programs with at least 40 hours of instruction and at least $1,000 in tuition" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005c, p.1) must register with PCTIA. According to the B.C. government, a finding of a Core Services Review was that "the legislation for PPSEC was too broad when compared with other jurisdictions in Canada. The new legislation narrowed the scope of the registration requirement to include only those institutions offering career-related training beyond a cost and time threshold" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005c, page 1). Career training programs were defined as "those programs offering training leading toward an occupation listed in Human Resources Development Canada's National Occupation Classification with the exception of ministers of religion and other religious occupations" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005e). The specification of career training as being a criterion for registration is quite significant, in that it eliminated all schools offering English language training from the roster of regulation as they are not considered to be offering "career training."

Thus, according to the B.C. government, the new legislation reduced the "regulatory burden" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004a) on private institutions as a group by instantly reducing the number of institutions which must be regulated. On the other hand, the regulatory requirements for individual institutions which are required to belong to PCTIA were, for the most part, unchanged.

Another change from PPSEC is that, as a group of private institutions, PCTIA is to operate on a cost-recovery basis. Previously, the B.C. government provided PPSEC with an annual grant of $200,000. Despite the loss of government funding, and the statement that PCTIA is to be self-regulating, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development has a seat on the PCTIA Board.

There is one representative from the public system (from the then Kwantlen University College) on the PCTIA Board (PCTIA, 2009). Intentionally or otherwise, this provides modest exposure of public and private institutions to each other.

A feature of the PCTIA's responsibilities that did not exist with PPSEC is the Student Training Completion Fund (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2004a), which all institutions registered with PCTIA must contribute to. The Fund is intended to assist students in cases in which the private institution they are attending closes before they complete their program of studies (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005c, 2005e, p. 1).

There are two categories of regulation by PCTIA – registration and accreditation. All institutions offering the type of program defined above must register with PCTIA.

Institutions may voluntarily seek accreditation status (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2005a), based on specific criteria and detailed review processes defined by PCTIA. Significant fees are involved for the institution. However, there is a considerable financial incentive for private institutions to become accredited by the PCTIA. Only PCTIA-accredited institutions and private institutions which have complied with the requirements of the Degree Authorization Act are allowed to register students receiving funds under the British Columbia Student Aid B.C. program (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2009b).

The PCTIA is mandated to ensure that accredited private institutions meet an appropriate standard for many activities. The institutional accreditation process is based on an institutional self-study followed by review by PCTIA consultants. The PCTIA process does not provide accreditation of individual programs of study although the PCTIA system does pay attention to the programs that any given institution is offering.

On February 8, 2005, PCTIA listed 194 accredited institutions (PCTIA, 2005a), as defined by PCTIA. On June 24, 2008, the number of different institutions which met PCTIA's standards for accreditation was 185 (PCTIA, 2008) (Note: The number varies on a daily basis.).

There are several private universities in the province which are not required to register with PCTIA as they have separate legislation which covers their activities or they have received approval to operate a degree program. Examples are Trinity Western University and Quest University Canada.

In 2007, the B.C. government commissioned a comprehensive legislation review regarding private career training in the province. The review was

intended to include a review of the Private Career Training Institutions Act and the Degree Authorization Act. The report of the review of the Private Career Training Institutions Act was published in January 2008 (Watson, 2008) and provided recommendations about creating a more rigorous registration process for private institutions, improving quality assurance processes, providing greater protection for domestic and international students enrolling in private institutions, and reinforcing the governance functions of the PCTIA through amendments to its board appointment processes and overall representation. As of September 2008, none of these action items had been undertaken.

It appears that there is little interaction among private institutions as a result of PCTIA. In addition, PCTIA has almost no influence on interactions between public and private institutions. A limited amount of information about private institutions is available on the PCTIA website for public institutions to review if they wish to do so.

Provincial Affiliations for Transfer Credit (BCCAT)

The British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer, another arms-length government funded organization in B.C.'s post-secondary system scene, was created in 1989 in order "to formalize and to provide more consistency and staff resources to the function of coordinating transfer [of credit] in an increasingly differentiated system" (BCCAT, 2008a, p. 5). BCCAT helps to ensure that, as much as possible given differences in credentials and institutions, students taking courses at one institution receive credit at another institution they may chose to transfer to, i.e., that courses and programs *articulate*. BCCAT manages the B.C. transfer system.

At the time BCCAT was established, the public system was smaller. Prior to the emergence of BCCAT, transfer credit arrangements were being made informally among the variety of public institutions and some private institutions which existed at that time. The number of these types of arrangements is not known. BCCAT did not record these arrangements. In the early days, BCCAT was directed at transfer between degree programs.

However, BCCAT has had a significant role in integrating private institutions formally into the transfer system, albeit not quickly. In 1991, after years of informal transfer arrangements with B.C. universities, "Columbia College and Coquitlam College became the first private institutions to join formally the BC transfer system and are listed in the B.C. Transfer Guide" (BCCAT, 2008a, p. 4). In 1992, Trinity Western University formally entered the B.C. transfer system "as a private receiving institution and is listed in the B.C. Transfer Guide" (BCCAT, 2008a, p. 4). In 2001, "Corpus Christi College [became] the fourth private institution in the transfer system and is listed in the B.C. Transfer Guide" (BCCAT, 2008a, pp. 3, 4). Corpus Christi College is also accredited by PCTIA. At that time, and in the language of the day, these four private institutions were approved to participate in the BC transfer system as "full" members (BCCAT, 2007b).

In 2004, the Ministry made changes to the process whereby all degree programs would be approved. Subsequently, through a process outlined by BCCAT (BCCAT, 2008e, p. 3), private institutions offering degree programs with Ministerial consent were enabled to be members of the B.C. Transfer System and have approved transfer credit recorded formally by BCCAT in the *B.C. Transfer Guide* if each program had gone through the quality assessment review of the

Degree Quality Assessment Board. However, the majority of private institutions dif not offer degree programs.

By 2005, three additional private institutions, University Canada West, Sprott-Shaw Community College, and the ultimately ill-famed Lansbridge University, were given permission to enter into transfer credit agreements for the specific degree programs (BCCAT, 2008a, p. 2) for which they had been approved by DQAB.

By 2008, BCCAT's Institutional Contact Persons Committee (BCCAT, 2008d) had members from all public institutions and 10 private institutions. This is a relatively small number of private institutions given their total numbers in the province but, nevertheless, represents a significant involvement by private institutions. The BCCAT affiliation for articulation is limited to the particular degree program approved by DQAB, and does not extend to the other credentials that the institution might offer. With the other developments in the post-secondary system with regard to granting degrees, all public institutions are now automatically part of the B.C. transfer system managed by BCCAT (BCCAT, 2008d).

The private institutions which are now formally affiliated with BCCAT under the DQAB requirements for degree-granting, are designated as either institutional or program members (BCCAT, 2008e). Program members are those private institutions which are offering degree programs with Ministerial Consent and which request articulation on that basis. An example of a private institution with institutional membership is Trinity Western University which was originally established as a university through a private member's bill in the provincial legislature.

Both public and private institutions may establish transfer arrangements with public and private education institutions outside of the province, such as Athabasca University, a publicly funded distance education institution in Alberta. The number of these arrangements is not known and they are not recorded centrally by government or BCCAT.

Perhaps the most recent progressive development with regard to private institutions and transfer credit was a motion of BCCAT in December 2007. At that time, BCCAT agreed to develop a policy regarding "block transfer agreements with PCTIA-accredited private institutions" (BCCAT, 2007a, p. 1).

One of the mechanisms put in place by BCCAT to foster efficient transfer of credit between institutions was the provincial Articulation Committees. Articulation Committees were originally established so that representatives of public institutions offering similar programs could interact with others and compare their curricula to ensure that students were receiving a similar curriculum and could transfer between institutions offering programs of study leading to the same credential.

The 70 Articulation Committees in B.C. (BCCAT, 2008c) are arranged on a discipline basis. For example, there are Articulation Committees for each of nursing, practical nursing, and Home Support/Resident Care Attendant (more recently, entitled the Health Care Assistant), programs. Public institutions receive funding by the B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education to send one program representative to the annual meetings of each of the Articulation Committees.

According to BCCAT (2008e), "private institutions that are members of the B.C. Transfer System are required to send representatives to articulation

committees" (p. 4). Unlike public institutions, private institutions are not, however, funded to attend.

The intended mandate of Articulation Committees does not specifically preclude the involvement of private institutions which are not formally a part of the B.C. transfer system. BCCAT (2008e, p. 4) has left it to individual Articulation Committees to decide whether to invite private institutions. However, on the occasions when a private institution has sought to join established Articulation Committees for health programs, the public institutions have paused to consider the ramifications of the request, including the matter of inviting a "competitor" to a meeting at which a lot of information about curricula, and perhaps more importantly, the program plans of the public institutions and outcome data such as actual enrollment and graduate numbers are being shared, albeit in a somewhat informal manner. One approach to handling this by one or two Articulation Committees related to health programs has been to devote the first day of two days of meetings to general articulation issues and industry reports, but to bar private institutions from the second day when curriculum issues are dealt with.

Of the private institutions which offer health programs, few have had significant involvement in many Articulation Committees over the years. There are probably several reasons for this. One is that, over the years, few private institutions have been formally in the B.C. transfer system.

Another reason for the limited participation of private institutions, at least for health programs, could be the cost in terms of personnel time. Also, for the very small private institutions, there may be no one who can be released from instructional and other institutional duties in order to attend one day meetings.

Another reason may very well be that individual private institutions are simply not aware of the existence and purpose of the Articulation Committees.

Nevertheless, in the health programs area, some participation of private institutions on Articulation Committees has taken place. For example, Trinity Western University, which offers a single health program, a nursing baccalaureate degree program, has participated on the Nursing Articulation Committee for many years.

The Home Support/Resident Care Attendant (more recently entitled, the Health Care Assistant) program Articulation Committee has also had representatives from private institutions for many years. The one or two private institutions which have attended that Articulation Committee have made a modest attempt to keep the many other private institutions which offer Home Support/Resident Care Attendant programs informed about the activities and decisions of the Articulation Committee. There is confusion on this point. As late as 2006, a representative of BCCAT and a representative of the BCCCA, the umbrella group to which many private institutions belong, were invited to the Home Support/Resident Care Attendant program Articulation Committee to discuss the participation of private institutions at Articulation Committee meetings (BCCAT, 2008b, p. 14). At that meeting it was agreed that private institutions could attend the meetings on day one of the two day meetings when articulation issues are discussed (BCCAT, 2008b, p. 14). BCCCA was going to identify a member to do this.

The Articulation Committee for Practical Nursing had invited one private institution to attend as the representative of all the private institutions which

may have been offering practical nursing programs. As for other types of programs, the effectiveness of this approach has not been evaluated.

Over the years, the B.C. government had encouraged informal transfer credit between public and private institutions. As early as 1997, a document entitled, *Final Report of the Working Committee on Public-Private Articulation Agreements* (B.C. Ministry of Education, Skills & Training and Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Transfer, 1997) provided an approach that individual public institutions may find useful when contemplating informal articulation agreements with accredited private training institutions.

In addition, in the early 2000s, the former Open Learning Agency, an organization in the B.C. public post-secondary system, had developed another approach for institutions outside of the public post-secondary education sector to organize transfer credit for their learners and graduates. The *Credit Review Service*, which became available through the British Columbia Institute of Technology, offered the potential of national recognition and a national "bank", for transfer credit or courses and programs offered by the private educational institutions and by business and government organizations, following a detailed review by faculty in public post-secondary educational institutions. Modeled after the work of an organization which has very successfully managed a similar process in the United States, the Credit Review Service was to have operated from the substantial fees that various organizations would have had to pay to have their courses and programs reviewed, and the modest fees that learners would have had to pay to have their credits recorded in the "Credit Bank". Unfortunately, only a handful of private institutions joined the Credit Review Service and had their programs reviewed. Although understandable given the

costs of program review which are borne by the individual institution, it limits the usefulness of the concept.

Program Approval/Accreditation/Recognition (Licensing Bodies)

The health programs of public and private institutions from which graduates are required to be licensed to practice through a professional/regulatory organization must meet the requirements of any approval or accreditation mechanism which has been put in place by the respective professional/regulatory organization. In B.C., the professional/regulatory organizations have been put in place under the legislation of the Health Professions Act. As of August 2008, there were a total of 24 professions (B.C. Ministry of Health Services, 2008) regulated in this way "in the public interest" (B.C. Ministry of Health Services, 2005, p. 1) . For example, programs of study leading graduates to practice as a Registered Nurse or Nurse Practitioner must be approved by the College of Registered Nurses of British Columbia. In the same way, programs of study leading to practice as a Licensed Practical Nurse must be recognized by the College of Licensed Practical Nurses of British Columbia. Obtaining program approval/accreditation/recognition is very significant for the institutions offering the education program as a considerable effort and expenditure of resources is required.

Curriculum Development

A recent development regarding provincial curriculum is that the government has funded the development of a revised curriculum for the Home Support/Resident Care (Health Care Assistant) program through joint activities

of public and private institutions. Using the new curriculum is not mandatory but the common curriculum may be used by institutions in either sector for a small licensing fee. The licensing process is handled by the B.C. Ministry of Labor and Citizens' Services.

Issues Regarding Health Programs and Integrating Post-Secondary Education and Health Care Systems (BCAHC)

In B.C., there have been and have continued to be significant issues in offering educational programs to prepare or upgrade health care workers. These problems have stimulated interaction between the Ministries of Health and Advanced Education and public and private educational institutions.

One of the problems was the availability of appropriate clinical placements for students. For the last over 20 years, B.C. educational institutions requiring clinical placements for students in health programs have either approached health care organizations directly and/or, if located in the Lower Mainland, worked through the Interschool Committee of the Lower Mainland. "Interschool", an organization of health care agencies and educational institutions developed to address these needs in a cooperative manner and to arrange placements on behalf of the educational institutions, primarily the public institutions. A small fee per student funded the activities of an Interschool coordinator to arrange placements. There was always an attempt to continue the historic placement arrangements and placement preferences of particular schools.

However, the work of Interschool Committee had become ever more challenging over the last decade. In part, this was because of the increase in

student numbers in public educational institutions in response to the need for increasing numbers of new health care workers. Also, more private institutions began to offer health programs, in particular, programs preparing Licensed Practical Nurses. These kinds of programs required a somewhat more advanced level of clinical placement.

Another cause had been that the health care system in B.C., as elsewhere, had been remodeled with significant changes in the distribution of health care workers by category, location, number, and role. For example, Licensed Practical Nurses work in an increasing number of settings in the health care system. The types of clinical placements traditionally used for students in educational programs in the health sciences have become increasingly scarce as the health care system tries new strategies, including more out-patient surgical procedures.

Also, as private sector institutions increased the numbers of students in their health care programs, the pressure on the clinical placement system increased. Private institutions had not necessarily worked through Interschool.

Whereas public sector institutions had been told by government not to compensate health care organizations for clinical placements, representatives of those institutions had discussed rumors that private institutions had entered into agreements with particular health care institutions to "purchase" clinical placements. The public system reacted by requesting that public institutions receive first consideration for clinical placements so as to not waste the government funds given for public programs.

The implementation of a new computerized system for assigning clinical placements (HSPnet) in recent years crystallized the problems. As the process of assigning placements becomes, in essence, more automated, at least for the

Lower Mainland, representatives of public institutions were concerned about whether their institutions would be assigned to the clinical placements which historically had met their student's needs, i.e. whether preferred placements would be assigned based on historical precedent. More questions about the quality of existing clinical placements and whether the system simply might not have sufficient placements arose.

The B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors had also considered the issues on many occasions. The Committee included representatives, at the Dean/Director level, of all publicly funded educational institutions offering health programs, and one private not-for-profit university. The issue identified was that, in the process of health human resource planning and identifying the number of seats needed in, for example, practical nursing programs, only the anticipated numbers of graduates from publicly funded programs had been considered. The proliferation of programs with similar intent in private education institutions and the numbers of graduates from that source had not been taken into account in the provincial planning process. Thus, projections of student numbers, planning for specified numbers of seats, and projections of total graduate numbers in the province from these types of programs were inaccurate. This had huge implications for government planning to fund appropriate numbers of seats in programs, employers, private education institutions wanting to fill seats to make programs cost-effective or profitable, publicly funded institutions wanting to fill seats to meet government funding quotes, both public and private institutions making claims about employment opportunities for graduates, clinical agencies providing student placements, and, ultimately, for program graduates seeking employment.

To date, the most direct action has been taken by the relatively newly formed organization, the B.C. Academic Health Council (BCAHC). BCAHC has taken the initiative of bringing representatives of public and private education institutions together for a discussion of system issues, in this case clinical placements. As a result of this dialogue, BCAHC developed a set of principles to guide working relationships with regard to clinical placements. In a summary document (BCAHC, 2004), two principles which were particularly pertinent were outlined as follows:

> 94. Students enrolled in [all] health professional education programs in BC should have the benefit of educational practice placements of the quality necessary to meet the objectives of their program / course and to reach a high standard of practice.
> 95. Public and private educational institutions should have representation and be guided by the provincial health human resource planning process. (p. 29)

In this manner, the issues have been described in greater detail and articulated and are now in the public domain. Most importantly with regard to possible partnerships between public and private institutions, the potential partners have met and have achieved a positive, albeit modest, outcome.

BCAHC thus serves a role in integrating the health care system with the post-secondary education system, in addition to beginning to bring together public and private post-secondary institutions focusing on a matter of common interest to the parties.

Issues Involving Private Post-Secondary Institutions in B.C

There have been publicized cases of problems associated with private institutions in the province. Depending on the circumstances, the cases tend to

become public because they involve some form of harm to students who may not be aware of mechanisms to get help and may end up approaching the media. These cases become known to educators in both public and private institutions, and certainly become topics for discussion by public educators. Awareness of the problems may have resulted in suspicion of private institutions by publicly funded institutions which already see the private institutions as competitors.

One level of issue with private institutions is regarding the status of institutions which have been accredited with PCTIA. PCTIA publishes on their web site, the names of institutions for which accreditation is suspended, including the reasons for the suspension. The reasons vary, may be temporary in nature, and may have more or less impact on students. Sometimes the reason is because a component of an accreditation standard is not met. Or, an institution may be late in paying its mandatory contribution to the Student Completion Fund. Institutions may close their doors mid-year, causing great difficulty for its students.

Concerns about the quality of the work of graduates of private institutions may be less public. Graduates of an institution may find that employers or a licensing body are not satisfied with the knowledge and skills they possess upon exiting a program that they thought would get them a job. Employers have sometimes expressed concerns about the quality of health programs of private institutions to the administrators of health programs at Articulation Committees.

Over the years, there have been other scandals and other questions raised about both the quality of instruction and, to some extent, the ethics of the managers/owners of private institutions in B.C. Examples include criticism of Sprott-Shaw Community College, a longstanding PPSEC-accredited private

institution with multiple campuses in the province, by local media (MacLeod, 2003) for problems with certification of graduates of a computer and web design program.

The B.C. government document *Campus 2020: Thinking Ahead: The Report* (Plant, 2007) provided examples when it referred to two private institutions, Kingston College and Lansbridge University (p. 56), both of which ran into some well-publicized difficulties after being granted degree-granting authority. Lansbridge University "was ordered closed for violations of the Degree Authorization Act (Charbonneau, 2007, p. 32). According to Clift (2006), writing for the Confederation of University Faculty Associations of B.C. following those difficulties, members of the public post-secondary educational community were left wondering whether the system of checks and balances created by the B.C. government for private institutions was functioning properly.

The report of the review of private post-secondary education in B.C., commissioned in 2007 and published in January 2008 (Watson, 2008), cited two reasons that government had an interest in issues associated with private education. According to Watson (2008), the first is protection of students, and the second is the protection of the reputation of the "BC Education Brand" (p. 6) in the international arena. Watson (2008) made the link between the Brand and B.C. economic interests because "the sector represents a great economic opportunity for the province" (p. 4). The government seems to pay the most attention when the external credibility of the post-secondary system is threatened with the potential for economic loss.

Palmer (2008) intimated that the desire for economic growth was responsible for the B.C. government's ill-fated involvement in supporting the

application to DQAB of a proposed World Trade University which was to have created "a United Nations global education partnership" (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008, p. 4) which would have offered graduate degree programs from a B.C. base in the Fraser Valley. The Minister of Advanced Education announced this venture in a March 6, 2006, speech in response to the government's February 2006 Throne Speech (B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, 2008, p. 4). The Vancouver Sun reported that the government had been duped by the institution involved because the institution misrepresented itself (Palmer, 2008, p. A3). The initiative did not progress.

Private institutions are no doubt aware of these issues. The (then) President of Quest University, formerly Sea-to-Sky University, reported about the not-for-profit university that it had "the credentials and the reputation, so I don't think there will be any issue of us getting differentiated from the pack" (Ward, 2007, p. 1) . In this case, the "pack" seems to be the for-profit institutions.

Contextual Influences Experienced by Government

There is some evidence that despite all the influence government itself exerts as a contextual element in post-secondary education in B.C., government actions are also influenced by contextual factors, including those provided by the marketplace and globalization. Mount and Belanger (2001) indicated that "Clearly, government actions are affected by global trends" (p. 139).

As reported in Chapters Two and Three, globalization is both a common theme in the academic literatures of business and post-secondary education and a contextual variable in the practice of both disciplines.

The B.C. government's responses to some of the issues at private institutions, as described in the previous section of this chapter, are reflective of the impact of globalization and government acknowledgement of the importance of the credibility of its "goods" (post-secondary education programs and institutions) in the exchange of the international "education-market" (Galan, 2001, p. 11). The technologies associated with globalization clearly have an impact here – news about problems in B.C. travels quickly in a digital global world.

It is interesting to reflect on how many of the provincial government's recent decisions in regard to post-secondary education area seem to have been a direct reflection of the influence of the market and globalization. Examples include: the creation of an additional six publicly funded universities since 2005; the dissolution of the university colleges in favor of their re-creation as universities in less than two decades because there were indications that stakeholders in the international market, as well as local employers, allegedly could not understand what B.C.'s university colleges were (Annandale, 2008; Plant, 2007); the somewhat cursory re-evaluation of the PCTIA Act (Watson, 2008) in a six month period after only three years of implementation mainly in response to the need to maintain the credibility of the "BC Education Brand" (p. 6) internationally because of its economic value; and, the reconsideration of the need to regulate private institutions offering ESL programs after deregulating them only three years previous (Watson, 2008, p. 13) to assure governments in other countries that their nationals can rely on the quality of education offered in B.C. (Watson, 2008, p. 13).

Conclusions and Implications for Partnerships

This chapter provides evidence, from the limited information available on the subject, that public and private institutions in the post-secondary education context of B.C. are quite different with regard to many dimensions on which they can be compared. This chapter compared public and private institutions on the basis of availability of information about them, their accountabilities, types and numbers of institutions in each sector, numbers and types of programs, enrollments and FTEs, financial intent, funding sources, workforce arrangements, governance, institutional stability, internally- or externally-imposed shifts in mandates, and institutional affiliations.

Of all the dimensions, the area of greatest similarity is that of one category of programs offered by both public and private institutions, although not the public comprehensive universities: first year college-type certificate-level programs leading directly to jobs. This is significant in terms of the potential for being partners as the public and private institutions are clearly operating as competitors.

The mechanisms put in place by the B.C. government to manage the activities of post-secondary institutions, particularly the quality control mechanisms regarding degree-granting and transfer credit, result in increased interactions between public and private institutions, but the points of intersection are still quite limited. An increasing number of private institutions are becoming more engaged in the structures, however, as they seek new and/or expanded roles for themselves in the province, particularly as they seek to offer degree

programs. It is possible that some of the work being done will result in potential partners identifying each other as they interact within the system.

Between 2005 and 2008, only one new structure for managing post-secondary education that affects both public and private post-secondary institutions offering health programs has been put in place by government. This was the process for licensure of the distribution and use of a provincial curriculum for one health sciences program by the Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services. PCTIA, BCCAT, DQAB, and BCAHC all existed prior to 2005. There have been refinements in these structures over the years but the types of changes do not have a significant impact on this study.

Based on the numbers of institutions involved in various functions/committees on the BCCAT website, and the numbers of institutions which have applied to DQAB, it appears that private sector institutions are involved in greater numbers than in the past. Again, this does not seem to have a large impact on this study.

BCAHC, the organization in the province which brings together organizations associated with the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development, has probably developed the most in breadth of influence and creation of potential for interaction between public and private institutions in the last few years. Its structure allows public and private post-secondary institutions which are interested in offering health programs to interact directly in professional activities related to both the post-secondary and health care systems.

Summary

This chapter described the challenges of obtaining information about the operations of post-secondary education institutions in B.C., particularly private institutions. However, using information available from a variety of non-academic sources, the chapter compared B.C.'s public and private institutions on a number of parameters which may have implications for partnerships The parameters include types and numbers of institutions, enrollments and FTEs, financial intent, funding, workforce arrangements, governance, institutional and programmatic stability, mandates, institutional affiliations, and programs. Changes in recent years were identified.

The chapter examined the role of government as a contextual element influencing the activities of public and private institutions through a variety of mechanisms/structures created to manage the planning/approval of degree and non-degree programs, transfer of credit between institutions, and registration and accreditation of private institutions. The chapter also reviewed the work of professional licensing bodies, and interactions between the post-secondary institutions offering health programs and institutions in health care, for the purpose of health human resource planning. How the B.C. government has been influenced by globalization was also examined.

Finally, some issues involving private institutions were described.

The next chapter describes the research approach for the study including its participants, how they were contacted, what information was collected, the information gathering process, the limitations of the study, and the sources of bias inherent within it.

CHAPTER FIVE: RESEARCH APPROACH

Introduction

This chapter describes the research approach used in this study. The study had two phases and made use of two concepts, one adopted and one derived, from the academic literature of two disciplines, business and post-secondary education, respectively. These concepts provided direction for gathering and analyzing data.

In this chapter, the research question as outlined in Chapter One is reiterated. Then, the details of the research approach for the study are described and the approaches to data collection are documented, including the development and piloting of the instruments used, the selection of participants, and the procedures for collecting data. The process for analyzing data is then reported. The limitations of the design of the study and its implementation are also considered.

Research Question

The research question for this study is:

What framework can be developed that will enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary institutions in British Columbia?

Important underlying questions are:

What does the literature of business tell us about the features of partnerships?

What does the literature about post-secondary education tell us about the characteristics and context of public and private post-secondary institutions that are important in existing and/or possible partnerships?

What partnerships already exist?"
What are the nature and processes of the partnerships that have made them successful or were barriers to them?
What are the benefits of these types of partnerships?

Research Paradigm

In this study, an inductive approach in the interpretive/descriptive research paradigm (Merriam, 2002) was used, first drawing on concepts related to two disciplines and then progressing to the use of interviews to obtain the perspectives of stakeholders.

By virtue of its purpose, the development of a "framework", this study has a somewhat constructionist attitude (Palys, 2003). The goal of the study was to document "what is" and develop a framework for "what might be" (Palys, 2003, p. 77). This study provides an opportunity for me, and others in, or associated with, public and private post-secondary educational institutions in British Columbia (B.C.), to "dwell in possibility"(Dickinson, 1957, p. 289) for a time.

Phases of the Study

This study had two phases. The first phase had three components, two of which were primarily conceptual in nature, focused on the literature of partnership and post-secondary education. Phase One also included a description of the current realities which form the context of the study as described in Chapter One. The second phase of the study required interaction with a variety of educators in public and private post-secondary education in BC and administrators in three related stakeholder organizations.

Phase One

In the first component of Phase One, academic literature about the concept of partnership and its implementation as a strategy used in the discipline of business, was gathered and reviewed. Salient features of business partnerships were identified. Given the topic of the study, literature about public-private partnerships (P3s), a special case of business partnerships, was also reviewed. This literature review formed Chapter Two of this thesis.

The second component was to complete a critical review of selected literature of post-secondary education. A number of key distinctions between public and private institutions were identified. This literature review resulted in the emergence of the concept of boundaries. It became apparent that there are many boundaries that are important when considering partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions. This work formed Chapter Three of the thesis.

The third component of Phase One was to gather contextual information about post-secondary education in health programs in the province of B.C. The contextual information gathered consisted of a compilation of background academic, non-academic, and readily available public information, about the activities and characteristics of public and private post-secondary education institutions in B.C., closely related organizations, and government. Contextual information was collected from a number of sources, with primary sources being institutional and government web sites. The web sites of organizations such as the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), various umbrella organizations of public and private institutions in B.C. and Canada, the British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer (BCCAT), the British Columbia

Academic Health Council, several education and training industry organizations, and government, were also reviewed. The focus was on the role of government. This work contributed significantly to a greater understanding of the circumstances in which the study was situated. This work forms Chapter Four of this thesis.

The work associated with the three phases of Phase One resulted in a preliminary model for educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions offering health programs in B.C. Although the preliminary model was subsequently abandoned as it was too detailed and lacked practical elegance, it was a formative step in the study.

Phase Two

In the second and more interactive phase of the study, it was important to gather the perspectives of academic administrators in public and private post-secondary institutions offering health programs in B.C., and administrators in selected other stakeholder organizations, about existing educational partnerships. Open-ended individual interviews were selected as the best approach to achieve the research goal. Academic administrators in both public and private post-secondary educational institutions in B.C. which offer health programs, and representatives of associated organizations, including the provincial government, the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), and the British Columbia Career Colleges Association (BCCCA), were interviewed. The processes associated with the second phase of the study were also intended to allow verification of some of the contextual information which was collected in the first phase of the study.

Changes in the B.C. context of post-secondary education between 2005 and 2008, the period of time during which the study moved from planning to final write-up, were examined, with the implications for partnerships being described.

Information Gathered

To address the research question, information related to several categories or clusters needed to be collected during Phase Two, the interactive phase of the study. The clusters were:

Existing partnerships

Evolution of partnerships and processes in partnerships

Possibilities for partnerships

Government role

The respondent and the organization

These categories reflected a compromise between the need to gather information related to the features of partnerships as described in the literature of business and the desire to gather real-life information about actual and potential partnerships in B.C.'s post-secondary sector.

Following identification of the clusters, key questions related to each were developed. Initial, and rather lengthy, drafts of the questions were pared down to a more manageable number.

The relationship between the categories or clusters of information to be gathered and the interview questions is documented in Appendix F.

Information Gathering Process

Given the intended outcome of the study, interviews were chosen as the primary mechanism for gathering information from the stakeholders identified as being important in this study as key informants.

Interview Questions

Questions for Representatives of Public/Private Post-Secondary Institutions

The questions developed for use in interviews with public and private post-secondary education institutions are provided in Appendices G and H. A chart showing the clusters of information to be gathered and the related interview questions is provided in Appendix F.

Interviewees were asked for some demographic information, specifically, confirmation of their title in the organization, whether they have worked in the opposite sector from which they are now working in post-secondary education, the length of their employment in their current institution, and whether they have been involved in a partnership.

Interview questions were arranged by topic.

Questions for Other Stakeholders

After creating and discarding initial drafts, the interview questions developed for representatives of the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education (Appendix I), and representatives of the PCTIA and BCCCA (Appendix J),

became very similar to those used for interviewing participants from the post-secondary educational institutions. This was considered important because it allowed direct comparison of answers from the different perspectives represented by the interviewees.

Originally, separate interview questions were developed for each of the three different Branches of the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education. These were consolidated into one set of questions. This worked well as only one interview with Ministry personnel was conducted.

Study Participants

For the second phase of the study it was deemed important to obtain the perspectives of individuals in multiple stakeholder organizations. The organizations included both public and private post-secondary educational institutions and some related stakeholder organizations, including government and two umbrella organizations in the field of endeavour. The criteria and processes for the selection of the post-secondary educational institutions and other organizations to be contacted and the individual interviewees within them are described below. The goal was to include participants from these organizations by interviewing them about the features of partnerships and the existence and/or potential for educational partnerships between public and private educational institutions. The second phase of the study also included verification of some of the contextual information which was collected in the first phase of the study.

Criteria for Inclusion of Post-Secondary Institutions

Generally, the institutions from which participants were to be drawn for inclusion in this study were public post-secondary educational institutions and the PCTIA-accredited private institutions in B.C. which, on a regular basis offer at least one health program, as defined below for the purpose of this study. Within the group of institutions which met those requirements, there were some additional selection criteria applied in an attempt to achieve a balance of institutional characteristics. The criteria for inclusion and selection, and their application for this study, are described below in greater detail.

Institutional Accreditation

One criterion for the selection of post-secondary institutions from which participants for the study would be drawn was institutional accreditation. As described in Chapter Four, public and private post-secondary educational institutions in B.C. are handled differently in terms of institutional "accreditation" status.

By virtue of their government funding and the associated accountabilities to the public and government, and because the province does not have a specific mechanism for public post-secondary institutions comparable to that of the PCTIA for private institutions, they are not "accredited" per se. Public institutions have many accountabilities to government.

On this basis any of the public post-secondary institutions in B.C. which met the other criteria for the study could have been included.

It should be noted that the type of institutional accreditation described above does not infer accreditation of individual programs within the institution.

There are health programs within these institutions which require individual program-level accreditation, approval, or recognition, by arms-length licensing bodies appointed to regulate the respective professions represented.

In April 2005, at the time the study was being planned, there were 26 publicly funded post-secondary education institutions in B.C. Although many of these public sector institutions had multiple locations, an institution with multiple locations was considered to be one institution.

A decision was made that the first criterion for private institutions to be included in the study was possession, as of February 2005, of institutional accreditation with the PCTIA. This was used as a criterion because meeting accreditation requirements requires a considerable commitment of resources. This criterion was imposed with the belief that achieving PCTIA accreditation was a reflection of a larger commitment to offering programs on a regular and ongoing basis and providing quality programming. This rationale may be somewhat altruistic, given that PCTIA accreditation allows an institution to enrol students who are recipients of Student Aid B.C. funding, and thus possessing accreditation creates an important business opportunity for private institutions.

Two exceptions were made in the application of this criterion. The first exception was to not include the continuing education departments of publicly funded school boards, even though they had achieved PCTIA accreditation and offered one or more health programs which may have met the requirements of the study. It was decided that the private entities established by school boards would still be their financial responsibility ultimately and, therefore, were not "private" for the purposes of this study. In the same way, the Continuing

Education division of public post-secondary institutions were not included in this study.

The other exception was to include in the group of private post-secondary educational institutions which offered programs, one which was not accredited by the PCTIA. This was Trinity Western University. Due to its unique history and the private member's bill in the B.C. legislature which brought it into being, Trinity Western University didn't need to either be registered with, or granted accreditation from the PCTIA, in order to achieve the same status as PCTIA-accredited post-secondary educational institutions. For the purposes of this study, it was deemed to have met requirements similar to being accredited.

With regard to PCTIA-accredited institutions, the PCTIA publishes on its web site a regularly-updated list of those private institutions which have successfully completed the PCTIA accreditation review and are currently accredited. As of February 7, 2005, PCTIA listed 194 private institutions as being accredited. The elimination of school boards from consideration effectively reduced the number on the PCTIA list to 192.

The majority of the accredited institutions on the PCTIA list have only one site and one accreditation number assigned. However, one quirk of the PCTIA list should be noted. Institutional accreditation can be granted to more than one site within an institution. Consequently, on the PCTIA list of accredited institutions, there is neither a one-to-one relationship of accreditation with institution nor a one-to-one relationship of accreditation with sites of the same institution. Institutions listed may have multiple sites but may or may not have one accreditation number.

The number of sites per accreditation number may also vary. For example, on the February 8, 2005, list, CDI had seven sites but only one accreditation number; Sprott-Shaw Community College had 21 sites and one accreditation number. However, the Academy of Learning had 11 accreditation numbers assigned to a total of 24 sites. The number of Academy of Learning sites associated with each of the accreditation numbers varied from one to six.

For the purposes of establishing the list of private institutions accredited by the PCTIA for this study, any institution which had accreditation at more than one site was considered to be one institution. Also, any institution which had more than one accreditation number was considered to be one institution. This parallels the treatment of those public institutions which have multiple sites and are considered to be one institution for this study. In either sector, not all sites of one institution necessarily offer the health programs which meet the criteria for the study.

"Health" Programs

The range of health and health-related programs offered by both public and private post-secondary educational institutions at the time of the study was large and diverse. For this study, it was intended to seek participants only from those "accredited" public and private post-secondary educational institutions (as defined above, and including Trinity Western University) which offered "health" programs which met the criteria for the study. Therefore, it was important to identify which of the programs could be considered to be health programs and would, therefore, "qualify" a particular institution for inclusion in the study.

The range of programs at the public and private institutions which offer health programs which met the requirements of this study are listed in Appendices K and L.

It is useful to note that for daily operations, post-secondary institutions group their programs in different ways to satisfy program and institutional administrative requirements. In B.C., there is no absolute and/or universally-accepted classification which determines if a program in a post-secondary institution is a health program or not, although there is some convention, or at least a common understanding based on past practice by educators, about what programs are usually termed as health programs in the institutions.

For the purpose of this study, a health program was considered to be a program which provides learning opportunities to prepare individuals to work in the health care system, either at an entry level or for continuing knowledge and skill development. The range of health programs included "health science" programs, which have tended to refer to programs which prepare professional, licensed practitioners. The range of programs also included health support worker programs which have tended to refer to programs which prepare health care workers which support the work of other licensed practitioners and may or may not be required to be licensed themselves. Health programs were variable in length, ranging from a number of months to a number of years.

Generally, the health programs included in this study were "mainstream", and typically offered in some form by both public and private institutions. The length of a program was not a criterion for inclusion of an institution. If it had been, and the required length of program was more than one year, most private

institutions would have been excluded from the study as the programs they offer tend to be shorter than those of the public institutions.

It was decided that, if a public or private post-secondary educational institution had at least one program that was considered to be a health program, it would "qualify" as an institution from which to draw a participant. Any given institution might offer a number of programs, and there might be several programs in an institution that would qualify in this study as a health program, however, one would be sufficient for the institution to be included.

The process of identifying those programs which were considered to be mainstream used a combination of "screens." One screen was provided by the National Occupation Classification (NOC) 2006 of Human Resources and Social Development Canada (2007). This classification describes "the work performed by Canadians in the labour market" (HRSDC, 2007, p. 1). Although the study focused on programs of study in preparation for and/or to augment workforce participation, the NOC was found to be a useful classification to assist in determining which programs should be considered to be health programs. The NOC classification is used by PCTIA in its institutional reporting requirements.

In addition to the decisions which were validated by the NOC classification, it was decided that there were other types of programs that would need to be eliminated from consideration. One of these was the veterinary assistant program because it does not address the health care of humans. Less obvious is the rationale for the elimination of programs preparing workers for occupations in complementary and alternative medicine. The NOC classification lists these occupations as being in the health field. However, the researcher felt that the inclusion of programs which are not universally

considered to be mainstream might be a confusing influence in a study which involves the examination of the practices of private institutions, which are already marginalized in some respects. For example, if the study included a private institution which offers only a Traditional Chinese Medicine program, there might be confusion about whether a lack of partnerships is because of the type of institution or the type of program.

One additional classification of workers dedicated to fostering health in some way deserves comment here. The classification is that provided by the Health Professions Act of British Columbia. The Act was created with the goal of ensuring that all "health care" is delivered in a manner that the public can be assured is safe. Various groups of health care workers are under the jurisdiction of the Act and have been required to organize themselves in self-regulating groups, the professional regulatory bodies, which then forward their plans for self-regulation to the BC Ministry of Health for approval according to the statute. To date, several of the categories of health care workers which are considered to be practicing complementary and alternative medicine, and are excluded from this study, have formally become health professions in B.C. These include massage therapy, naturopathic medicine, Traditional Chinese Medicine and acupuncture. Again, the rationale for excluding programs of study leading to these occupations is to avoid distraction from the main purpose of the study.

"Regular" Programs

An additional criterion for inclusion in the study is that each institution must offer at least one of the designated health programs on a "regular" basis.

For this study, a program offered on a regular basis is one which has been offered at least once in the two year period starting January 2004.

Institutions Meeting the Criteria

After all the institutional inclusion criteria described were applied, there were 23 public and 21 PCTIA-accredited private post-secondary educational institutions from which to select interviewees at the time of the study in 2005. In addition, Trinity Western University was included on the list of private post-secondary institutions for the reasons described earlier, making a total of 22 private institutions at that time.

The lists of the public and private institutions which were eligible to be included in the study are provided in Appendices A and B. The lists of health programs which "qualify" the institutions to be in the study are provided in Appendices K and L.

Selection of Institutions with Programs Meeting Inclusion Criteria

Following the compilation of the lists of public and private post-secondary institutions which met the general criteria for being included in the study (being accredited and offering one or more health programs on a regular basis), the selection of institutions from among the groups took place. The goal for the study was to interview participants from 10 post-secondary educational institutions in each sector.

In this study, an attempt was made to apply additional non-exclusive criteria to the selection of the institutions. This was done in order to achieve a modest match of public and private institutions in some characteristics. Thus, the

number of private institutions included in the study was planned to balance the number of public institutions, both in total size and proportion.

Types of Institutions

Given the diversity of types of public institutions which offer health programs, and the shift in mandate of many publicly funded colleges toward offering applied degrees, an attempt was made to ensure that participants from one or more of each of the following types of publicly funded post-secondary education institutions which regularly offer health programs would be interviewed:

Comprehensive university (choice of SFU, UBC, UNBC, UVIC)
University college (choice of KUC, MUC, UCFV)
Provincial institute (choice of BCIT and JIBC)
College (choice of Camosun, Capilano, College of the Rockies, College of New Caledonia, Douglas, Langara, North Island, Northern Lights, Northwest, NVIT, Okanagan, Selkirk, Vancouver Community College)

As there was only one special interest university in the province as of April 1, 2005, Thompson Rivers University, and as it was in a state of change at that time, it was not included in the study. This reduced the total number of public institutions to 22.

Among the private institutions, there are no similar institutions to the public provincial institutes. A list similar to the list for public institutions was:

Comprehensive university (TWU)
University college (Sprott-Shaw Community College)
College (choice of Academy of Learning, BC College of Optics, Cambridge College of Technology, Canadian Family Resource Institute and Career College, Canadian Health Academy, CDI College of Business, Technology, & Health Care, Central College, Discovery Community College, Excel Career College, Gateway Careers, MTI Community College, Native Education Center, Omni

College, Pro-Soft Training Institute, ProCare Institute, Stenberg College, Thompson Career College, Trend College (Kelowna) Inc., Vancouver Career College, West Coast College of Health Care

All but two of the 22 private institutions were for-profit institutions. Trinity Western University and the Native Education Center were the two not-for-profit institutions. TWU is a denominational university and the Native Education Center is a Society.

Breadth of Institutional Mandate

Of the public institutions which offer health programs of the type which were included in this study, seven were considered to be either comprehensive universities (SFU, UBC, UVIC), provincial institutes (BCIT, JIBC, NVIT), or a special purpose university (TRU), all with provincial responsibilities. Although institutional boundaries or catchment areas are not, in practice, as definitive as they once were, the remaining institutions have mandates which tend to be more localized or regionalized (Camosun, Capilano, College of New Caledonia, College of the Rockies, Douglas, KUC, Langara, Malaspina University College, North Island, Northern Lights, Northwest Community, Okanagan, Selkirk, University College of the Fraser Valley, University of Northern BC, Vancouver Community College).

It is unlikely that many of the private institutions with health programs see themselves as having a provincial mandate or market share. Based on the number and location of sites, it appeared that the Academy of Learning, CDI, Sprott-Shaw Community College, and Trinity Western University, might be among the few that see themselves operating provincially or even regionally,

across several provinces. Some of the private institutions might see themselves as operating locally or within a region of the province. This is a business decision for any one private institution.

Locations of Institutions

It was decided that there was merit in attempting to include institutions from locations around the province of B.C., with participants from four broad regions: Lower Mainland, Vancouver Island, Okanagan/Interior, and the North.

The profile of public sector institutions from which participants were drawn has institutions from those four regions (See Table 1.). The profile of private sector institution from which participants were drawn includes institutions from three of the four regions (See Table 2). There was no private sector participant from the North in which some of the multicampus private institutions, for example the Academy of Learning and Sprott-Shaw Community College, have campuses.

Selection of Institutions

Public Institutions

Potential participants at 14 public institutions of the 22 which met the criteria were contacted between May and June, 2005 about participation in the study. Of those, participants for interviews were drawn from 12 of the institutions (Appendix M). The persons contacted at the other two institutions declined to participate.

Table 1 illustrates the distribution of the characteristics of the public institutions from which participants were drawn, including type of institution, breadth of mandate, type of programs, and location.

Table 1. Characteristics of Public Institutions from which Interviewees were Drawn

Institution Name	Institution Type	Mandate of Institution	Location	Degree Programs	Non-Degree Programs
Not named	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	Yes	Yes
BCIT	Institute	Provincial	Lower Mainland	Yes	Yes
Camosun	College	Regional	Vancouver Island	Yes	Yes
College of the Rockies	College	Regional	Okanagan/ Interior	No	Yes
Douglas	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	Yes	Yes
Kwantlen University College	University College	Regional	Lower Mainland	Yes	Yes
Malaspina University College	University College	Regional	Vancouver Island	Yes	Yes
North Island College	College	Regional	Vancouver Island	Yes	Yes
Northern Lights College	College	Regional	North	No	Yes
Selkirk	College	Regional	Okanagan/ Interior	Yes	Yes
University of British Columbia	Comprehensive University	Provincial	Lower Mainland	Yes	Yes
University of Northern British Columbia	Comprehensive University	Regional	North	Yes	Yes

The 12 publicly funded post-secondary educational institutions from which interviewees were drawn included the full range of types of publicly funded post-secondary education institutions in the province of British Columbia at the time of the study in 2005. This included one degree-granting provincial institute (BCIT), two comprehensive universities (UBC and UNBC), two university colleges at that time [the (then) Kwantlen University College and the (then) Malaspina University College], and seven community colleges. (As of 2008, both of the university colleges have become regional universities: Kwantlen University College is now Kwantlen Polytechnic University and Malaspina University College is now Vancouver Island University.)

Initial Selection of Private Institutions

Potential participants at 14 private institutions of the 22 which met the criteria (including Trinity Western University) were contacted between May and July, 2005 (Appendix N). Of those, participants for interviews were drawn from eight (8) of the institutions. The persons contacted at the other six (6) institutions declined to participate or could not be reached to complete the protocols required by the study. These were CDI College, Gateway Careers, MTI Community College, ProCare Institute Inc., Sprott-Shaw Community College, and Trinity Western University.

Table 2 illustrates the distribution of the institutional characteristics that were described earlier as being of interest about the participating private institutions. The characteristic of institutional mandate was not considered for the private institutions in the same way as for the public institutions. This was

because it was entirely a business decision by any given institution, not imposed by government as for the public institutions. The Academy of Learning may have said that it had a provincial mandate as it had locations around the province, however, it is a franchise operation so each site is owner operated. The other private institutions would have seen their self-assigned mandates as being regional or local.

Table 2. Characteristics of Private Institutions from which Interviewees were Drawn

Institution Name	Institution Type	Mandate of Institution	Location	Degree Programs	Non-Degree Programs
Academy of Learning	College	Provincial	Multi-site throughout the province	No	Yes
Canadian Health Care Academy	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	No	Yes
Discovery Community College	College	Regional	Vancouver Island	No	Yes
Omni College	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	No	Yes
Stenberg College	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	No	Yes
Thompson Career College	College	Regional	Okanagan/ Interior	No	Yes
Trend College	College	Regional	Okanagan/ Interior	No	Yes
Vancouver Career College	College	Regional	Lower Mainland	No	Yes

All of the private institutions from which interviewees were drawn were for-profit institutions.

None of the private institutions from which participants were drawn were degree-granting at the time of the interviews. This reflects the limited diversity of type of private institutions, at least in B.C., where there are few private universities in relation to the number of private colleges. In PCTIA's list of 194 accredited institutions as of February 2005, there were two that were degree-granting.

Summary

The distribution of locale of the public institutions is roughly comparable to the distribution of all publicly funded post-secondary institutions in the province which offer health programs.

The locations of the eight privately-funded institutions from which interviewees were drawn was similarly distributed. Discovery Community College was the only private institution on Vancouver Island which participated. There were two private institutions in the Interior of B.C. from which there were interviewees. There were no interviewees from private institutions with locations in the north. All other interviewees from private institutions were located in the southwest part of the province/Lower Mainland.

The distribution of post-secondary institutions between the Lower Mainland and rural/smaller communities in the groups of public and private institutions from which interviewees were drawn was similar. Among the eight private institutions which participated, five were in the Lower Mainland and three were in rural/smaller communities. Of the 12 public institutions from which there were interviewees, eight were in the Lower Mainland, and the remainder were in rural/smaller communities.

All of the private institutions from which interviewees were drawn were for-profit institutions.

Interviewees from Post-Secondary Institutions

At the outset of the study, it was believed to be important to interview individuals in both public and private institutions who have an understanding of both the academic and administrative issues associated with institutional planning, government roles, roles of organizations established by government, interacting with government and/or other institutions in the system, institutional accreditation, seeking the approval of external licensing bodies for health programs, and operating and evaluating programs of study. It was felt to be important that the individuals to be interviewed have an understanding of, and are likely to have wrestled with issues in managing programs, human resource issues including operating in a unionized environment, program accreditation processes, and budgets, etc. However, the determination of which types of institutional representatives which were interviewed was based, in large part, on their availability.

Interviewees from Public Institutions

It was believed that the individuals in public sector institutions who were most likely to have had these experiences were Deans or Directors of health program areas and Vice-Presidents Education/Academic. The actual interviewees in the public sector were primarily at the Dean and Vice-President levels in their institutions, with various titles including Dean, Vice-President

Education, Vice-President Academic & Provost, Senior Instructional Officer, and, in the case of UBC, Principal.

The individuals who held the title "Dean" had responsibilities for a single department, typically health programs or a combination of health and human service programs. The interviewees with other titles held positions which were responsible for many program areas and all of the Deans in their institution. The only deviation from that was the Principal at UBC who was responsible only for health programs. Appendix O provides a listing of interviewees and their titles.

The average length of employment of the interviewees at the public institutions was 14.6 years. Seven of the 12 interviewees had been employed at the institution longer than 10 years. The range of length of employment at the institution was 1 year (10 months) to 39 years.

Eleven of the twelve public sector interviewees reported that they had not worked in the other sector in post-secondary education.

Interviewees from Private Institutions

As the study was being planned, it was believed that the individuals most likely to meet the criteria for interview at private institutions would be Directors, Vice-Presidents, Presidents, or Chief Executive Officers, depending on the size and structure of the organization.

Finding the appropriate representatives of the private institutions was more challenging as there was no easily-accessible or comprehensive listing of the institutions with this type of information. The web sites of the private institutions did not generally name individual administrators. Consequently, it

was necessary to contact the institutions to obtain the name and title of one or more administrators.

The interviewees in the private sector were in positions with more diverse titles than those in their public counterpart institutions which all tended to have similar structures. Titles included President (2), Executive Director (2), Director (4), School Administrator, (1), and Program Coordinator (1) (Appendix O). The person with the title of Program Coordinator was substituting for the owner. In contrast to the public sector, none of the private sector interviewees held a position entitled Dean.

Although the question was not asked explicitly as part of the interview process, information provided by participants during the interviews indicated that six of the eleven interviewees in the private sector institutions were the owners/operators of the institution or of one of the branches (locations) of the institution. (In one of these cases, someone else represented the owner for the purposes of the interview). This is a significant difference from how public sector institutions are organized.

In contrast to the lengthy service periods of interviewees in public sector institutions, in the private sector institutions, the average length of employment of the 10 interviewees who were asked the question was 6.3 years. Just two of the interviewees had worked in their institution more than 10 years. The range of length of employment among the 10 private sector interviewees was 1 year (6 months) to 15 years.

There appeared to be some confusion among private sector interviewees regarding the question about whether they had worked in the public sector. Only

three of the eight interviewees who answered the question affirmatively then went on to give examples that matched the question.

All interviewees in private post-secondary educational institutions indicated that their institutions were for-profit, or were intended to be for-profit! This contextual factor is a fundamental difference between the sectors.

Selection of Individual Participants

The plan for the study was that the participants from post-secondary educational institutions were to be drawn from the ranks of academic administrators, generally at the levels of Dean/Director and Vice-President, Education/Academic, in both publicly funded and PCTIA-accredited private post-secondary educational institutions which offer health programs in B.C.

As noted earlier, it was essential to involve academic administrators at the Dean and Vice-President Academic/Education levels in public post-secondary education institutions and individuals at similar levels in the private institutions in this study. The criteria for identifying which institutions "qualify" as the group for inclusion in this study are described below.

Two representatives of each of two of the private institutions were interviewed. Specifically, two representatives of the Academy of Learning (AoL), were interviewed separately on different dates. One of the AoL representatives interviewed was a branch owner, the other was an owner of a different branch and the President of the Canadian Office. The President of the Canadian Office of AoL was interviewed simultaneously with a representative of the British Columbia Career Colleges Association (BCCCA) at their mutual request. They

felt they had a good understanding of the issues the other was experiencing related to the topic and that there would be benefit from this arrangement. In addition, two representatives of Discovery Community College were interviewed simultaneously at their request as they felt this was a comprehensive way to answer the questions on behalf of their institution.

Interviewees from Related Stakeholder Organizations

The plan for the study included obtaining the perspectives of individuals in a limited number of other stakeholder organizations which were not educational institutions. The organizations included the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, the Private Career Training Institutions Agency, and the British Columbia Career Colleges Association (Appendix P). It was deemed to be beyond the scope of this study, and the resources of the researcher, to obtain the perspectives of individuals in a large number of other stakeholder groups, for example, students, graduates, employers of students and graduates, and other organizations.

Participants in Government

With regard to the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education, the intention for the study was that interviewees would include current/Acting Directors of the three Branches of the Ministry which were in existence at the time, the Private Institutions and Developmental Programs Branch, the Universities and Research Branch, and the Post-Secondary and Industry Training Branch. Each of the three branches had responsibilities of relevance to this study as described below.

Among its many duties at the time, the Private Institutions and Developmental Programs Branch was responsible for the regulation of private post-secondary education institutions, worked directly with the PCTIA, and managed issues related to private post-secondary education institutions. In addition, this Branch managed the degree quality assessment process. The Universities and Research Branch was responsible for the five public universities, and looked after health programs in the public post-secondary education institutions. The range of programs assigned to this Branch included nursing and allied health. The Branch was also responsible for BCCAT. The Post Secondary and Industry Training Branch was responsible for the public university colleges, colleges, the province's one publicly funded provincial institute, and the province's two publicly funded aboriginal institutes. This branch was also responsible for the new mandate of the colleges for applied degrees.

Using the process planned for the study, initial contact with individuals at all three of the Branches of the Ministry was made by letter. Follow-up phone calls resulted in an agreement between the Branches that there would be one interviewee representing all.

PCTIA Participant

It was also felt to be important to involve one or more participants directly associated with the PCTIA organization. Potential participants included the PCTIA Registrar, who for many years previous, was the Executive Director of the predecessor organization, PPSEC, and thus could provide perspectives about, and a comparison of, the contexts, mandates and activities of PCTIA and PPSEC. The PCTIA Registrar was interviewed.

BCCCA Participant

An interview with a participant from the BCCCA was seen as a way to obtain comprehensive information. This had limitations as not all private institutions belong to the BCCCA.

Contacting Participants

The research protocols required by the University of British Columbia's Behavioral Research Ethics Board (BREB) (Appendix Q) were implemented for this study.

Contacting Human Subjects

The first contact with prospective interviewees was made through a Letter of Initial Contact (Appendix R) which described the study in detail, described the role and anticipated time required of the participant, and invited participation.

Obtaining Consents and Distributing Interview Questions

Once it was established, through a phone call following-up on the Letter of Initial Contact, that the individual was interested in participating in the study. a Letter of Consent (Appendix S) for audiotaping the interviews, and the interview questions, were provided to each category of prospective participant in advance of the interview. Interviews were recorded only with the written consent of the participant.

Pilot Testing

The interview protocol and interview questions were pilot tested with two prospective participants. The pilot testing process "mimicked" the entire participant contact and interview process with two exceptions. One exception was that the first contact included a phone call to the individuals asking them specifically to participate in the pilot. The other exception was that the pilot interviews contained additional questions about the process itself (See Appendix T).

The pilot process demonstrated that the protocol and interview questions were effective but stimulated some improvements in the flow of the interview questions. After discussion with the UBC thesis Committee, probing questions in the form of subquestions for key questions 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were built into the interviews (Appendix U). In addition, the word "problems" in key question #11 was changed to "issues" (Appendix U).

The Interviews

It was the intention that at least 70% of all interviews would be held on-site at the institutional offices of individual participants with the remainder taking place over the phone. This target was met.

Acquiring Documents from Interviewees

During the interviews, the interviewees were asked if they could provide any documentation about partnerships they had been in or had contemplated, or if they had any other information or protocols about administrative processes related to partnerships. Responses indicated that few such documents were

available. Some that were promised were not forthcoming despite reminders by the researcher.

Analysis of Information

A number of approaches to analysis of information from the interviews conducted for this study were used and are described below. These included assessing the quality of interview processes and questions, a comparison of the answers to questions from interviewees in the public and private sectors, and an assessment of themes and general impressions evident in answers to questions. In addition, an analysis of answers to interview questions against the features and ways of thinking about partnerships and post-secondary education described in the academic literature of business and the academic literature of post-secondary education, as well as information about the context of post-secondary education in B.C., was completed. The responses of interviewees to clusters of related questions (Appendix F) were considered.

The responses of interviewees were also used to consider the boundaries in post-secondary education which were identified in Chapter Three as being significant in partnerships between public and private post-secondary educational institutions.

Assurance of Confidentiality and Accuracy

The mechanisms for assurance of confidentiality and accuracy of information gathered through interviews were described to prospective interviewees in the letters inviting their participation in the study (Appendix R) and obtaining their consent (Appendix S).

The two transcriptionists who assisted with the transcription of taped interviews for this study signed a confidentiality agreement (Appendix V) that they would treat all information as confidential.

All interviewees were given the opportunity to review the transcript of their interview and make changes. This was intended to avoid "measurement error" which Singleton and Straits (2001) described as "inaccuracies in what respondents report" (p. 60).

Access to Findings by Interviewees

Once accepted by UBC, the dissertation will be available to the public through the UBC Library. Once completed in its entirety, it is intended that a copy of the summary, conclusion, and recommendations will be sent to each participant. Participants will also be advised of the location of the dissertation at the UBC library.

Validity

External Validity

In a qualitative study such as this one, the concept of generalizability may be thought of as translatability and is about "the 'fit' between the situation studied and others to which one might be interested in applying the concepts and conclusions" (Schofield, 2007, p. 199). This conception of external validity relies on rich, or detailed, and otherwise "thick" (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001; Schofield, 2007, p. 188) descriptions and "enough descriptions to contextualize the study" (Merriam, 2002, p. 31).

In this study, interviewees provided detailed accounts of their existing partnerships and closely related experiences such that allowed the construction narrative "vignettes" describing those experiences (Chapter Six). The chapter about the findings from the study provides many direct quotes from the interviewees which reflected their perspective in their own words. This, combined with the detailed and broadly based contextual information about the B.C. post-secondary system, would allow another researcher to understand the experience of the interviewees vicariously (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 122) to some extent, and to determine whether there is a match with their own setting.

Internal Validity

For this type of study, internal validity is defined as the "match between the intent of the study and what was actually studied" (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 122) or the congruence of the findings and reality (Merriam, 2002, p. 25). The replies of interviewees in this study about the existence, or not, of partnerships, can reasonably be relied on as a fairly accurate portrayal. Clearly, the interviewees were in the best positions in their respective organizations to have this information. They were articulate key informants. The unexpected occurrence of having collected information from two "pairs" of interviewees across the sectors who had interacted with each other as potential partners, and who described their interactions with each other and were consistent in what they said about the experiences, lends extra "trustworthiness" (Guba & Lincoln, 2004, p. 32; Merriam, 2002) to the data collected. (This could be considered as a limited example of triangulation, although not planned.) More broadly, there

were commonalities and consistencies in the descriptions provided by all the interviewees about potential partnerships and approaches for partnerships.

As the researcher, I had identified how the study had evolved from my circumstances as an educator/administrator in a public post-secondary institution. I came to the planning of the study and the eventual analysis of data gathered with that perspective and a limited awareness of the realities of private post-secondary education. My previous exposure to private post-secondary education was limited although I had heard various unsubstantiated information about quality issues at private institutions.

Due to the limited number of existing partnerships, the study turned, as data was reviewed, from its original intent to use data collected about existing partnerships to develop a framework for partnerships, to examining the barriers to partnerships based on the proposals for partnerships which did not proceed, and using that analysis to develop a framework. However, the key informants provided information which was appropriate to the task and they were credible in describing partnership experiences. There was lots of detail collected (Chapter Six) and considerable depth to the analysis (Chapter Seven) (McMillan & Wergin, 2002).

Reliability

For this study, reliability was understood to be "whether the results are consistent with the data collected" (Merriam , 2002, p. 27) and that "given the data collected, the results make sense" (p. 27). Guba and Lincoln (2004) and Merriam (2002) refer to this as the "dependability" (Guba and Lincoln, 2004, p. 32; Merriam, 2002, p. 21) of the results.

A detailed description of data collection and analysis has been provided for this study. It provides an audit trail which documents how the study progressed.

In this study, the main finding about the number and nature of existing partnerships which met the criteria for the study rests for its dependability on the audiotaping of interviews. Also, having interviewees review transcripts of the interviews ensured accuracy of data collected, another contribution to reliability (McMillan & Wergin, 2002, p. 122)

Limitations

There were a number of limitations associated with this study. These included:

- The limited academic literature about the Canadian post-secondary system and, particularly, private post-secondary institutions, and the very limited literature comparing Canadian post-secondary education with that in any other jurisdiction. The lack of literature limited the foundation to work from to understand the context, plan the study, and analyze information from key informants. However, I prepared a detailed review of the context of B.C. post-secondary education in which the interviewees were operating.
- The limitation of my understanding, as the researcher, of some of the comments of private sector interviewees, as I had not worked in the private sector of post-secondary education.
- The impact of a perception of the interviewees, and particularly the private sector interviewees, that I represented the public sector in some way. None of the private sector interviewees asked me about my background, but it would be

logical for them to think that I was employed in the public sector and was working from that perspective. It was not possible to determine the impact this may have had on their responses to questions. It may have influenced their ability to trust me with their answers to questions.

- The general limitations of a methodology based primarily on interviews. I was reliant on the memories of the interviewees about events and their perceptions about their partnership experiences, their interpretation of the interview questions, and their use of language to describe the pertinent events and circumstances. A mitigating factor was that the interview questions were available to interviewees in advance. Some of the interviewees told me that they had looked at the questions before their interview. This may have added to their ability to recall instances of partnerships. Also, interviewees had the opportunity to ask me questions.

The interviewees were from workplaces which required them to have well-developed verbal skills and the ability to articulate thoughts. However, there was also potential for me to misinterpret the meaning of what interviewees said. However, as I transcribed most of the interviews myself, there was an opportunity for me to hear the responses of the interviewees a number of times. This provided an additional opportunity to understand what the interviewees meant as I heard their voice inflections several times.

The information received from interviewees indicated that many were well-prepared to be key informants, with the majority, and particularly the public sector interviewees, having worked in their respective institutions for many years. This study did not provide for triangulation of data using other data sources.

- The limited number and distribution of institutions from which interviewees were drawn. The goal for the study was to interview participants from 10 institutions in both the public and private sectors, for a total of 20 institutions. In fact, participants from 20 institutions were interviewed, but the distribution was 12 from the public sector and eight from the private sector, although 14 institutions from each sector were approached. However, given the limited diversity of type of private institutions and the limited type of programs in the private institutions described earlier in this chapter, the reduced number may not have a significant impact in terms of outcomes.
- The mismatch in numbers of interviewees drawn from public and private institutions, with 12 from the public sector and eight from the private sector. There could be a perception that the public sector was given a greater voice. A counter-argument could be that, proportionately, the private sector was less likely to participate. From the 14 private institutions approached, eight interviews resulted. From the 14 public institutions approached, 12 interviews resulted. Another counter-argument could be that, as the public sector has a greater diversity of types of institutions, drawing participants from a slightly higher number of institutions was acceptable. The methodology for the study called for "purposive sampling" (Palys, 2003, p. 142), not the rigorous probability-based sampling methods required for a positivist study. The mix of institutions represented was acceptable.
- The lack of interviewees from the not-for-profit component of the private sector. All private sector interviewees worked at for-profit institutions. However, the majority of private institutions in B.C. are for-profit.

- The lack of interviewees from private universities. Unfortunately, there was only one private university on the list of private institutions which met the criteria for the study and there were no participants from that university.
- The private institution representatives who had agreed to be interviewees but did not make themselves available to complete the protocols required and were, therefore, not included in the study. Nevertheless, there were a sufficient number of key informants for the study. As there were a large number of reasons why an institution might not have agreed to participate in the study, it was difficult to compensate for all of them in advance. I could not control many of the variables which may have lead to a decision not to participate. I could only enquire as to whether there was anything that might be done to support the institution' s representative to participate or to remove roadblocks, such as timeframe, for that participation. The plan for selection of alternate institutions and/or interviewees was described earlier. In the end, this was not a significant problem in the study.
- The mix of interview modalities (phone and in-person), due to the limitations of my time and travel funds, rather than the use of one modality consistently. I made a commitment that a minimum of 70% of the interviews would be held in person. This goal was precisely met.
- That face-to-face interviews are less anonymous for the interviewee. This had the potential to result in less candor in responding to interview questions (Palys, 2003).
- That the act of tape-recording face-to-face interviews had the potential to result in less candor in responding to interview questions as interviewees recognize that their responses are "on-the-record" permanently. Although it is not always possible to determine by observation whether interviewees were

speaking freely, this was a particularly articulate group of interviewees who were accustomed to being thoughtful, and providing opinions and a rationale for their position on topics related to their work.

- A potential for interviewees in either public or private institutions not to answer some questions openly or completely, due to proprietary considerations related to their institutional activities, which are not explicitly expressed by the interviewees to the interviewer. As the researcher, I may not have been aware of any instances of this.
- The potential that participants from private sector institutions may have looked at this study through different lenses, including with concerns about how ideas may be used, or that the smaller institutions would be overpowered by a larger publicly funded partner. Consequently, they may simply have been less willing to share information. All of this may have contributed to the unequal, although not unacceptable, participation from the two types of institutions.
- That there were so few reports from interviewees of partnerships which met the criteria for this study, interviewees tended to answer the questions about aspects of partnerships hypothetically ("If my organization had a partnership with a post-secondary educational institution in the other sector ..."), and may have made some suppositions and guesses. With the lack of experience in intersectoral partnerships, it is entirely possible that some of the interviewees were, in their answers, perpetuating some stereotypes about institutions in the other sector.
- Although this study focused on partnerships with regard to health programs within the groups of institutions, there may have been significant partnerships

between public and private sector institutions in other program areas. The responses to interview questions indicated that this could be the case.

Sources of Bias

As I had been employed for the majority of my working life to date in public post-secondary institutions, with only a short work experience in a not-for-profit private institution as this study was being concluded, my own perspectives may have been biased without my being aware of it.

The fact that I had worked for many years in the public post-secondary system in B.C., and had interacted with many of the prospective interviewees in the public system as colleagues, may have contributed to the larger number of participants from public sector institutions. On the other hand, there was anecdotal evidence that at least four participants had either no knowledge, or no recollection, of who I was.

I had previously had direct contact with only one of the interviewees in the private sector. However, my name was probably known to at least two or three of the prospective interviewees who were approached about the study.

Another potential source of bias existed. During face-to-face interviews, interviewees had the opportunity to observe the interviewer's responses to the answers being given. A "reactive bias" (Palys, 2003, p. 160), in which interviewees respond to questions based on their perception of whether the interviewer thinks they are answering questions correctly or in line with what the interviewer wants, may have taken place.

I anticipated that most respondents in the public sector would respond positively to my request for an interview. I was less certain that potential respondents in the private sector would respond positively.

The reason that I felt this might be the case was that, having worked in the public sector directly with, and at the same level of, most of the representatives of the public sector, I suspected that they would want to cooperate if for no other reason than to assist a former colleague. This was source of bias in my being the interviewer. Singleton and Straights (2001) point out that, at least in survey interviewing, when potential interviewees are making a decision as to whether to allow themselves to be interviewed, "the interaction between interviewer and respondent appears to play a large part in the decision to cooperate or refuse" (p. 68).

There may have been a perception by the proposed and actual participants of a bias by the interviewer in favor of public institutions. There were at least two sources for a perception of bias of this type. One was the language used in the interactions. The researcher understood that subtleties in language can reflect the bias of the interviewer or the perceptions of the interviewee about the interviewer. To mitigate this as much as possible, the pilot testing process addressed this issue by asking the two interviewees if they had noted any bias in the language used. Also, the same questions were asked of participants in both public and private institutions so that, at least, the language used in the interviews was consistent. The other potential source of perception of bias was that some interviewees may have been aware that my work experience had been in public sector institutions and some not. I also had a concern about interviewees at private institutions learning, after their interview, that my work

experience had been primarily in the public sector, and then discounting the findings of the study in their own minds.

Summary

This chapter documented the research approach for the study. The research question was identified and the two phases of the study were described. The information gathering processes and the information to be gathered were specified in detail, including the selection of institutions and interviewees from those institutions, as well as interview questions and background information to be obtained. Detailed procedures for contacting and interacting with human subjects and assuring the confidentiality and accuracy of information gathered were outlined. Perspectives on the validity and reliability of the study were provided. The limitations of the study and the sources of bias inherent in the study were discussed.

The next chapter describes the findings of the study.

CHAPTER SIX: FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter summarizes and makes observations about the information provided by interviewees.

The chapter begins with an analysis of the context of the study as described by the interviewees themselves. The analysis of context focuses particularly on the educational philosophies and attitudes of the interviewees and the role of government.

Context Considerations

Business partnerships take place in a context which may or may not contribute positively to their establishment and continuation. Any discussion of the potential for educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary educational institutions must include a consideration of context. Chapter Three described the general context of private post-secondary education. Chapter Four described some of the specific contextual elements regarding post-secondary education to prepare health care workers in B.C. However, responses to interview questions during the study provided much richer insights into the views of interviewees about some contextual elements. These insights were found threaded throughout the responses to various questions in the interviews and form an important finding of the study.

In the next section, these perspectives of interviewees about selected contextual elements are described. The contextual elements addressed are categorized as the philosophy of post-secondary education presented by the

interviewees linked with the attitudes of interviewees in post-secondary educational institutions in the public and private sector about each other, and the perspectives of several categories of interviewees about the role of government.

Philosophies and Attitudes About Post-Secondary Education as Contextual Elements

The personal philosophies about post-secondary education and the attitudes of educators are part of the context for post-secondary education. The interviews for this study did not contain any direct questions about either the philosophies or attitudes of public and private post-secondary educators in B.C. However, as many interviewees made remarks which reflected these contextual elements, it seemed important to report them. The remarks made by interviewees provided perspectives about how public and private educators view the work of educators in the other sector.

Philosophies and Attitudes of Private Sector Interviewees

Generally, the interviewees from private institutions differentiated between the management of their business in post-secondary education and their management of students in the learning process. For example, one private sector interviewee emphasized, when explaining the work of private post-secondary education institutions, that "we're not talking about philosophies of corporate ownership but the welfare of the individual student", i.e., that the first consideration is the interests of the student. This interviewee emphasized that, whatever the politics of public and private institutions might be, it is important

to be certain that the system is not "discriminating against a student for their choice of educator."

On the other hand, the financial health of the private institution is a very real concern. All of the interviewees at private institutions indicated that their institutions were intended to be for-profit, although some interviewees indicated that they did not necessarily produce an annual profit.

Along the same lines, another interviewee from a private institution provided a general history of private education from the following perspective:

> The first pioneers of private education were educators and not business people, and so as businesses they failed because they had every intention of providing education in a more flexible format or in the areas that public education didn't deal with. But they failed because they weren't a business. They weren't business savvy. That group, if you will, have [sic] almost been – that generation of private educators has almost entirely been swept away now. Then, in sort of the middle ages of private education, there came along a number of people from the American model of private education and they were not educators. They were strictly in it for the money. And they succeeded financially but failed academically. Now we're in the third generation, if you will, of private educators, and you're dealing now with business savvy companies. And I very much believe that we are a leader in this philosophy – business savvy companies that understand that the education is the most important aspect of our business – quality education – and results-based education – and that those results are measurable, and that if you demonstrate that you are having success with educational delivery through employment rates, etc., then it's just going to complete the circle of bringing more students to you, etc., etc., and you don't have to do hard sell – you don't have to be so aggressive in the marketplace and aggressive with directing people to enroll and things like that, things that came out of that business-oriented American model.

The interviewee summarized his statement about private education by saying, "Our business happens to be education, but we have to take education very, very seriously." None of the other private sector interviewees provided such a comprehensive picture of private education. One noted, however, that "we are providing an important, you know, an important service."

Perspectives of Private Sector Interviewees about Public Sector Attitudes

In their responses to interview questions, private sector interviewees made some strong statements about what they believe the attitudes of public sector educators are about private sector education. Petty as some of the remarks may seem on superficial review, they reflect attitudes, in both sectors, which have a significant impact on the potential for any positive interaction which might form the basis of a partnership.

For example, a private sector interviewee, describing strategies the sector has used to foster greater acceptance of private education, stated that public sector educators "don't want to pay any more than lip service to partnerships," because "the public sector wants nothing more than to see us disappear." An interviewee at a private college indicated that to establish a partnership with a particular public institution, the public partner would "have to overcome the natural aversion to associating in any way with private institutions."

Several private sector interviewees spoke to their belief that the public sector does not see the private education sector as offering quality education. This is a significant credibility issue for private sector institutions. One interviewee from a private college indicated that he believes that the perception among the public sector is that, "Just by definition, a private educator could not possibly do as good a job of educating as a public educator." Another interviewee spoke to her belief that there is a "stigma" associated with private education and that public sector educators consider private education to be substandard.

Another private sector interviewee indicated that, although attitudes seem to be changing, public sector representatives still seem to belong to "an ol' boys and ol' girls network" and have the view that they couldn't possibly work with "those profit-oriented people."

Interviewees also described what they viewed as almost religious beliefs within the public sector regarding the "sanctity of public education" and that the public sector "considers itself to be the holy protector of education."

As presented by the private sector interviewees, the picture seems bleak. However, some private educators do express hope that public sector attitudes will change. One private sector interviewee expressed the more positive view that, "the public institutions are starting to, you know, recognize some of the strengths that private institutions have."

However, if the private sector educators are correct in their perceptions of the philosophies and attitudes of public sector educators, then the underlying credibility issues do not bode well for partnerships.

Philosophies and Attitudes of Public Sector Interviewees

Public sector interviewees also made some remarks about private sector post-secondary education which reflect attitudes about the other sector and philosophies of post-secondary education. It should be noted that interviewees were not asked to comment separately about for-profit and not-for-profit private education. It is not known how this may have influenced their responses.

One public sector interviewee made the comment that "private education is still controversial in the province." This interviewee indicated that the organization would carefully evaluate any potential partnership to avoid

becoming involved with any "fly-by-night" organizations. This interviewee was not suggesting that all private education institutions were of questionable quality. However, questions regarding the quality of educational offerings and the need to verify that quality arose consistently among public sector interviewees. In regard to quality, two interviewees from large urban public institutions questioned the value of the PPSEC (now PCTIA) accreditation process. One of those interviewees noted that because private institutions are actually competitors, "we look at them with suspicion." The same public sector interviewee also indicated that in a potential partnership with a private sector educational institution, the college wouldn't expect to learn "a whole lot from them." On the other hand, one college-based interviewee indicated that working in partnership with a private institution would be an opportunity to learn about how to make flexible curricula work administratively, how to reduce attrition and increase retention, and how to manage continuous entry.

The interviewees from two public colleges noted that the two types of institutions have such different philosophical bases that it is difficult to find "common ground." The public institution representatives felt that the private institution will make decisions about offering programs primarily on the basis of whether a program continues "to be very profitable for them," rather than meeting a social purpose. On that point, another public sector interviewee noted that those involved in the approval processes for new initiatives within her institution did not look kindly on making profits from educational programs. A related statement was that there is a significant contingent in the public institution who believe that "all education should be sponsored by the government and God help anybody should be making money off of education."

More than one interviewee made it clear that their view was that part of the motivation for a private institution seeking a partnership with their institution was to obtain the credibility of being associated with a public institution. These interviewees also noted that private institutions may think that the relationship has the potential of "fast-tracking" the private institution through approval and accreditation processes.

Three interviewees had difficulty with the idea of private institutions using the publicly funded provincial curriculum which exists for some programs, if those programs were being offered in direct competition with the local public institutions and if there is an intention to make a profit through the program. Public sector interviewees expressed discomfort with the idea that, at some point, this could lead to the public sector no longer offering entry-level programs in some disciplines. The view was expressed that the public sector institutions have a responsibility to continue to make a baseline of programs available to the public. One interviewee spoke to the problems associated with opening and closing programs in a unionized environment.

Implications of Philosophies and Attitudes

Given the comments of the potential partners in post-secondary education as documented from the interviews, it appears that there are many philosophical issues to address before partnerships can evolve. There would also have to be a shifting of some attitudes.

The philosophies and attitudes are, no doubt, reflected in another dimension of partnerships about which interview questions were asked in this study. This is the matter of whether there have been approaches between the

public and private sector about potential partnerships and who has approached whom.

Based on the reports of the interviewees, the 10 interviewees from the eight private institutions in this study reported no approaches from public institutions which would have met the requirements of the study. Interviewees from eight of the twelve public institutions reported approaches about partnerships by private institutions.

Aside from philosophies and attitudes, there are other factors of importance. The public institutions have a wider range of health programs than the private institutions (Appendices K and L) and thus the potential for partnership activities could be larger because the range of possible activities is larger. On the other hand, the public institutions are relatively self-sufficient and do not need to partner with private institutions in order to maintain their credibility and/or fulfill their mandate. The public institutions have more resources.

Government Role in the Context for Partnerships

Based on the responses of the interviewee in the B.C. provincial government, it appears that the provincial government has two roles with regard to the context for post-secondary education. One role is as, either by design or accident, action or inaction, one of the creators of the context for potential partnerships. Clearly, government creates the policy climate for the activities of public and private post-secondary education institutions.

Second, government is also, at least to some extent, an element within the context, and affected by it. Even a provincial government cannot completely

control the context for its own operations, the increasingly global market economy, and the variables which influence that economy.

The responses of interviewees, within and outside government, about the role of government, illustrate many of the features of the context in which post-secondary education institutions and systems operate. However, some of the features of the context, such as free-trade agreements, and their implications for post-secondary education, were not mentioned.

Ministry Interviewee's View of Government's Role in Post-Secondary Education

It appears that the Ministry, in consideration of health programs at the post-secondary level, has positioned itself somewhere between the demands of the marketplace and matters of accountability. The intention, as represented by the interviewee in government, seems to be in both directions simultaneously. There are several examples.

In terms of the marketplace, the interviewee from the Ministry stated that one goal of the Ministry was to "level the playing field" in order to encourage private institutions to play a role in the post-secondary system. Unfortunately, as will also be noted later, the outcome of this approach has been perceived by some interviewees at public post-secondary institutions, as reducing the value of the work of the public institutions. According to the Ministry representative, however, the overarching goal is to create "a more coordinated private and public post-secondary system," not to undermine the work of the public post-secondary institutions. In this respect, the goal of the Ministry could be described as being to create a more ordered marketplace or to increase the flexibility available in the post-secondary education system. It would appear that the latter

is more likely as the interviewee indicated that the desire is to foster a "more seamless ability for students to sort of go back and forth between private institutions and public institutions."

The interviewee described enabling strategies being undertaken by the Ministry in order to reach that goal. Overall, according to the interviewee, the strategies of the Ministry are intended to eliminate barriers for participation by private institutions and, in general, not penalize students for being in a private institution. In essence, as described by the interviewee, the B.C. Ministry is creating student access to private institutions as a viable choice by changing policies and processes that may seem to be or are restrictive.

The interviewee from the Ministry described some examples of changes in policy and process designed to achieve this outcome. One example is a change to the Motor Vehicle Act which will allow out-of-province students enrolled in private institutions to keep the vehicle license from their province of origin just as out-of-province students in public institutions do.

Another example is that BCCAT has recently received a mandate from government to, not only allow, but to foster, transfer credit between public and private institutions. This is, of course, limited in its impact for students as BCCAT has tended to address university transfer and most private institutions are not offering degree programs. Another change in process is that representatives of private institutions are now invited to sit on what have historically been provincial committees available for participation by only public institutions, including program articulation committees and emerging broader/higher level committees of the recently-established British Columbia Academic Health Care directorate.

Another policy change noted by the interviewee was the use of the PCTIA institutional accreditation process as a clearance mechanism for the B.C. Student Assistance program/Student Aid B.C. This means that the students of a private institution accredited by the PCTIA may access this funding. This is a policy which is marketplace-oriented in that it gives a decided boost to the likelihood of financial success for private post-secondary education institutions in the form of more reliable income from its students and allows students with government loans to opt to attend either public or private institutions. On the other hand, it removes government from the day-to-day operations of private institutions, leaving the process to arms-length accreditation and regulation processes. Another example of a policy which "levels the playing field" is that government has recently made access to the process of obtaining the ability to offer a degree program less dependent on the type of institution, public or private, involved.

Further evidence of the marketplace orientation adopted by government is that, when asked, it directs that decisions about program offerings by both public and private institutions are to be based on employer and community needs. Further, the interviewee said that, when asked, the Ministry will direct private institutions to talk to their public counterparts about offering particular programs. (While reconnaissance by private institutions to find out what public institutions are intending to offer may be useful to their business, talking about organizational plans with competitors is not typical marketplace behavior. Also, government is not suggesting a cooperative dialogue.) The interviewee pointed out that now that public institutions receive block funding, the government provides less direction to public institutions about their profile of programs. Apparently, the Ministry views public institutions (not just confined to

universities, but including colleges) as "autonomous entities" which are expected to "make decisions for the mix of programs that will serve their communities." The interviewee indicated that the expectation was that "the marketplace has a way of ironing that out." Given the stakeholders associated with public institutions, the probability of establishing a program profile exclusively on market requirements seems quite optimistic.

In addition to all these marketplace-oriented approaches, the interviewee noted that the Ministry has developed a strategy to help students make their way through the post-secondary educational institution marketplace. Specifically, the government's intent is to help students become better consumers and make informed choices about post-secondary education institutions by providing information to students about their choices of institutions.

On the side of accountability, it would appear that, based on the information provided by the interviewee, the accountability and/or quasi-regulatory measures chosen by the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education allow it to position itself, probably by design, at arms-length from the private institutions, i.e. the Ministry has disengaged from direct decision-making and judgement about the quality of programming offered by private institutions. For example, the processes of BCCAT, expanded to include private post-secondary institutions as well as college-level programming, become a form of academic review because the actual judgements in decisions about transfer credit with private institutions are made by public institutions. The processes of accreditation of private institutions by PCTIA are managed in a self-regulatory mode, by a Board comprising private institutions, with no direct intervention by government. The interviewee from the (then) Ministry of Advanced Education

indicated that work is underway with PCTIA to develop a system of accreditation/review at the program level, not just the institution level, "so that accreditation really means something." From the Ministry perspective, this increases the reliability and usefulness of the PCTIA accreditation process as a regulatory mechanism. Finally, in fields of endeavour in which the government has already put regulatory bodies in place, such as for particular groups of health care workers, the program accreditation processes which have been developed by the regulatory bodies are the government's accountability mechanisms. Government does not manage these processes directly.

Ministry Interviewee's View of Government's Role in Partnerships

The interviewee from the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education indicated that government would not have a significant role in partnerships. However, the interviewee went on to say that the Ministry would be "encouraging of partnerships between public and private institutions" but would not go to the extent of approving them. The interviewee indicated that government has a desire to foster more partnerships because "it makes the most sense for institutions to kind of maximize their resources as well." The interviewee indicated that in terms of both public and private institutions, it is the intention of the Ministry to "treat each with similar interests and respect and, you know, sort of fostering that good will back and forth." No details were provided as to how this might be accomplished.

Transfer credit between the two types of institutions seemed to be seen by the interviewee as a form of partnership from a system, not an individual institution, perspective. Another area that the interviewee indicated that the

public and private institutions should collaborate on as a system is the development of curriculum. The government no longer funds curriculum development directly. The interviewee made the general comment that public institutions could learn from private institutions in terms of response time.

Views of Public Sector Interviewees about Government's Role in Post-Secondary Education

The most significant feature of responses from the interviewees at the public sector institutions is that they don't seem to understand and/or share the vision of government and the context government is creating regarding the place and role of private institutions in B.C.'s post-secondary education system and marketplace. The contrast with the comments of the Ministry interviewee are striking.

Several interviewees at public institutions expressed views that government bureaucrats lack clarity about the Ministry's position on the roles of public and private institutions in the B.C. context. Interviewees stated that if the government is "serious about free enterprise in post-secondary education," they need to let the public institutions know. One public sector interviewee recommended that government prepare a position statement about this. This interviewee also stated that without a directive, the public institutions are left to "second guess what the Ministry perspectives are."

Another interviewee proposed that there may be confusion between the stance of government and the ability of bureaucrats to interpret and implement the stance. This interviewee described the belief that, "for some people in the Ministry, it has been awkward for them as well." For example, in taking a

position about an issue such as sharing publicly developed curriculum with private institutions who would use the curriculum in making a profit, "they either didn't have a clear idea at the onset or maybe there was uncertainty themselves about what free enterprise is supposed to look like in post-secondary" education. This interviewee indicated that, "I don't think they have clarity on how this whole thing is supposed to operationalize and I think some of them also have philosophical unease with it as well."

An interviewee noted that, on the one hand, the broadly-known political stance of the current BC government is that B.C. is "open for business." Two interviewees reflected on whether, however, the government is thinking of post-secondary education as a business and if it is really prepared to let the "marketplace" reign in this matter. An interviewee from a public institution stated the view that, "I don't think, again, that dealing with these pieces of policy or legislation, that all the politicians get it about how education and health, for instance, are linked and it's not about the making of widgets. It will do harm to the public" because the field of work for graduates of health programs is delivery of health care.

A related policy matter which another interviewee identified that government could deal with, was identified as being "the connection with health human resource planning and capacities for training and education provincially." A different interviewee indicated that there is a lack of statistics to assist with planning to determine what the need for workers is and whether government is providing it.

Unlike the interviewee from the Ministry, at least one public sector interviewee believes that government does have a role in the rationalization of

programs and related resources. The provision of access has always been a public sector system and individual public institution mandate. Three interviewees questioned why public and private institutions are offering the same programs. This leads to questions such as: Is there really a need for both? Should the entry level programs be offered exclusively by the private sector and what would the implications of that be? One area for consideration is that private sector institutions require higher fees of students. If only the private sector offered some entry level programs, what would the impact of the higher level of tuition be for all students who want to enrol in that program?

There is evidence that the perceived lack of clarity about the stance of government is leading to an "us" versus "them" mentality among the public institution interviewees regarding private sector institutions. One public interviewee expressed the view that private institutions had gained favour with the Ministry and that "the government seems to be so encouraging of private institution endeavours that it feels like a devaluing of public, of what we do." This interviewee said that there seems to a "continuing sense among the privates that the government has a position around private education." The implication is that the government position is to encourage the growth of private post-secondary institutions, to the detriment of the public institutions.

Interview responses from public sector participants provided some indication that they don't see themselves operating in a market economy. One interviewee stated the opinion that the public sector institutions are much more heavily scrutinized and have many more accountabilities, including to the electorate, than private institutions. (As will be noted in the next section of this chapter, many of the interviewees in private sector institutions would disagree

that the accountability requirements were heavier for the public sector.) An interviewee at a large urban public college stated the belief that there is limited understanding of "what it means to have unaccountable schools providing education, juxtaposed against a system of high accountability" in the public sector.

In terms of potential partnerships, an interviewee noted that, between public and private institutions, "the burden is different, and because the burden is different, where is the partnership going to happen and to whose advantage?"

Nor did the public sector interviewees speak to public and private institutions functioning in a coordinated system enveloping both sectors. In fact, one interviewee expressed the view that public and private institutions "are operating in fairly isolated spheres."

Perhaps the most telling response in this regard was that of one interviewee who indicated that the B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors had recently voted to not allow access by private sector institutions to the provincial publicly funded curriculum. This seems to contradict the position of the Ministry described earlier.

Public sector interviewees focused heavily on the need for the government to attend to quality issues associated with the activities of the private post-secondary education sector.

Views of Public Sector Interviewees about Government's Role in Partnerships

More than one public sector interviewee stated that if the government wants public and private institutions to undertake partnerships, then

government should make that statement, or create a related policy, or include it in the service plans of public institutions.

The potential role of government identified by one interviewee at a large urban public institution, was that the (then) B.C. Ministry of Advanced Education could simply provide direction that there be partnerships between the two types of post-secondary educational institutions. That interviewee stated that, "if this is something the Ministry considers desirable then they should so indicate to us and encourage us to sign partnerships and make it one [sic] in the service plans, make it one of the goals for each institution." The interviewee was not making a statement that government should do this but that this was a potential role that government could have if the government sees such partnerships as important. The interviewee indicated that the government could "create a policy on it and give us some indication on what they want." This would not, of course, be a marketplace-oriented approach as it would be a mechanism to ensure that public institutions were accountable for creating partnerships with the private sector.

One interviewee from a public post-secondary educational institution noted that, at the present time in B.C., government has not provided clear direction to the public institutions in this area. Another interviewee indicated that the Ministry position needs to be clarified and that, "It's almost like institutions are having to second guess what Ministry perspectives are."

More than one public sector interviewee stated that a necessary prerequisite to partnerships would be for the Ministry to take steps to ensure the quality of private sector offerings. Interviewees from both large urban and small rural institutions suggested that government assure quality in the private

institutions by drilling down to the program level through the accreditation process, the historic approach to institutional accreditation not having been sufficiently in-depth to assure the quality of individual programs. Another interviewee from an urban institution seemed to concur, saying that the government role should be to determine "what it means to be an *accredited* private post-secondary ... and is accreditation addressing the things that the accreditation should address?"

On the other hand, an interviewee from a smaller institution indicated the view that government also needs to work with accrediting bodies to ensure that the processes of accreditation do not become a barrier. More than one interviewee mentioned the need to streamline some institutional accountability mechanisms, including accreditation processes.

A majority of the interviewees in public post-secondary educational institutions referred generally to a government role in assuring that activities at private post-secondary institutions are of appropriate quality. Interviewees felt that there needs to be a sense of confidence in the accreditation process, so that the standards of private sector institutions were known. It was felt that this was essential and that government must take direct responsibility for this. One interviewee stated that the government should ensure that the "checks and balances that are there for the public institutions are also there for the private institutions." The interviewee from one of the smaller institutions cited the need for government to set standards, particularly with regard to provincial curriculum, a role that the government seems to have dropped some time ago when the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology was closed.

One fear among public institutions regarding the role of government is imposed partnerships because of quality concerns. An interviewee at a large public college stated the concern this way, "I really don't want government messing around here trying to set up private partnerships because of the integrity of programs and the quality." The interviewee from a smaller rural college made a statement that would have been in agreement with that assessment:

> Government's [sic] there to kind of ensure that institutions meet certain standards and that their credentials are of a certain quality, and if they do that, then I think that you allow the institutions to determine where the partnerships work and where they don't. I don't think the Ministry should be sort of saying, "Well, we would like you to partner with this person.

Public sector interviewees made a link between quality control, accountability, and the potential for partnerships. One public sector interviewee described the linkage of these elements with regard to private post-secondary educational institutions:

> If, you know, you could trust that they're doing a great job, then it makes it a lot easier to form those relationships and work with them. If you know that there's no accountability, then you're going to really think twice about it.

Another interviewee indicated that if the government chooses, its role could be to put standards in place which would foster working relationships with private sector institutions. The interviewee felt that government could "put in place processes that give us assurance of quality."

Several interviewees from public institutions referred to the multiple accountabilities that public institutions have in contrast to those in the private sector. This interviewee suspects that the evaluation standards for private

institutions are not necessarily the same as for public institutions. Public institutions operate in the public domain and, according to some of the interviewees from the public institutions, are subject to different kinds of scrutiny than the private institutions, including, ultimately, responsibility to the electorate because the government elected by the public is the funding body. (Private institutions have also made comments about burdensome accountabilities that are imposed on them but not on the public institutions, e.g., the requirement for maintaining student attendance record.)

It seems that, in the eyes of some of the interviewees from public institutions, the difference in accountabilities is a factor which effects the potential for partnerships between public and private sector institutions. It appears that at least some interviewees believe that if the government can "level the playing field" regarding accountabilities, partnerships might follow more easily.

Views of Private Sector Interviewees about Government's Role in Post-Secondary Education

An interviewee from a small private institution summed up his view of the role of government in post-secondary education as being one of "providing a sandbox, a place where that planning occurs and then defining, if you will, the rules for gatekeeping." This interviewee also felt that an appropriate role for government is "to mandate an approach for cooperation, without being overly bureaucratic."

Another private sector interviewee stated a view that there has been some improvement in the relationships between public and private institutions,

generally. This interviewee felt that the private sector is now getting invited to "almost every table" and is increasingly being listened to.

Interviewees from two long-standing private institutions indicated that it would be useful to be involved in provincial committee work with the public sector. Both interviewees indicated that they felt their private sector institutions had something to offer, in general, although this is not necessarily understood or accepted by public sector institutions. In both cases, there was a belief that government could be helpful in making this happen.

One interviewee suggested that government should establish a private career college organization. Related to this, the interviewee noted that the private sector umbrella organization, the BCCCA, does not represent a majority number of private institutions in the province.

The interviewee from an urban private institution shared the opinion that one approach to putting institutions on an equal footing was monitoring. The interviewee felt that, for degree programs, government has put an initial review process in place, but there is no ongoing monitoring system planned.

A private sector interviewee who had been involved with the private sector voluntary umbrella organization, the BCCCA, described the ongoing struggle that the organization had to educate government on behalf of its member institutions and the private sector. The goal was to ensure that the Minister and staff in the bureaucracy were aware of the important role of private education at the post-secondary level and demonstrating that private sector institutions were also interested in the welfare of individual students. An interviewee from a private college noted, however, that private institutions are not necessarily asking that government promote private institutions as that could

have unexpected negative consequences, due to a general distrust of government. However, the interviewee stated that, regarding the matter of transfer credit between public and private institutions, government may have to mandate it, "like affirmative action."

Other private institution interviewees did, however, suggest that government could "level the playing field." Examples were provided. Apparently, an immigrant who attends a publicly funded college can stay in the country and work for two years. If an immigrant attends a private institution, this is not the case. Also, the provincial health care bursary to support people returning to the health workforce is not available to students attending a private institution. According to the interviewees, private colleges cannot enroll someone until they are a high school graduate or are nineteen years of age. Provincial tuition grants are not available to people enrolled in programs that are any less than two years in length. Most private institutions offer shorter programs.

Another example given by an interviewee is that private colleges must record student attendance and must discontinue students, and return the fees of students who do not meet a stated standard for attendance. This is not required of public institutions. One private sector interviewee referred to the tremendous amount of scrutiny which the work of private institutions receives while public institutions undergo no such attention. As noted earlier in this chapter, the interviewees at public institutions would disagree.

One area of government inaction that seemed to rankle several private sector interviewees was the matter of access to provincial curricula for use in delivery to students. Several interviewees noted difficulties they had in accessing

provincial curricula. Generally, the Ministry was not viewed as being helpful with this matter.

One interviewee indicated that there is a need for research to support decisions about offering programs of study. This interviewee proposed a consortium of public and private sector institutions and government to work to develop good data on which to plan. The interviewee indicated that he would not object to having private institutions partially fund the planning research as the data would have value to them as entrepreneurs. Another interviewee indicated that, to avoid duplication of programs, the government could tender program delivery, including public institutions in the process.

One private institution interviewee also felt that government-funded provincial curriculum development projects should be available to both the public and private institutions, as both parties have expertise to offer.

Views of Private Sector Interviewees about Government's Role in Partnerships

The private institution interviewees offered almost no concrete ideas about how government could support partnerships between public and private institutions.

One private sector interviewee indicated transfer credit arrangements between the two sectors, interpreted presumably as a form of partnership, could be improved by government establishing a "non-bureaucratic, nonpolitical organization" to handle them. Two interviewees noted that, in the current system, it is beyond the capacity (time, energy, finances) of any of the smaller private institutions to approach all of the public institutions about transfer credit for a particular program. The interviewees felt that if one institution in the public

system accepts credit transfer from a private institution, all should be mandated by government to do so.

Existing Partnerships

Differing Perspectives on Partnerships

The responses provided by interviewees make it evident that there are different perspectives, from one interviewee to the next within a sector, and between sectors, about what constitutes a partnership.

This was not completely unanticipated before interviews began. As a consequence, examples of what were considered to be partnerships for the purposes of this study were described in both the letter of initial contact (Appendix R) which was sent to potential interviewees and in the letter of consent (Appendix S) which was sent to those who expressed interest in being interviewed. The statement about partnerships in those two documents was as follows:

> For this project, examples of partnerships between public and private post-secondary education may include, but are not limited to, such activities as: transfer credit for specific courses or programs; offering learning opportunities for student audiences in countries with which one institution has not had experience; jointly offering a program of studies in a manner in which each institution takes instructional responsibility for a pre-selected set of courses toward a common credential offered by one or both of the institutions; support for degree-granting activities by a private institution from a public institution which has extensive experience in managing degree programs; joint planning and/or development of courses and/or programs and/or curricula for a specified student group; creating professional development opportunities for faculty; joint community development activities; and, joint research activities.

Transfer Credit and Laddering

One example of the difference in perspectives about what constitutes a partnership was regarding transfer credit. Transfer credit was presented as an example of a partnership in the letters inviting prospective interviewees.

However, an interviewee at one public institution offered the view that transfer credit arrangements were more "on the articulation side than the partnership side." The particular institution represented had numerous transfer credit arrangements with many institutions, including one with a small private institution which allows students to transfer most courses, for credit, to the public institution.

The interviewee at a public institution presented a rather detached view, certainly not treating transfer credit as a partnership arrangement with a private institution. The interviewee noted that in-province transfer credit is handled through the Registrar's office, and that decisions about transfer credit from private institutions within B.C. are made consistent with BCCAT guidelines, including whether or not an institution has been through the degree approval process. Decisions about transfer credit from private institutions outside BC are made primarily on the basis of precedent from reputable universities without direct contact with the private institution. In this interviewee's thinking, there is no need for direct contact with the "sending" private institution and, therefore, it is not a partnership relationship. The specific response from that interviewee was:

> We apparently have also accepted credits from private institutions out-of-province where another, if you will, a local accredited university has accepted those credits. We look at each one of those, but by and large we feel that if the University of Saskatchewan has taken the time and effort to review something from an independent institution and has approved it,

> we would in all likelihood approve it. And I think, as you know, our province is probably well known for trying to accept as much as we can.

On the other hand, an interviewee at a private institution reported on the importance to that institution of the laddering arrangements it has with two public institutions. The laddering arrangements allow a student who has completed a Home Support/Resident Care Attendant program at the private institution to enter a Practical Nursing program at two public institutions. However, the interviewee at the private institution made ambiguous statements as to whether this was actually seen as being a partnership. Having reported it as such, the interviewee later said, "Basically, in terms of the purpose and intended outcomes, you know, they're [the arrangements for laddering to the public institution] not expressed, 'We are partners'."

During the interview, the interviewee at the private institution produced the apparently hard-won transfer credit agreement provided by one of the institutions. The agreement was simply a short letter from the department head at the public college.

The interviewee at another private college highlighted a variation on traditional transfer credit arrangements that the interviewee felt would not meet the criteria for partnership "in the sense that I think you're using partnership here." This private college had received recognition for one of its health program, through a special service for the post-secondary system, the Canadian Learning Bank, which is managed by BCIT separate from it's own educational offerings. In this case, the public institution does not offer a program which would provide a ladder for graduates of the program at the private college, but it records the credit in, essentially, a credit bank. The interviewee at the private institution was

"not sure necessarily the value of it." However, the recognition of the program is recorded centrally through the credit bank.

Sale of Curricula

Another example of differences in perspectives on what constitutes a partnership is the matter of sale of curricula. One public institution reported having been approached to sell the curriculum for a program to a private institution in another province. The contract for sale did not contain plans for ongoing contact between the institutions, other than some consultation from the public college about the curriculum. The sole benefit to the public institution was the ability to direct funds from the sale back into curriculum development or for other discretionary purposes. The benefit for the private institution was relatively cheap access to a tested curriculum. The private institution would also not incur development costs. The curriculum itself was available in a very detailed format and the sale included the program handbook, the course outlines, and assignments. The private institution was not even required to acknowledge the developing institution as the source when it printed copies. Although the interviewee presented this as an example of an approach for a partnership, it is questionable as to whether it is appropriate to portray this activity, consisting solely of a sale, and not requiring any but the most modest ongoing interaction, or even informal feedback by the private partner about the curriculum, as a partnership. (For the purposes of this study, the fact that the private institution is not in British Columbia disqualifies this example as a partnership.)

A public institution was approached by a private institution in B.C. about the sale of the curriculum for a dental program. In this case, the interviewee who received the approach rejected it. In making this decision, the interviewee relied on the policy of the institution not to sell curricula to any institution that would be competing directly with the institution. The interviewee indicated that another rationale for rejecting the approach was a decision, at about that time, by the B.C. Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors that provincial curricula for health and human service programs curricula should not be provided to private institutions on the grounds that only public funds were used to develop the curriculum (i.e., the principle being that the private sector should not be able to profit from a publicly funded resource).

Facility Rental

Interviewees at several public institutions had been approached by private institutions about the rental of their health science-related lab/in-house clinic facilities. The responses were not consistent. One public institution indicated that there would have to be some discussion about that internally at the institution before approval was given. Although that public institution had previously rented its facilities to professional groups (e.g., dental study clubs, etc.), it would not necessarily agree to rental to private institutions. The interviewee at another public institution had received a similar enquiry from a private institution and indicated that the response had been "no" as the public institution could not see the benefit. However, the interviewee at one of the institutions indicated that facility rental to a private institution might be a possibility for highly capitalized programs.

Other Reports of Partnerships

In addition to the collaborative arrangements which, as described above, may or may not be considered by interviewees to be partnerships, interviewees reported on other activities which met the criteria for partnerships in this study. There were few.

In total, only two of the twelve interviewees at public institutions, one interviewee from a private institution, and one interviewee from an umbrella organization, answered the interview question about existing partnerships affirmatively.

The two partnerships with public institutions involved the recruitment of international students by a private institution. The public institutions benefited from the knowledge and past experience with the international market and the marketing activities of the private institutions. In each of these partnerships, the beneficial outcome for the public institution was an increase in enrollments due to access to students whom it did not have the ability to reach itself. This was a significant increase in business value for the public institutions.

As these partnerships were reported by the public institutions, we can only assume that the private institutions also saw the benefit for their institutions as an increase in business. There may certainly have been other benefits to the private partner.

There was one additional consideration that more than one of the interviewee from public institutions mentioned which put the descriptions in context: Some interviewees emphasized that, although they do not have partnerships with private post-secondary educational institutions related to

health programs, they have, or have explored, partnerships with other organizations. These included partnerships with other public institutions in B.C., public institutions in other countries, not-for-profit non-government organizations in B.C., and for-profit businesses which are not educational institutions. They also have, or have been approached about, partnerships with other private institutions in other countries.

Public Institutions

One of the interviewees from a public institution provided a very detailed description of its current partnership with a private institution. At the time, the private institution was accredited by the PCTIA. This partnership is described in Vignette 1 below.

Vignette 1

A Program for Immigrant Prospective Health Care Workers

Nature of the Partnership

The two institutions worked collaboratively to offer a program to assist international students to become health care workers in British Columbia. The students began their studies in one location and completed the program at the facilities of the public institution in another region of the province. The public institution arranged clinical placements at facilities within its region.

Roles

The role of the private institution included recruiting prospective students internationally, and, early in the partnership, screening them for admission. The public partner felt that the partner had handled recruitment very well.

However, the public partner was not satisfied with the initial student assessment process. The parties came to an agreement to outsource this activity.

Consequently, a later element of the project was a separate partnership, perhaps more appropriately termed a contract, with a third-party public institution in the Lower Mainland which conducted the face-to-face assessment of potential students.

The private institution provided physical space for students to meet together in its region, as well as technical support for those courses in the program which were offered in a distance learning format over a six to eight month period.

The public partner provided the faculty who instructed in the distance courses, instructed labs and provided clinical supervision of students. The public institution also provided a faculty member as an on-site tutor at the private partner site. The on-site tutor provided additional support to local students as they moved through the distance courses.

Evolution of the Partnership

According to the interviewee at the public institution, the partnership "kind of evolved by accident." It appears that the two institutions were already "primed" for this partnership by previous activities they had undertaken previously. The private institution was already doing work in an Asian country. The public institution had already piloted the proposed delivery model for the distance courses in a limited way. A representative of International Studies at the public institution had met with the principal from the private institution for exploratory discussions. The two institutions had looked at the range of program possibilities and identified this as a potential partnership. At one point, the public institution had presented, "a smorgasbord of ideas" to explore and the private institution selected this partnership idea as one that could be pursued jointly.

Benefits to the Partners

For the public institution, this partnership arrangement provided a broader client base that it could not easily reach itself, increased the work available to be undertaken by its staff, and created the opportunity to generate enrollments and revenue, the latter which could be used for further curriculum development.

The interviewee from the public institution identified that the private partner probably derived some credibility from working with a public institution. This was

particularly important in this partnership as the program had to be accredited by one of the health care professional regulatory bodies.

The interviewee from the public institution also identified that the private partner benefited from additional revenue, an expansion of activities, and a generally higher profile from being involved in the partnership.

The interviewee from the public institution identified that the private partner benefited significantly by acquiring significant technical equipment for its operations through the computer purchase plan of the public institution. This is interesting given the role of the private institution in providing technical support to students but it does illustrate how partners can benefit each other.

The public institution benefited by being able to use its own existing curriculum which also had been offered in a distance format.

Processes

A contract was created at the outset.

The private partner was responsible for recruitment of students.

The public sector interviewee noted that the two institutions were able to work together very well to problem-solve as the joint activities in the partnership matured.

Factors which Helped the Partnership Proceed

According to the interviewee from the public institution, the partnership was influenced positively by the existence of a clear and "very specific contract, you know, that laid out the responsibilities and roles of each party." Apparently, it was necessary for the partners to return to the contract several times for direction and to make adjustments.

Another component of the perceived success of the partnership was regular meetings of the partners even though some travel was required. Meetings continued through the entire process.

The interviewee from the public institution also identified that the faculty it had assigned to the partnership "had the proper sort of personalities to work with this group of students in this kind of environment. They were fairly open. They realized that there would be some challenges" as the project proceeded.

Another feature built into the student experience was face-to-face meetings with the students in the distance component of the program while they were in their home

region of the province. The relationships established with students from these meetings were found to be excellent preparation for clinical experiences in facilities in the region of the public institution.

The public institution planned their allocation of faculty so that there was some consistency of personnel from the region of the private institution to the location of the public institution. The goal was to help students feel that they knew some faculty members during the part of the program when they had to relocate to the region of the public institution to participate in face-to-face learning activities.

Issues

As noted earlier, some changes were made to the process of assessment of prospective students by the private partner. A third party institution in the Lower Mainland was engaged to handle this activity and that worked well.

Initially, there was also an issue regarding the selection of students and paperwork for admission purposes. This was resolved over time.

Unanticipated Events/Outcomes

A particularly notable sidebar about the partnership was the one-time, but significant and detailed level of involvement of the provincial government. When the Ministry learned of the project and asked about how it was organized, the public institution was asked to make a change from using one of the employees of the private partner as the on-site tutor for students when they were in the region in which the private partner was situated, to requiring that the public institution employ the on-site tutor. The rationale stated by the Ministry was that if the program belonged to the public institution, then the public institution should supply all instruction. The public institution made the change although it reduced its profit margin from the project. The interviewee from the public institution noted that this type of requirement would have been more usually expected from a union than the Ministry. (For this study, it significantly changed the balance of the partnership in terms of its educational component and the sharing of instructors.)

Another unexpected event in the partnership was the challenges the public institution faced in explaining the role of the private partner, and how the program worked, to the professional regulatory College for program accreditation purposes.

A third unexpected outcome of the partnership for the public partner was the interest in, and appreciation of, the international students and the program by local health care institutions. The health care institutions found that they had experienced benefit in the form of "broadened cultural awareness" for their staff. The public institution found a similar benefit for its faculty.

An interviewee from a public institution gave an affirmative answer to the question about existing partnerships. This partnership had a particularly interesting feature: The public institution had the role of preparing international students for admission to the private partner's program. The partnership is described in Vignette 2.

Vignette 2

Partnership for Preparatory Programming at a Public Institution

Nature of the Partnership

The partnership was intended to help international students complete a program of study leading to a credential offered by the private institution.

Roles

The private institution was responsible for marketing the program to international students, for recruiting them, and for directing them to the public institution.

The public institution provided the initial lower level English language training to cohorts of international students who were planning to move into the private institution's program. Although the public institution regularly provided the same preparatory courses to its own students, it organized a special cohort class for these students. The arrangement enabled the students to go on to a higher level of training at the private institution. This arrangement made the public institution the sending institution. Thus, the public institution offered a part of a curriculum which the private institution did not and then students continued their education in the private

institution. In this arrangement, the public institution entirely controlled the quality of the education at the initial stage, and the private institution controlled quality thereafter with no public institution involvement.

This was a reversal of what might be considered a more traditional laddering arrangement in which the public institution awards the credential and the private institution does the preparatory work with students.

Evolution of the Partnership

The private institution approached the public institution.

Benefits to Partners

The private partner marketed the program, including the relationship with the public institution.

The public institution felt there was very little benefit back to the public institution, particularly as it already had numerous activities and partnerships. However, the arrangement brought additional international students to the public institution and, in that way, was a source of enrollments and increased the net activity of the institution.

Processes

The public institution reported that the partnership worked well, particularly as the private partner was a well-established institution with a clear mission and mandate, and well-prepared faculty.

Issues

As this had been a long-term partnership, the interviewee indicated that most issues had already been worked through.

Private Institutions

Other than the laddering arrangements that one private institution had negotiated with two public institutions, as described earlier under the heading *Transfer Credit and Laddering*, no other existing partnerships were reported by the 10 interviewees from eight private institutions.

The interviewee from the private institution cited the benefits of the laddering arrangements for the program in the example as giving "our students more educational opportunities. It enhances our, you know, working with publics, gives us a greater, wider recognition." The interviewee noted that the arrangement also gave the partnering public institutions "a new pool of applicants for their Access program."

A System Partnership

The interviewee from one of the umbrella organizations contacted during the study described a short-term, inter-institutional and fairly informal collaborative activity, which did not achieve its goal but was, nevertheless, a positive experience for the parties. It was the view of that interviewee that this partnership was a positive harbinger for a similar partnership in the future. Details of the partnership are provided in Vignette 3 below.

Vignette 3

Partnership for Curriculum Development

Nature of the Partnership

The activity was an inter-institutional partnership undertaken as a post-secondary system partnership activity to achieve system goals.

Specifically, the partnership was to prepare a proposal to obtain funding on behalf of institutions in both public and private post-secondary sectors to update the curriculum for a specific program area.

Roles

The work of preparing the proposal was undertaken by the Articulation Committee for the particular program area and a private sector organization.

Evolution of the Partnership

It was the view of the interviewee from the private sector organization that the development of the partnership activity came about because private institutions are involved on the Articulation Committee for the program, and a private sector organization attends meetings of the BCAHC. It was from that group that the private sector organization agreed to participate on a Task Force with public and private representation to pursue funds for the identified curriculum activity.

Benefits to the Partners

If the project had been funded, all institutions would have contributed financially to it and all would have benefited by being able to use the curriculum.

The interviewee from the private sector organization felt that the involvement of the private sector in the formation of the proposal was, in itself, an important opportunity for private sector post-secondary education institutions.

Processes

This partnership did not have many of the features of more formal partnerships. For example, there was no contract, and it was very short term.

Where this project did have some features of a partnership was that it would have required all parties to commit "seed money" to the future project, with the intention that the proposal being developed, including information about the funds already committed, would go to the a third party which would be asked to cover the remaining costs. The interviewee at the private sector organization described the proposal as a "win-win" for both public and private institutions.

Factors Which Helped the Partnership Proceed

The partnership to develop the proposal proceeded but the curriculum development project that was to have arisen from it was not funded.

Unanticipated Events/Outcomes

Unfortunately, the proposal did not receive funding. However, the proponents intended to resubmit the proposal at a future date.

> Note: The project was eventually funded and the curriculum was made available to both public and private institutions wanting to use it through a provincial licensing process managed by the Ministry of Labour and Citizens' Services in 2008.

"Un-partnerships"

The example provided below is not about a program that is considered to be a health program for the purpose of this study. The program is too short. However, the circumstances are illustrative of an important point in the post-secondary system.

A public institution reported having been approached by a local private institution which offered the same low-level continuing education/training health-related program, with the firm request that the public institution not offer that programming again in one of the local communities of the public institution's jurisdiction. Apparently, the private institution publicly portrayed the public institution's offering of this programming as unfair competition. In this case, the public institution complied with the request of the private institution in consideration of local political issues.

A practical issue for the public institution in this case was the regularity of the course offering from the private institution. Students in the public institution needed the training to meet admission requirements for some programs in the public institution. When the public institution offered the training itself, it could schedule the course when needed for its own students.

Although a seemingly small concession on the part of the public institution, the reports of other interviewees indicated that similar, and larger, issues have arisen elsewhere. Another public institution received complaints

from a local private institution when an extra cohort of a particular health program was added to meet the demand of prospective students or industry for a particular health program. The public institution said that the local private institution portrayed itself and the situation this way:

> A small business and part of economic development in the region, and here is this big bully institution which is getting all the taxpayers' money and this – the favorite phrase is "misuse of taxpayers' money" when you have students who are prepared to pay, whatever, the $7,000 or $8,000.

The position of a private institution about this type of scenario was that, when a public institution found funding to accommodate an additional group of students, "It wiped out one of our programs."

As noted by a private institution interviewee, in this type of scenario the question for private institutions becomes, "Why doesn't the public institution focus on the longer, the three and four year training and why do they get involved in the six month or one year stuff? Privates don't generally have the ability to deliver a four-year" program.

Another public institution expressed the scenario this way: "We're in direct competition with private schools for programs of approximately the same length and so on. So, really it is because we are in direct competition, it's hard to find the place for partnerships."

Other Proposals for Partnerships

Having observed the limited array of existing public/private partnerships, it seems appropriate at this point to review some of the "ones that got away" – the proposals that met the criteria for partnerships as defined in this study, but did not, or have not yet, become partnerships. There is also some use

in reviewing several of the proposals that did not meet the criteria for partnerships in this study.

Irrespective of outcome, the proposals illustrate some of the creative thought involved, particularly by the private institutions.

Sources of Proposals

Similar to the search for existing partnerships, the search for proposals for partnerships that met the requirements of the study yielded limited results. As noted earlier, only the interviewees at public sector institutions reported having been approached about partnerships. The private institutions had not received any proposals for partnerships from public institutions but had made proposals for partnerships to public institutions.

Perhaps this is not surprising, given the attitudes of the interviewees reflected in answers to interview questions as described earlier in this chapter.

Proposals Meeting Study Criteria

An unexpected outcome of the analysis of the interviews in the study was finding *pairs* of potential public/private partners within the interviewee groups. There were two instances in which the prospective private sector partners who had made proposals for partnerships to interviewees in the public sector were themselves interviewees in this study.

These "paired" proposals are described below. These are particularly interesting because the perspectives of both parties was available.

Proposed Partnerships Reported by "Pairs"

One of the proposed partnerships between "pairs" is described below in Vignette 4.

Vignette 4

Pair #1: Proposal for a "Recognized" Program for Immigrants

Nature of the Partnership

The proposed partnership would have resulted in immigrants being prepared to enter a program of studies in nursing at the public institution.

Roles

The private partner would have provided content-related English language and pre-nursing training for immigrants recruited by the private partner from an Asian country.

The private institution had already developed the curriculum and was prepared to provide it to students. The private institution had expended considerable resources developing the curriculum.

The role of the public institution would have been to receive graduates of the private institution's preparatory program. The public institution would not have been required to provide any instruction in the program of the private institution. The public institution said that the motivation of the private institution was that, "they just wanted our name."

Evolution of the Proposal

The private institution approached the public institution.

Benefits

The potential benefit identified by the interviewee in the public institution was that the partnership would have provided a source of more enrollments and that the public institution would have been seen as "supporting the building of the workforce through immigration." The interviewee at the public institution saw the benefit to the private institution as being affiliated with the credential from the public institution.

Processes

Following the approach by the private institution, the public institution undertook a detailed review of the curriculum and program operations at the private institution. The private sector interviewee did not release the curriculum to the public institution during the review. The public partner was, however, allowed to review it fully during time spent at the private institution. The review by the public institution included a representative of the public institution attending some classes and observing teaching in progress at the private institution.

Barriers to Proceeding

The public and private institutions provided different reasons as to why a partnership has not proceeded to that date. According to the interviewee in the public institution, the partnership did not proceed primarily because the private institution did not have accreditation by the appropriate credentialing body.

The public institution also had the view that what the private institution wanted the most was the link with the name and reputation of the public institution. As a result, the public institution would have expected the partnership to result in some revenue back to the public institution. The public sector interviewee indicated that the proposal had not been declined unequivocally and that the public institution would entertain the partnership again at some future date when the private institution had achieved accreditation status.

The private institution seemed to have a different understanding of why the proposal has not proceeded, that being that the Board of the public institution did not approve it based on negative past experience with another private institution.

A public institution was approached about access to their lab facilities and guaranteed access for graduates of a private institution's certificate program for entry to the public institution's diploma program. This proposal for a partnership is described in Vignette 5 below.

Vignette 5

Pair #2: Proposal for Sharing Program Resources and Guaranteeing Access

Nature of the Partnership

The proposed partnership would allow graduates of the private institution's certificate program to ladder into the public institution's diploma program. The private institution also wanted to use the facilities of the public institution to offer part of their own program.

Evolution of the Proposal

The private institution approached the public institution.

Benefits

The private institution's perspective was that the benefits for the private institution, would have been "visibility in the community. It would have improved the recognition of our diplomas. It would have given us sort of more clout and more marketing ability." The private institution had the view that being able to identify themselves as being affiliated with a public institution would have assisted in marketing efforts.

The interviewee at the private institution indicated that the public institution would also have had access to the lab and resources (e.g. videos) of the private institution. In this regard, the private institution envisioned mutual benefits.

The public institution identified that the benefit to the public institution would have been to fill seats in the program, and contribute to meeting FTE targets. The public institution could not envision any other benefits that it would receive.

Processes

The interviewee at the private institution complained that the process of consideration of the proposal by the public institution required multiple meetings over an extended period of time, a period of six to eight months.

The interviewee at the private institution also complained that the public institution did not return the curriculum. This was a source of considerable angst for the private institution.

Barriers to Proceeding

The interviewee at the public institution could not think of a reason that the busy public institution "should have our competitor using our sites and all of our resources."

The interviewee at the public institution indicated that guaranteeing seats in the diploma program for graduates of any one, of many, private institutions which offer a certificate program was not viable, particularly if the private institution could not guarantee filling the seats that would be set aside. The public institution interviewee acknowledged that there is attrition from their certificate program and that, from time-to-time, there are seats available in the diploma program. However, this interviewee did not want to expend the resources required to review the quality and credibility of the curriculum of the proposing institution or the operations of the institution itself in the detail that would be required by institutional policy to establish the credibility of the curriculum and the institution for internal approval by the public institution's Education Council.

Issues

The public institution indicated that "the issue relating to program quality and credibility is huge. We have a policy within the [institution] related to educational affiliations that is pretty stringent in terms of the information that you need to get to determine the credibility of the institution, etc. So you have to go through all of that, and then through Education Council before you can even explore a relationship."

Unanticipated Events/Outcomes

The private institution had been granted accreditation from the licensing body to offer a diploma program independently.

The interviewee from the private institution indicated, emphatically, that based on this experience, they would not consider a partnership with a public institution again – "no, never, never, no."

Other Proposals

As noted earlier, many, but not all, of the interviewees from public sector institutions reported that their institutions had been approached by a private post-secondary educational institution about a partnership.

As described in Vignette 6 below, a public institution reported that they had been approached by a private institution to jointly offer the Home Support/Resident Care Attendant program.

Vignette 6

Proposal for an Existing Program

Nature of the Partnership

The proposal from a private institution was for joint delivery of an existing program, the Home Support/Resident Care Attendant program in the area in which the public institution normally operates and offers the same program.

Outcome

The interviewee at the public institution reported that it rapidly concluded that, "We didn't really see any compelling reason to undertake the partnership since we had a curriculum in place." The interviewee at the public institution stated that, as a curriculum update for the program was required, they could just as easily do that themselves.

A public institution reported having received a preliminary contact from a private institution about a dental assisting program. This proposal for a partnership is described in Vignette 7 below.

Vignette 7

Proposal for Sharing an Existing Program and Facilities

Nature of the Partnership

The partnership proposed would have involved joint instruction in the dental assisting program and use of the public institution's dental clinic facilities.

Benefits to the Partners

The private institution would have had access to the larger facilities of the public institution.

The public institution would have benefited from being able to claim full utilization of its facilities and could have generated revenue from the private organization.

Processes

The interviewee at the public institution indicated that in the process of considering the proposal, the public institution would have wanted to have a thorough discussion internally. This discussion would have been about the merits, or otherwise, of allowing access to its clinic facilities by private organizations. The public institution has previously rented the facilities to groups of dentists and dental hygienists for professional development purposes.

In addition, the interviewee at the public institution indicated that the partnership would not have proceeded without, at least, a thorough review of the partner's curriculum. The interviewee indicated that their decision "would have depended a lot on the nature of their program."

Outcome

The prospective private partner which had made the initial contact had not made any further contact with the public institution.

As described in Vignette 8 below, a public institution was approached by a private institution about jointly providing what would have been a new program for the public institution.

Vignette 8

Proposal for a New Diploma Program

Nature of the Partnership

The partnership would have resulted in the joint development and offering of a diploma level paramedic training program.

Benefits to the Partners

The assessment of the public institution about the potential partnership was that the concept fit well with the nature of programming that the public institution already offered. However, the view of the institution was that, given its current strategic direction with regard to offering degree programs, an additional diploma, even in a discipline with a good fit to the institution, would be of limited value.

The public institution saw the benefit for the private institution as allowing them to "penetrate a current market niche" dominated by another public institution of long-standing in the province.

Processes

Before replying to the private institution, the public institution undertook some background work to assess the need. The public institution also approached the Ministry for an opinion about the need for the program. The research conducted by the public institution produced the finding was that "there was not a uniform opinion as to whether another provider was needed."

Issues

Given the existence of another paramedic program of long-standing in the province, the public institution decided that it "was not willing to go head-to-head in a competitive mode against a sister institution," i.e., in the public sector.

Outcome

The public institution declined the opportunity.

A private institution approached a public institution with a proposal to modify the nursing program of the public institution and offer it as a review

program for foreign nurses. This partnership proposal is described in Vignette 9 below.

Vignette 9

Proposal for a Curriculum and Audience Variation of an Existing Program

Nature of the Partnership

The private institution would have undertaken to revise the curriculum of an existing nursing program of a public institution order to serve the needs of the foreign-trained nurses which it would have recruited.

Benefits to the Parties

As described by the private institution, the benefit to the private institution of modifying and then using the curriculum of the program of the public institution would have been to make use of a tested curriculum with a new audience.

As the private institution already had considerable experience with students from other countries, there was the potential for the public institution to learn from the experience although it did already have some experience itself.

Depending on its response to the proposal, the private institution believed that the public institution could have benefited financially by charging a fee for the curriculum, or could have benefited financially and/or experientially by participating in a partnership arrangement with the private institution for program delivery, or by delivering the revised program itself. With the background of the particular private institution, the public institution could have negotiated with the private institution to recruit students from other countries.

Outcome

The public institution declined the opportunity. The interviewee at the private institution indicated that the reason provided by the public institution was that the matter of clinical placements in a joint program with a private institution was "politically too sensitive." According to the interviewee at the private institution, the public institution was concerned that if they used clinical

> placements outside of their immediate region, they would be "perceived as being ambitious and aggressive."
>
> The private college described its dissatisfaction with the response of the public institution. After declining the private institution's offer, the public institution began moving ahead independently with a similar initiative and attempting to recruit in the same country that the private institution would have sought students. The private institution acknowledged that this outcome may have been coincidental but it was suspect in the mind of that interviewee.

Proposals Not Meeting Study Criteria

Interviewees described some existing and potential proposals which did not meet the criteria for the study. However, taken together, these examples are illustrative of the rich variety and creativity of existing partnerships and approaches about partnerships for health programs in post-secondary education.

As previously, the existing and the potential partnerships were proposed by private institutions. Many of the partnerships crossed or would have crossed provincial or international borders. This is an interesting feature given the characteristics and effects of globalization in post-secondary education described in the earlier literature review.

In one proposal, a public institution was approached by a representative of a private institution to jointly offer a degree program in one of the health professions, building on an existing diploma program offered in B.C. A description of the proposed partnership and the reasons that the proposal did not proceed, as described by the interviewee, are provided below in Vignette 10.

Vignette 10

Proposal for a New Degree Program

Nature of the Partnership

The partnership desired by a for-profit private institution was to jointly offer a degree program in a discipline for which a diploma program was already being offered in the province. The public institution would be the degree-granting partner. According to the public institution, with changes in the health care system and the regulation of health professions in B.C., the private institution believed that the profession needed a degree program rather than a diploma program.

While deliberations about the potential partnership to offer a degree program were underway, the representative of the private institution and the public institution had a separate (i.e. phase one) agreement/partnership which was an arrangement to work together to explore the possibilities of the degree program.

Why the Proposal did not Meet Study Criteria

Neither the proposed partnership to offer a degree program nor the partnership to explore the possibilities met study criteria because the field of study was not one which met the criteria for health programs in this study.

Benefits to the Partners

The interviewee at the public institution saw the benefit to the private institution as being able to offer a degree program "in a profession that really needed to be able to move to a degree." The interviewee saw the benefit to the public institution as being to fulfill "a social purpose, you know, to support a profession that needed degree access" and to fulfill it's own purpose "to meet the needs of your region and your community" as a public institution.

Processes

The public institution worked with the representative of the private institution for several years in a partnership to complete curriculum and "philosophical work."

Issues

The public institution had concerns about the private institution which included, "the curriculum end, and, about the institution, 'Were they [financially] viable'?" The

public institution felt that it needed information about the business side of the institution during the course of discussions.

After several years of discussion and a form of "partnership" (as described by the public institution), the two institutions found that they were unable to overcome a curriculum-based philosophical objection of the program area in the public institution to which the degree program would have been assigned.

Finally, there were issues "at a broader education level at the public institution around the concept of partnering with a private for-profit" institution.

Outcomes

The interviewee at the public institution facilitated the withdrawal of the public institution from the potential partnership for offering the degree and helped the owner to consider an alternative partner in B.C.

A public institution in B.C. was approached by a private educational institution in another province to jointly offer a non-health program in the other province. This potential partnership is described in Vignette 11 below. It illustrates some of the concerns of both public and private institutions about the approach to operations of institutions which sometimes become problematic in potential relationships.

Table 11

Proposal for Offering an Existing Program in Another Province

Nature of the Partnership

An out-of-province private institution approached a public institution about offering one of the public institution's programs in another province. The partnership would have also nominally included a large public post-secondary institution in the other province because there would have been some value to students administratively.

Why the Proposal did not Meet Study Criteria

The proposed program was not considered to be a health program for the purpose of this study, although it was related. The private institution was located in another province.

Benefits to the Partners

Had the partnership proceeded, the public institution in B.C. would have received revenues from the private institution.

The benefit to the private institution would have been access to a tested curriculum. The private institution wanted consultation on how to teach the program and how to arrange clinical placements.

Processes

The public institution in B.C. established a contract with the private institution which included clauses about partner responsibilities, costs, and copyright issues. There was considerable interchange between the proponents with the parties meeting face-to-face at each other's locations.

Issues

According to the terms of the contract, the private institution was to have reimbursed the public institution for travel costs incurred. Apparently, this had not occurred.

During the review process, the public institution provided a copy of its curriculum to the private institution, with the requirement that it not be copied. Although the proposed partnership did not proceed, the public institution was very concerned that the curriculum was not returned for a considerable length of time, and only after considerable discussion between the two primary partners that the curriculum was not to be shared. The interviewee at the public institution wondered if "there are copies of it floating around in different institutions" in the other province.

The public institution indicated that these two issues resulted in a loss of trust in the relationship with the private partner.

Outcomes

The partnership did not proceed beyond the preliminary stages as the private partner was not able to generate sufficient interest in it in their home province.

As described below in Vignette 12, the proposed partnership was for the joint delivery of a Practical Nursing program from another country, in this case the United States of America, in B.C.

Vignette 12

Proposal for Offering an American Program in B.C.

Nature of the Partnership

The private institution in B.C. approached a public institution in another country about offering the Practical Nursing curriculum of the out-of-country jurisdiction in B.C.

Why the Proposal did not Meet Study Criteria

The prospective public partner was not located in the province.

Benefits to the Partners

The private institution in B.C. would have had the benefit of a well-developed curriculum. The private institution had assessed that it would not have to go through the process of obtaining approval for its program from the College of Licensed Practical Nurses of British Columbia, because program graduates could write the licensing exams of the jurisdiction of the public partner and transfer the licensure obtained in the other jurisdiction to B.C.

The private partner would have been permitted by the public institution to be responsible for all instruction in the program, with back-up, including teaching staff, as needed from the public institution.

Processes

The proposed partnership had already been approved at institutional and governmental levels in the jurisdiction of the public partner.

The private institution requested that the public partner participate in all the hiring processes for the program.

The private institution felt very comfortable with the decisions, responsiveness, communications, and business ethics of the public institution in the other jurisdiction.

The private institution intended to place students for clinical placements in some private health care facilities in B.C.

Outcomes

The proposed partnership had not yet been implemented. The prospective American partner was waiting for the private college to make the decision to proceed. That decision was going to be made entirely on the private partner's assessment of remaining market share of prospective students in the field. At the time of the interview, it was the private college's assessment that there may already be too many similar programs in the province.

Other Potential Partnerships

In addition to being asked questions about specific existing partnerships and partnerships about which they had been approached, interviewees were asked the more hypothetical question about what other partnerships they could envision for their institutions. A review of the responses by both public and private sector interviewees reveals a limited number of other ideas which might have potential as partnerships.

Responses of Public Sector Interviewees

One quite specific idea that was presented by an interviewee at a public sector institution was for academic consultation and research and scholarly activity in one program area. The interviewee was giving consideration to seeking an informal agreement to receive consultation about scholarly activities related to a nursing degree program with a private university in B.C. that has been running the program for a number of years. This was a particularly

interesting response given the large number of public institutions, specifically comprehensive universities and university colleges, which have been offering the same type of program for many years, and which could offer this service. Perhaps one reason is that, historically, there have been various failed attempts at collaborative activities for this program area among public institutions in this province.

An interviewee at an urban public sector institution commented that it would be interesting to be in a partnership with a private sector institution in order to find out how private sector institutions are managed. The interviewee also expressed interest in learning how private sector institution manage flexible curriculum approaches.

Another idea presented by an interviewee at a large urban public college for future consideration was to have private institutions offer the first year of some applied degree programs. This would be similar to earlier ideas of private institutions offering certificate level programming which would ladder into diploma and other higher level programs.

In answering the question about other potential partnerships, some of the public sector interviewees added caveats to activities they might propose. One interviewee noted that the institution would not consider a partnership in a program area in which the private institution did not have some form of external certification. One of the interviewees from a university echoed the importance of some form of program accreditation having been achieved by the private institution before a partnership would be considered. This type of stance would probably eliminate first year programming.

In addition to concerns that have been illustrated above about quality at the program level, one interviewee at a public college stated the caveat that, based on recent experiences, there is some sensitivity about partnering with private colleges, but that a partnership with "a very highly regarded private institution" might be possible. In this example, the University of Phoenix was named as such an institution. It is notable that the University of Phoenix is a for-profit institution.

Finally, several urban and rural public sector interviewees made a common point: "Why would they partner with a private institution when there were so many opportunities to partner with other public institutions?" Reasons put forward included the ease of working with someone with common values and culture, and no need to be concerned about curriculum ownership issues. (Public institutions may find that issues of curriculum ownership within the public sector itself will increasingly emerge now that the B.C. government is not funding curriculum projects for post-secondary education directly.)

Responses of Private Sector Interviewees

In answer to the specific question about potential partnerships, one private sector interviewee in a small college suggested that, for the purposes of curriculum development with standardization of the curriculum provincially, it would conceivably be possible for all public and private institutions intending to use the curriculum to each pay a portion of its development costs. All institutions which participated in the cost sharing would then have usage rights. The interviewee felt that other private institutions would likely be willing to pay a share as a common curriculum has business value to them. Related to this idea,

some private sector interviewees proposed that they could jointly seek funding for curriculum development projects with public institutions.

More than one private sector interviewee mentioned the idea of curriculum laddering for students from one year of study to another, or from one credential to another, in partnership with a public institution. Such laddering could be in either direction: public to private, or private to public. It was acknowledged that there would probably be some issues with licensing bodies regarding program accreditation with some laddering. One interviewee indicated that, whereas private institutions don't typically have the resources to offer a four-year program, they could certainly be offering the first semester or first year of a program in association with a public institution. Related to that, one interviewee felt that private institutions could serve as "entry-level training and screening mechanisms" for the public institutions in some program areas. Private colleges could help students upgrade to meet the entry-level requirements at public institutions.

Another idea put forward was to have private sector instructors oriented by the public institutions as to expectations regarding transfer credit. This was viewed as having the potential to be an important opportunity to assist students.

One private sector interviewee mentioned sharing lab resources as a potential partnership. The substantial difference in such resources between public and private institutions was noted.

Applied research was put forward as a partnership possibility by one private sector interviewee. No specifics were provided.

The interviewees from private institutions did not generate many additional ideas in direct response to the question about potential partnerships.

However, other examples of the ideas for potential partnerships by private sector institutions were documented in the vignettes provided earlier in this chapter. The array of potential partnerships is rich.

One interviewee indicated that, based on past experience with a public institution, an individual partnership with a public institution would not be considered. However, related activities, such as joint professional development activities with groups of public and private instructors, would be welcomed.

Strategic Outcomes

The limited array and number of examples of existing partnerships between public and private institutions related to health programs leads to further reflection on the answers provided by public and private institutions to the generic question not associated with a particular example of a partnership, "What strategic outcomes could you see your organizations achieving through partnerships with a public/private institution?"

The interviewees provided a number of ideas about strategic outcomes which could be met through partnerships with the other sector. Some of these would occur through individual "inter-institutional" partnerships, and some would be based on "system" partnerships.

Public Sector Responses

For the interviewee from a large urban institution, strategic outcomes of importance for the institution which could be met through partnerships with private sector institutions included, "enlarging your span of input, so your whole network is enlarged ... your whole breadth and depth of your organization and

partnerships." It seems that, if it is possible to achieve these goals for the institution through partnerships, then, generally, partnerships would be seen as having a positive effect.

More specifically, the majority of public sector interviewees at different types of institutions cited increased enrollments, meeting FTE targets, and increased revenues through contact with new student groups to be strategic outcomes that would provide a motivation for partnerships with the private sector.

Some interviewees at public institutions saw an opportunity to achieve their intended enrollment and revenue outcomes by partnering with private institutions which cater to the needs of international students who are either currently located either in Canada or outside of it. One interviewee described the importance of international students to the public institution and that there is a strategic plan in place to reach international students.

Interviewees at two colleges and a university college indicated that partnerships in the international arena can also provide opportunities for some additional learning and professional development experiences for faculty and students which might not otherwise be possible. This included cross-cultural learning.

Two of the public sector interviewees referred to what they would characterize as social reasons for considering public-private partnerships. An example provided by one interviewee referred to partnerships as enhancing the possibility of enabling the provision of educational opportunities to immigrant populations and thus making a significant contribution to society. Such partnerships may provide a mechanism for public institutions to meet

community needs, and to build relationships in the community, in ways that would not ordinarily be the case and that would, in turn, have the effect of strengthening the resources of the public sector institution's programming.

Another interviewee at a public institution indicated that the institution was taking a "strategic perspective on creating linkages with other institutions." This interviewee indicated that, "Certainly, there was no intention not to include credible private institutions. It's just simply that we have not really gone down that road" in deliberations.

One public institution interviewee identified an important strategic outcome private institutions might achieve from partnerships with public institutions. The strategic outcome this interviewee had in mind would be achievement of transfer credit. However, the interviewee did note that this outcome would need to be achieved at the system level and that, "the real strategic kind of partnership isn't actually at the institution to institution level, but at the system level."

One public institution interviewee provided the view that the credibility of public institutions could be enhanced by partnerships with private institutions if an outcome was more flexible programming to serve individual and community needs.

That interviewee was the only public sector interviewee to refer to any enhancement of credibility for public institutions. In fact, an interviewee from a large public sector institution expressed the view that the reputation of the public institution must be carefully guarded during any type of collaborative activity as it has considerable value, and has been developed over many years and at considerable cost. This interviewee indicated that a private institution could

enhance its own reputation through a partnership because of the resultant affiliation with the good reputation of the public institution. That would be an important strategic outcome for the private institution.

Similar to the comments about credibility, the interviewees at two rural institutions referred to the idea that, particularly at smaller institutions such as their own, it also might be possible that, by partnering with a private institution, a program might be initiated which might not otherwise get off the ground, with positive outcomes for the community. This would enhance the institution's reputation also.

Basically, public institutions are interested in partnerships if they both service the obvious educational need and strengthen existing institutional resources, with no threat to institutional credibility.

Private Sector Responses

Private sector institutions described a variety of strategic outcomes that they could reach by partnering with a public post-secondary educational institution. Many of the strategic outcomes that were seen as possibly being achieved through a partnership with a public institution were similar to those referenced by the public institutions.

A small private institution stated the desire to achieve a strategic outcome related to enhancing the predictability and stability of enrollments, which is, of course, somewhat dependent on predictability of offerings. In this case, ultimately, the related strategic outcome is financial stability while providing service to students. The same institution's interviewee also stated a strategic

outcome as being to offer a larger range of programs by a partnership with a public institution.

The same private sector interviewee also noted the strategic outcome of his institution related to quality within the institution's programs and felt that working with public sector institutions could assist with that. One private sector interviewee indicated that credibility was an important strategic outcome which might be met by a partnership with a public institution.

A private institution interviewee described the desire of his institution to increase the opportunities for graduates of their programs to be able to move into programs in the public institutions which have been articulated between the institutions. This would be a very tangible form of recognition of the private institution with positive outcomes for students and achievement of a tangible strategic outcome by the private institution of helping students progress on to further education. The interviewee provided the view that, at least in the case of private educational institutions, "what is good for the student, is good for business," if not in the short-term, then in the longer-term.

The interviewee at one college-type private sector institution stated that the organization would not consider a direct partnership with a public institution, but would be willing to collaborate within the post-secondary education system with public institutions as a group. Examples of collaboration could include attending common meetings on common issues, and attending educator's conferences. Strategically, the goal of such participation would be that, "We don't want to be the substandard group of the private schools. We want to be equal out there in the arena." Credibility is the currency being sought.

Participating in the interview on behalf of private sector constituents, the interviewee from an umbrella organization stated that "the process of curriculum development would be augmented and facilitated by partnerships with a private institution."

Some private institutions had ideas as to what strategic outcomes public sector institutions might achieve from partnerships with private institutions. One such idea which would help public institutions to meet their strategic direction of identifying new revenue streams would be to allow their facilities to be used by private institutions when they otherwise would be empty. This was considered to be useful strategically for those private institutions which cannot manage the overhead costs associated with some types of programs but could be quite flexible in their utilization of the public facilities.

Some representatives of private institutions proposed another strategic direction for publicly funded institutions that the private institutions could contribute to. Now that the publicly funded colleges can offer degree programs and are actively seeking to do so, the private institutions could take over training of less length, such as certificate and diploma programs. This would help the private institution to achieve their own strategic outcome of being more consistent in their program offerings. One private sector interviewee noted that what often happens in her area is that they make a program offering known, only to find that, at the last moment, the local public institution receives additional funding and makes additional seats in their program area available, thus making the enrollment numbers in their own program less than viable.

The interviewee from a small rural college probably had the most astute statement about strategic outcomes at private sector institutions: "I think,

strategically, frankly, for private sector institutions to try and compete with publicly funded programs is kind of foolish in a lot of ways." The strategic outcome for private institutions would be to find a way to collaborate.

Advantages of Working With the Other Sector

With the distinct lack of existing partnerships between public and private institutions, the few approaches about partnerships between the institutions, and some of the distinctly negative attitudes about each other's institutions, it was interesting to observe that interviewees at both public and private institutions were able to envision some advantages that derive from partnerships with institutions in the other sector. It should be noted that, in some cases, what an interviewee might cite as an advantage of working with an institution in the other sector could also be interpreted as a benefit.

Public Sector Responses

Several of the public institutions did not provide any comment on what advantages there might be to their institutions from partnerships with private sector post-secondary educational institutions.

A number of the responses from other public institutions about what advantages there might be cited the entrepreneurial side of education administration. Public sector interviewees acknowledged that administrators of private institutions are in the "business of education" and that the public sector institution might be able to learn some business approaches from them. For example, one university-based interviewee felt that his institution could learn from the private sector about how to cost programs, although the interviewee

noted that for them this may have limited impact because, generally, the institution may not unilaterally raise tuition fees for its base programs. Learning the entrepreneurship skills of the private sector in terms of how to evaluate a potential opportunity and then capitalize on that opportunity were also considered advantages for a public institution that might stem from a partnership with a private institution.

Another advantage cited by two public sector interviewees was that it might be possible for the public institutions to "externalize" some costs, depending on the private institution. For example, the private institution might come to the partnership with either capital resources or labour-intensive resources or might be able to charge extra fees with revenue-sharing with the public institution. The interviewee noted, however, that, generally, the capital requirements for most health programs are modest. Another public sector interviewee also noted that the ability to share resources such as faculty, staff, and clinical space might be an advantage of a partnership under certain circumstances.

Several public sector interviewees noted that the responsiveness and flexibility of the private institutions would be an advantage in a partnership. One other interviewee indicated that she felt that there would be potential for learning from "well-run private institutions" with regard to designing a flexible curriculum.

An important facet of working with the private sector cited by one interviewee was the increase in marketing capability and being able to "market to a larger audience with really sort of minimal cost to us". Linked with this was

the ability of the public sector institution to generate more revenue through a partnership.

Two interviewees, one at a university, the other at a college, indicated that if a large well-backed private institution with a good reputation and external accreditation in place in, for example, the United States, approached them, this would probably be a welcome partnership. One of the two interviewees indicated that the institution already had many partnerships with other public sector institutions and wouldn't find a particular advantage to partner with local private "small operators".

One interviewee stated a concern that her institution already does almost everything that any private institution might do so there was no real need for, or advantage to, a partnership. Her comment was "where you find a private institution that's doing work that you don't, and not only that you don't but that you don't think you're going to do in the future, that's the magical partnership".

Private Sector Responses

A private sector interviewee referred to two types of advantages for a private sector institution working with a public sector institution, "perceptual" advantages and "factual" advantages. Based on this interviewee's comments, a perceptual advantage is less concrete than a factual advantage. A perceptual advantage for a private institution working with a public institution would be, for example, a perception by the potential student body that it had the same high standards as the public institution. This would be good for the private institution in terms of its own marketing. The interviewee noted that an exception to this

perception might be the case of some immigrants, those that come from countries in which private sector institutions are considered to have higher standards.

The "factual" advantage cited by this interviewee would be the tangible outcomes of the partnership, for example, allowing students to transfer, with appropriate credit, between public and private institutions. Other institutions spoke to the creation of opportunities for students to bridge between programs in public and private institutions as being an important outcome. It was noted that this could be important to public sector institutions in terms of them filling their seats each year.

Another interviewee noted that one advantage of a private sector institution working in a partnership with a public institution would be potential access to facilities that the private sector doesn't have and for which the private sector may not have the capital which the public sector has. More than one interviewee cited this as being an advantage.

Another private sector interviewee cited that an advantage for the private institution of working in partnership was staying current, including in approaches used in educating nurses. This interviewee also felt that a partnership was a way for her institution to be visible and "on the team" and "at the table " with a voice. The underlying intent seemed to be the idea of making a contribution in terms of sharing experiences with the public institutions and receiving benefit.

As in the public sector, one private sector interviewee noted that a partnership would permit, "a good cross-over of intellectual resources." This was echoed by another private sector interviewee who referred to opportunities for both sides to expand their knowledge and improve as educators.

Referring to a variety of potential partnerships his organization has considered previously or was currently entertaining, the interviewee from another private college referred to several advantages, including broader marketing opportunities through the other organization, increased recognition just from being associated with the public institution, use of a curriculum that the public partner already has in place, smoother access to accreditation, expanded and perhaps more reliable student numbers. Another advantage cited from a partnership with a public institution was access to increased credibility from just being associated with the public institution. The interviewee described it as "a safeguard for us". This interviewee noted that, in international projects, it is often easier to attract high quality instructors because of the opportunities available through international work.

The private sector interviewee noted an advantage for a public partner from working with his unique organization specifically, access to the wealth of information that the interviewee possessed about activities in other private institutions in Canada. This interviewee also said that the public institution in a partnership would have access to an additional revenue source.

The matter of acquiring credibility by virtue of association with a public institution also arose. More than one private institution mentioned this.

Comments

Both public and private institutions felt that learning would occur, at least at the faculty level, from the two types of organizations working in partnership. Both public and private interviewees referred to administrators also learning about each other's delivery models and operational efficiencies. One private

college referred to institutional flexibility and that, "the public institutions are starting to, you know, recognize some of the strengths that private institutions have in those areas."

Barriers and Issues

Interviewees made many comments from their experience about the barriers to, and issues regarding, working in partnership with the other sector. Although not an exact match, the comments have been categorized using some of the same categories as the boundaries between public and private institutions identified in Chapter Three that may influence the possibilities of partnerships.

Accountabilities and Policies

Interviewees from both public and private institutions have given the impression that their respective sectors bear the heavier burden of accountabilities. Both public and private institutions have external accountabilities, although these may be different in nature. Comments documented earlier from private institutions about their view of their burden of accountabilities and that the government needs to "level the playing field" so that the private institutions, and their students, aren't undermined by policies, were described earlier.

Some private sector interviewees cited the different accountabilities faced by their institutions, such as, a condition of funding being required to monitor and take action about student attendance, and meeting post-program job placement standards, noting that these may interfere with a partnership.

Private sector interviewees noted that a challenge in working with public sector institutions is the autonomy of those institutions which, from the private perspective, is seen as allowing them to "do what they want," despite government directives. Public sector institutions might disagree with that assessment of their freedom to act.

Private sector interviewees noted that a specific issue in a partnership would be aligning policies, for example, in regard who is permitted to enter a program. The two types of institutions may need to standardize policies for a specific project if they were going to work together.

Two (then) university colleges which participated in this study indicated the different accountabilities of the two types of institutions as being an issue. The interviewee at a rural college referred to the many "checks and balances" in place for public institutions, including mandated program review processes. Public institutions are expected to have various processes in place to protect students, including policies and procedures regarding, for example, the termination of students for poor performance.

Philosophy

Philosophical issues were described by several institutions as barriers to partnerships. The interviewee at a university college indicated that proposed partnerships with private institutions have been declined, not by the management of the public institution, but by the faculty-populated Education Council, because they were opposed to a partnership with an organization which offered education for profit.

One public sector interviewee summed up the matter of philosophy in these partnerships by saying, "the private institutions, they are private business people, and they sometimes tend to look at the bottom line whereas, in the public institutions, we sometimes look at the broader educational issues."

The interviewee from a university indicated that the "academic machine" at the university could result in any consideration of a partnership with a private institution being, at the least, "fairly fractious." According to this university administrator, at the heart of the argument which might be made would be some of the cultural differences from private institutions, including perspectives on academic freedom, scholarship, and control over quality in a partnership arrangement. Also, a university-based interviewee cited "a real wariness about being co-opted by the profit motive."

Two interviewees referred to existing tensions between their institutions and local private institutions which had shown up in public behaviors, with the public institutions being labeled as engaging in "unfair competition" or at least encroachment on the business of the private institution because of lower publicly subsidized tuition rates.

One interviewee from a small college noted that the board of his institution expressed concerns about offering a cost-recovery program, although their Continuing Education department does that all the time, and working with an institution that needed to make a profit.

Other issues cited regarding competition were even less concrete. An interviewee from a rural college described that, because private institutions, by their very nature, work in a competitive environment, they may have values which do not match those of public sector institutions and can result in different

behaviors. The interviewee at another rural college felt that publicly funded institutions are more "altruistic." The interviewee noted that there is also competition between post-secondary institutions but that they work the issues through, and are able to come to an understanding as to where the institutions will compete and where they will collaborate.

Several of the public institutions expressed concern about losing their curriculum to the potential private partner. The underlying thread of this argument, as noted by several of the public sector interviewees, is that the taxpayer paid for the curriculum and it seems inappropriate for it to be used by an institution expecting to profit monetarily by its use.

Attitudes

Private sector interviewees cited "trust issues on both sides," particularly around sharing curriculum. A private sector interviewee noted that private institutions put a lot of resources into course development and are reluctant to share what they consider to be proprietary material. More than one interviewee at a private institution indicated that the public sector institutions "steal" their employees and, through those employees, the curriculum. Also, interviewees at two private institutions described their fear of loss of their program to a public sector partner, and used the term "steal."

On the other hand, there was concern that the provincial curriculum, which, in some cases (e.g. the program preparing Licensed Practical Nurses), must be used by an institution if it wishes to seek accreditation for its program, is not being made accessible. As one private institution stated, "I believe that

curriculum is available, but I don't know if it's available to us," the "us' being private sector institutions.

One administrator at a public institution indicated that, given that private sector institutions are having an impact on their enrollments, it would probably be wise to partner with them.

There were public sector administrators who also felt that they could learn from working with private sector institutions.

Culture/Organizational Culture

The matter of quality of programming arose in several interviews. Many of the concerns stated by a large urban public institution related to placing its financially-valuable and hard-won reputation at risk if it worked with a private institution that did not offer quality programming. The concerns seem to be about dissimilar values and resultant dissimilar attention to academic rigor.

Administration

Private sector interviewees described one problematic area when working with a public institution. It was noted that with regard to as simple a matter as articulation of credit, the elapsed time required for decision-making processes and making changes in curricula was problematic for private institutions in which decisions can be made more quickly. An interviewee provided an illustration of the perceived difference in decision-making at private and public institutions. The comparison made was, "It's like turning a rowboat and turning a battleship." These examples of "bureaucratic inertia" were described by private

sector interviewees as being barriers to public and private sector institutions attempting to work together.

Another aspect of the issue of decision-making described by one private sector interviewee was that in a partnership with a public institution, "All of a sudden the decision-making process isn't yours anymore. You're not dealing with the 'owner' anymore." Also, it seemed problematic to at least one of the private institutions, that at a public institution, processes can be vetoed at the final review by an Education Council of faculty at a public institution and that this has happened.

The interviewee at a private college was also aware of objections from "certain individuals or factions within the public sector, or within the public partner, not wanting to align themselves with a private institution." This was a reference to unions within the public sector institutions.

Another issue cited by a private interviewee was the matter of ensuring communication. The interviewee felt that this would be the biggest problem as the two types of institutions communicate differently about the business enterprise of education.

Another administrative issue was that public institutions don't like the idea of faculty from their institutions "moonlighting at privates." The public sector pays for substantial education leaves and pays for professional development for faculty. It is the perception that privates do not provide this for their own faculty and, therefore, gains an advantage when they hire faculty from public institution even on a part-time or short-term basis while those faculty members are on their generous vacation or professional development periods.

An interviewee at a large public institution presented another concern. Generally, public institutions are larger and a partnership would suffer simply from a power imbalance in relationships. One private interviewee also felt that, in a partnership with a public sector institution, they might simply be overwhelmed, given the size and resources of the public partner. Another private institution cited loss of "territory" to the public sector as being an issue in a partnership.

Reputation

As has been noted earlier in this chapter in the descriptions of responses of some public sector interviewees , there is some sensitivity about partnering with private colleges. The responses of some interviewees in public institutions indicated their awareness of the importance of their reputations as an institution and the value of that reputation in a partnership with private institutions. One interviewee from a large public institution indicated that when approached by a private institution, the faculty felt that the private institution "just wanted our name." On the other hand, a public sector interviewee indicated that they might be interested in a partnership with a well-respected private institution such as the University of Phoenix.

The reference to the "perceptual" advantages of partnerships in the responses of private sector institutions described earlier is closely related to the reputation of the public institutions.

Summary

This chapter began with an analysis of the context of the study as described by the interviewees themselves, focusing particularly on the educational philosophies of the interviewees and the attitudes of interviewees about the other sector. There was evidence, from the answers to a variety of questions, that public sector interviewees have some significant negative attitudes toward the private sector in general, with concerns about program quality, some lack of trust of private institutions, and a philosophical distaste for private post-secondary education.

Private sector interviewees were keenly aware of the attitudes of the public sector toward them. There was some evidence of distrust of public sector institutions, particularly related to specific interactions that had taken place as offers of partnerships were made.

The chapter also examined the context created by government with regard to post-secondary education and the role of government as seen by public and private sector interviewees and as stated by the government interviewee. Public sector interviewees particularly expressed concern that government was not being clear as to the intended role and status of private sector post-secondary education. The government interviewee described some actions that government had taken to "level the playing field" between public and private institutions.

A key finding from the interviews was that there were few existing partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions in this area of endeavor in B.C. Interviewees from both sectors described concerns about working with institutions in the other sector although the concerns varied

between sectors. When specifically asked, however, both public and private institutions could cite some actual and potential advantages of, and benefits from, working with the other sector. However, there was one notable difference between replies: Concerns about the quality of the programming in the private institutions were mentioned by public institutions but not by private institutions.

It is particularly notable that none of the private sector interviewees cited instances of having received an approach about a partnership from a public sector institution. Many of the private sector interviewees had made approaches about partnerships to public sector institutions.

This chapter provided examples of actual partnerships and those for which approaches had been made, the majority of which did not evolve beyond the proposal stage. The examples include those which would have met the requirements of the study had they evolved and a few that would not have met the requirements but were instructive regarding potential partnerships in other ways. Information about the nature, evolution, internal processes, benefits, unanticipated outcomes of some of the partnerships or proposed partnerships were described.

Interviewees described a broad range of ideas for partnerships, although private sector interviewees expressed many more ideas than public sector interviewees. Institutions in both sectors cited greater enrollments and revenues as being important potential outcomes of partnerships. Partnership outcomes related to community service and research were mentioned only occasionally. Only interviewees in the public sector spoke about partnerships for community service purposes. Provincial curriculum development activities involving public

and private sector institutions were mentioned by interviewees from private institutions.

Both public and private institutions could envision advantages of partnerships with the other sector. These ranged widely.

Interviewees described a number of barriers to partnerships, and issues related to them. These included accountabilities and policies, philosophy, attitudes, culture and organizational culture, administration, and reputation.

The next chapter examines how some of the findings of the study relate to the academic literature of both business and post-secondary education with the goal of developing a framework for understanding partnerships between public and private post-secondary institutions.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION

Introduction

This chapter relates the findings of the study to the academic literature and contextual information which were reviewed earlier, in order to develop a framework for understanding educational partnerships between public and PCTIA-accredited private post-secondary institutions offering health programs in British Columbia.

There were a number of inter-related findings of the study that, with appropriate analysis based on the perspectives found in the pertinent academic literature, assisted in achieving this underlying purpose of the study. These are described in the next sections.

Few Partnerships or Proposals for Partnerships

The most obvious finding of the study was the very limited number of existing partnerships that could be considered for any type of analysis in order to develop a framework for understanding partnerships. This was reflective of the academic literature of post-secondary education in which there were no descriptions of the specific type of partnerships being considered in this study.

The absence of existing partnerships was particularly noteworthy when compared to the relatively large number and variety of potential partnerships and possibilities for partnerships described by the interviewees. There were a number of elements, reflected in the comments of interviewees, that were considered in assessing why this is so. These elements were critical to the

development of a framework for understanding educational partnerships of the kind being examined in the study.

Distrust and Negative Attitudes

In this study, interviewees described a lack of trust between the two types of institutions. Negative attitudes were evident in both directions, although not necessarily universal, between the public and private sectors. As described in Chapter Two, the literature of business indicated that trust (Svendsen, Boutilier, & Wheeler; Ward, 2001) and a "willingness to cooperate" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39) are essential to partnerships. Leadbeater (1999) referred to the importance of "networks of social relationships" (p. 11) and Ward (2001) described the need for the development of a "culture of collaboration" (p. 10), as the basis for partnership-type activities. Presumably, if some version of these positive relational states did not exist, neither would partnerships.

When the comments of interviewees in this study and the comments of writers of the academic literature are considered together, four possible sources of the lack of trust and negative attitudes can be proposed.

Lack of Knowledge About the Potential Partner

Sweet (1996a), writing about Canadian private institutions from the perspective of a public sector educator, stated that "Knowing more about these schools would contribute to our understanding of their position and potential within the postsecondary training system" (p. 31). It has already been noted that the amount of academic research and published literature about private post-secondary institutions in Canada is limited (Maher, 1998; Sweet, 1996a; Sweet &

Gallagher, 1999). The same is true within the province of British Columbia (Maher, 1998). Other than the very limited amount and variable type of information on the websites of private institutions, and the lists of private institutions on the PCTIA website (PCTIA, 2008), there is really no easily accessible information about private institutions. Public institutions which might consider a partnership with a private institution can obtain only very limited information about the prospective partner institution other than from the institution itself. For a potential partner in a private sector institution, the web sites of public institutions contain a much more extensive array of information.

Logically, this leads to a question that should be considered at some point: "What type of information would partners want to know about each other in order to inspire trust, if a partnership is being considered?"

Philosophical Disagreement

A second source of the distrust and negative attitudes found in this study is no doubt a reflection of a fundamental philosophical disagreement about post-secondary education, including whether it is a business from which profits should be made at the expense of students. The comments of authors in the American context are illustrative: Bok (2003) noted the "widespread distrust of business and business methods in academic circles" (p. 3); Keller (2001) described the view of publicly funded and non-profit educators about for-profit institutions as being "a crass intrusion, a sudden sprouting of coarse dandelions on the manicured lawns of higher learning" (p. ix); Ruch (2001) described the deeply held belief of public institutions, and particularly public universities, that "profits and the market are fundamentally antithetical to serving the needs of

society and of students" (p. 8), and that the public sector cannot see "how the profit motive could properly coexist with an educational mission" (p. 1).

In this study, public sector interviewees made statements that reflected these values with regard to private post-secondary education. One public sector interviewee expressed the view that there is the belief in the public sector that "all education should be sponsored by the government and God help anybody should be making money off education." It is not possible to know if the responses of public sectors interviewees would have varied if they had been asked to differentiate between partnering with for-profit and not-for-profit institutions in their responses.

The interviewees from the private sector in this study defended their stance that profit-making in post-secondary education was acceptable. A notable comment from a private interviewee was that, "Our business happens to be education, but we have to take education very, very seriously" in terms of ensuring benefits to students. The interviewee had thus expressed two, in this case, co-existing values: the value of business and the value of service to students. That particular interviewee did not seem to be prepared to let either value supersede the other.

Private sector interviewees demonstrated that they were keenly aware of the attitudes of some public sector educators toward their activities. One interviewee from the private sector referred to the public sector view that they could not possibly work with "those profit-oriented people."

In many respects, these remarks by interviewees parallel philosophical considerations debated in the literature about private post-secondary education (Altbach, 1999a; Bok, 1993; Clark, 1983) and about the juxtaposition of public and

private education (Altbach, 1999a; Galan, 2001; Geiger, 1986, 1987), and whether education is a business (Katz, 1999a, Lenington, 1996), as well as the attitudes of other educators (Ruch, 2001). The comments made by interviewees are similar to the concerns of public educators summarized in the Report of the Working Committee on Public-Private Articulation Agreements (B.C. Ministry of Education, Skills and Training and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology, 1997). For the purposes of considering potential partnerships, an important consideration is whether these different philosophies about post-secondary education can co-exist in a working relationship as intense as a partnership. Thus, understanding the perspectives of the potential partners about each other is important.

Concerns About Quality in the Private Sector

A third source of distrust and negative attitudes may have stemmed from concerns about the quality of private sector educational offerings. Of all the concerns that might have lead to distrust and negative attitudes, this was the one that seemed to be unidirectional – public institutions were concerned about the educational standards of the private institutions, and not particularly the reverse. Once again, private sector interviewees were aware of public sector attitudes in this regard. One private sector interviewee referred to the allegedly prevalent belief in the public sector that "a private educator could not possibly do as good a job of education as a public educator."

As noted in Chapter Four, there have been some anecdotal reports and reports in the media of administrative and quality-related issues among private

institutions. In B.C., PCTIA databases give no information about individual institutional quality for accredited institutions.

The limited academic literature about private institutions describes some measures of quality, including ability to find employment and earnings from employment (Li, 2006). Li's (2006) report from Canadian data from 2003 showed positive outcomes. Sweet's (1996b) examination of data about private post-secondary education in Manitoba noted that private institutions tend to have shorter programs but program length is geared to meet employment requirements. There is some information about some indicators of quality, such as student satisfaction with facilities (Sweet, 1996b). However, there is a need for recent research in the area of quality of program offerings.

Given the limited Canadian academic literature of post-secondary education about the quality of the program offerings of private institutions, one has to wonder whether the negative information about private institutions that appears from time-to-time in the local popular press (MacLeod, 2003), in non-academic publications about post-secondary education, and even in the B.C. government report, *Campus 2020: Thinking Ahead: The Report* (Plant, 2007), about instances when private institutions find themselves in difficulty, has had an impact on the attitudes of public sector interviewees.

Without defending these private institutions, it should be considered that there are also instances when public institutions have problems, such as with accreditation of particular programs. However, these instances seldom enter the arena of public knowledge or discussion. One other consideration is that, given the very large number of private institutions in B.C. (600+ at any given time) compared to the number of public institutions (26), it is not surprising that some

private institutions have difficulties. PCTIA publishes lists of private institutions whose institutional accreditation has been suspended. Suspensions may be for a variety of reasons which are not always programmatic in nature.

There is no data to support the belief that health programs offered by private institutions are fundamentally inferior. However, even one or two notable examples in a 20 year period can colour perceptions. In addressing the matter of quality of post-secondary education in Canada, the Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials (2008) indicates that each province has its own approaches to quality assurance which can include legislation, affiliation, transfer credit and articulation, external and internal reviews, institutional registration or licensing, and accreditation of specific programs leading to a professional status (p. 2). B.C. uses these quality mechanisms. In this study, interviewees from public institutions indicated that, in particular, they didn't trust the accreditation process of PCTIA for assurance of program quality.

Based on the findings of the study, these latter two sources of lack of trust seem to be more predominant in the public sector.

"Bad Experiences"

Another source of the lack of trust described by interviewees in this study from both sectors seems to come from what is portrayed as their own "bad" experiences" with specific potential partners in the other sector. These "bad experiences" seem to reflect concerns about the ethical behavior of the other in specified circumstances, rather than authenticated quality issues. In part, this is because there have been few partnerships and not much interaction between

individual institutions. Even the bad experiences described by interviewees are quite limited in number and in scope. Concrete examples presented by interviewees were limited to such items as inappropriate use of the other institution's curriculum materials and are, in fact, cited by both sectors.

In describing his previous work in public post-secondary education from the perspective of his current work in private post-secondary education, Ruch (2001) noted that in that earlier period, he had the view that "all proprietary institutions were the scum of the academic earth" (p. 1) from an ethical perspective. This language used in the academic literature reflects a strongly-held emotion about this matter.

The finding of distrust and negative attitudes is not entirely surprising, although the level of emotion in some of the comments of interviewees is.

Complementarity, Competition, and Self-Sufficiency Among Institutional Types

In examining the literature and the findings of the interviews from this study in an effort to understand partnerships, the question naturally arises as to whether there are particular types of institutions in the public and private sectors which may be potential partners and, if so, why. One of two existing partnerships described in the study were between somewhat unlikely partners, a public and a private institution located in different regions of the province. Many of the possibilities for partnerships described by interviewees posed a variety of possible permutations and combinations of institutional partnering.

Complementarity

The concept of complementarity between potential business partners (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a), as presented in the academic literature of business, becomes important here. An examination of the complementarity between the potential partners in this study may lead to a further understanding of why partnerships form, or not, in the B.C. context. The attempt to apply this concept to post-secondary education requires that the dilemma be stated: Can institutions which do not complement each other find a basis for a partnership? Can institutions which are highly similar find a basis for a partnership?

Some authors of the academic literature of business partnerships have evidently examined this matter in more detail. Bleeke and Ernst (1993a) indicated that, "Alliance partners should be complementary in the products, geographic presence or functional skills that they bring to the venture" (p. 14).

For the purposes of this study, the "products" (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a, p. 14) of the prospective partners in post-secondary education can be thought of as the educational programs being offered. Appendices K and L show the large and diverse array of health programs offered by the public institutions and the more limited breadth of programs offered by the private institutions in this study. Sweet's (1996b) work about private vocational training institutions in Canada described the array of programs and the generally shorter length of programs in those types of institutions. In this study, the interview population in the private sector contained those types of institutions.

The larger public institutions offer a wide range of programs and multiple levels within their program areas so that students could enter or exit at various

levels. Private institutions in B.C. tend to offer the more basic entry-level programs only.

As a result, "product" complementarity (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a) between public and private institutions in this study may not be so readily found because, at least at the lower and/or entry-levels, there is overlap of programs among public and private institutions. There is some potential complementarity in laddering of students between higher and lower levels of programs between institutions. This study provides examples of this, although limited, in terms of articulation between public and private institutions. Some of the interviewees from private colleges in this study had ideas for creating complementarity by offering preparatory programs. Offering this kind of program doesn't seem to be of great interest to the public institutions.

Another consideration with regard to complementarity is "geographic presence" (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a, p. 14). B.C. is a small province with a geography that imposes recognizable barriers to education for the population. B.C. has regions bounded by water and mountains. The public institutions cover the expanse of the province and, by virtue of Ministry actions culminating in 2008, there are public universities in most regions. Many of the newer universities also continue a college-type mandate and, combined with the public institutions which are exclusively colleges, provide college programs throughout the province. There are larger numbers of both public and private institutions in more populated areas.

Complementarity between institutions can be limited in contained geographic areas within the province. In this study, several institutions reported that public and private institutions were offering the same programs in the same

region to a similar population, and, thus, had become competitors. This was true in rural regions as well as the more densely populated urban areas, although there are subpopulations (e.g., recent immigrants) which tend to be the target populations of some of the private institutions in the urban areas, but not the public ones.

Complementarity of "functional skills" (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a, p. 14) between potential partners in the public and private sectors is more difficult to document. Examples from interviewees of functional skills or expertise offered by private institutions to public institutions to form the basis of a partnership included the ability to access international student groups, and experience in offering programs which were preparatory to programs of study leading to a credential at a public institution. Interviewees at some public institutions could envision learning some administrative skills from private institutions and also how to make their programs flexible and generate profit.

Competition

One interviewee from a large urban public institution explained: "We're in direct competition with private schools for programs of approximately the same length. Because we are in direct competition, it's hard to find the place for partnerships." That same interviewee also said, there are "very few places where we're not in the same business as the closest private school." Bleeke and Ernst (1993a) reported that partnerships are least successful, and, presumably, may not even be initiated, "when two partners bring competing products to the same shared distribution channel" (p. 15).

The academic literature describes the growing similarities of public and private institutions in terms of funding and, in a limited way, programs (Levy, 1999; Schuetze & Day, 2001). The cost-recovery activities of public institutions seeking to subsidize their core operations may, in some program areas, put them in competition with private institutions.

One private sector interviewee asked "Why doesn't the public institution focus on the longer, the three and four year training and why do they get involved in the six month or one year stuff?" The academic literature reflects the source of concern of public educators that private institutions "are not required to provide broad-based course offerings to serve the interest of the public good, leaving them free to hone in on lucrative niche markets" (Galan, 2001, p. 23).

Thus, the fear expressed by Katz (1999a) with regard to the use of information technology to deliver some types of programs, is also the fear of some public sector interviewees in this study, that private sector institutions will "'cherry pick' those offerings that subsidize much of the academy" (p. 36) by selecting programs that are entry-level and have the highest student numbers, leaving the public institutions to deliver the upper-year and more expensive programs which have lower enrollments.

Skolnik (2006) noted that, in Canada, private institutions tend to move into market niches that are not being addressed by public institutions and where their flexibility can be used to advantage. Skolnik (2006) noted that the direction taken by private institutions in Canada is to respond to the "excess demand for occupation-specific programs that are delivered on a fast-track to adults, in imaginative and flexible space-time configurations, employing learner-centered pedagogies, and using faculty who are not expected to do research" (p. 19).

Dennison and Schuetze (2004) indicated that private institutions "seek to offer niche programs to people unable to enroll in traditional programmes" (p. 34).

Self-Sufficiency

In attempting to understand partnerships, it may be useful to consider how much of an institution's willingness to partner is related to its need to collaborate. In writing about his model of inter-institutional co-operation with a focus on mergers between publicly funded post-secondary institutions, Lang (2002) indicated that "colleges and universities ... are attracted to inter-institutional co-operation in order to do things that they cannot do individually, usually because of a lack of wherewithal" (p. 17). This is a rather intuitive conclusion.

However, Lang (2002) further noted that inter-institutional co-operation is more likely to happen when a "system is not large and diverse, or the system is saturated to the point that every institution in it is at its capacity" (p. 23). Currently, the B.C. public post-secondary system is large, well-resourced, and not fully utilized, at least in terms of enrolments. In addition to those characteristics, all the public institutions have one strength which gives them a level of self-sufficiency which may not foster partnerships with private institutions – their relatively stable funding base.

The relative institutional and programmatic self-sufficiency of the public institutions must surely be a factor in regard to formation of partnerships because, as individual entities, they are already large, well-resourced, able to offer a wide range of programs and services for students, and firmly entrenched in the public post-secondary system. Possibly the smaller rural colleges are the

least well-endowed with regard to these elements of self-sufficiency among institutions in the public sector.

On a related point, Bleeke and Ernst (1993c) warned, "Alliances between strong and weak companies rarely work" (p. 18). The private institutions in which interviews for this study took place were all either small proprietary privately-operated institutions, like those studied by Sweet (1993, 1996a, 1996b) and Sweet and Gallagher (1999), or were small, local, and individually-owned and -managed franchises of larger conglomerates. The resources of a public institution could, inadvertently, overwhelm a smaller institution, a point made by at least one of the private sector interviewees in this study.

The relatively self-sufficient public institutions may not see the possible gains from partnering with private institutions as outweighing the perceived risks. One public sector interviewee noted that, if they saw opportunities to accomplish goals through partnerships, there are many other public institutions with which they can partner. Although there are possibilities, the existence of any real complementarity between public institutions that would drive them together as partners, other than for articulation and transfer-credit purposes, and to collaborate for Ministry-funded projects, could be questioned.

One other factor which may have contributed to the trend to not partner is a pragmatic one. It may simply have been easier for the interviewees in this study to identify when they should not partner with each other than when they should. Specifically, it may be easier for institutions, and require less investigation by them, to determine whether they do the same thing in the same location, than whether there is sufficient complementarity of "products,

geographic presence or functional skills" (Bleeke & Ernst, 1993a, p. 14) for a partnership.

Having considered complementarity, competition, and institutional self-sufficiency, it is still difficult to answer the question as to whether there are particular types of institutions across the public and private sectors that would be best able to be partners. Clearly, there are no absolute or categorical answers. A further examination of the ideas presented by interviewees about the potential purposes of partnerships is warranted, and is provided in the next section.

A Typology of Institutional Purposes of Partnerships

The literature about business partnerships presented in the academic literature speaks to the broad and generic purposes of partnerships, those being increasing business value (Doz & Hamel, 1998; Roussel, 2003; Ward, 2001) and reducing risk (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003c). For the purposes of this study, these could be termed the primary purposes of partnerships.

In this study, interviewees provided a range of purposes for the various partnerships they were participating in, had considered based on an approach from another institution, or could envision. Taken together, the ideas as to the purposes of specific partnerships had considerable breadth.

However, the examples of actual or possible partnerships provided by interviewees in this study did not specifically reference the primary purposes of partnerships cited in the business literature related to increasing the value of the business or reducing risk (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres & Robinson, 2003c; Ernst, 2003; Roussel, 2003; Ward, 2001). The purposes of partnerships described by the interviewees in this study comprise, in essence, a secondary level of purposes.

These secondary level purposes probably represent "incremental commitments to an unfolding strategy" (Bamford et al., 2003c, p. 37) in reaching the broader, primary level, purposes of partnerships. This is consistent with the view of Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003d) from the business literature that, "Alliances are a means to an end, never an end in themselves" (p. 73).

Many of the purposes of partnerships suggested by interviewees were consistent with the specific type, and secondary level, of partnerships described by various authors in the business literature, (Doz & Hamel, 1998; Gerybadze, 1994; Kuglin, 2002; Ward, 2001). Of course, the examples provided by the various authors from the business literature, and the context those authors describe, varied from the examples and context of post-secondary education in this study.

In Table 3, examples of specific partnership activities from the responses of interviewees have been grouped in the left hand column. A label for each grouping is provided in the right hand column. Together, the groupings in the right-hand column comprise the typology of purposes of partnerships.

Table 3

Typology of Purposes of Partnerships

Examples of Partnership Activities	Type of Purposes of Partnerships
Sharing facilities, buildings, equipment	Sharing physical assets
Generating revenue	Generating revenue (or increasing assets)
Helping students: learn, complete a preparatory or laddered program, obtain a credential, transfer credit	Meeting clients needs
Human resource development, staff, marketing, instruction, business management of post-secondary education, curriculum development processes, use of technology	Developing and sharing expertise
Making transfer credit arrangements; helping students in a laddered program; helping graduates got a job; offering a degree program	Building positive recognition, credibility, reputation, span of influence
Sharing clinical placements, practicum sites	Sharing system resources
Developing new programs, completing needs assessments, developing curricula, conducting relevant research projects	Completing research and development activities; Contributing to development of knowledge
Combining and laddering programs	Reconfiguring assets
Increasing enrollments, either within a class or with multiple classes.	Achieving economies of scale
Finding international students within Canada and in their home countries	Reaching, penetrating, and serving new and existing audiences/customers/markets locally and internationally
Serving specific groups in a community, educating immigrants	Serving society in general; Contributing to social purposes

The purposes of partnerships in the typology above are not new or necessarily exclusive to this study. Many have been described, in a general way, in the literature of business. For example, Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, and Robinson (2003a) referred to partnerships for "creating new skills" (p. 79) among the partners. Doz and Hamel (1998) described partnerships to achieve "economies of scale" (p. 6). Those authors (Doz & Hamel, 1998) also described partnerships for the purpose of reaching new audiences in "marginal, but well-known market segments" (p. 6). Similarly, Bamford et al., (2003a) referred to partnerships for the purpose of "entering emerging markets" (p. 79) and Gerybadze (1994) has described partnerships to achieve "the access or greater penetration of a particular market or customer group" (p. 16). Gerybadze (1994) referred to partnerships with a "social goal" (p. 16).

Based on the interviews, it is notable that private institutions did not specifically mention partnerships with a social purpose. Only the public institutions mentioned these types of purposes. Although private colleges were capable of carrying out partnerships with those purposes, they may not be of highest priority for those institutions given their size and the demands on them, and particularly the small proprietary institutions, in terms of livelihood.

Program Accreditation

The need for institutions to have some of their health programs approved or accredited by professional licensing bodies may also be a factor in the limited number of partnerships found in this study. The accreditation processes are rather arduous and to the educational institutions it may seem difficult to

incorporate a partner into the process. Licensing bodies may face challenges when presented with documentation for a program from two partners.

A Special Purpose: Partnerships in the Context of Globalization

There is much evidence that globalization and/or internationalization is having an impact on post-secondary education in B.C. (Evans, 2006). One piece of evidence is in the work of Plant (2007) in reviewing the B.C. post-secondary system. The author (Plant, 2007) suggests that one reason that the B.C. government is concerned about the quality, viability, and ethics of private post-secondary institutions is because of the interconnectedness of countries and the economic impact in the province if other countries don't trust the B.C. post-secondary system.

Several of the interviewees in private institutions mentioned that they had developed considerable working relationships in other countries, in some cases for many years. Those interviewees described how they could establish viable partnerships with public institutions in B.C. to assist those public institutions to work with, and directly in, other countries for a possible range of benefits. These benefits were described as ranging from practical international and cultural experiences for B.C. students, to bringing international students to B.C. for training, thereby generating both enrollments and revenue for the partners. The interviewees described their, unfortunately to date, futile efforts to engage in such partnerships. It was noted that some public institutions already had their own connections in at least one other country. However, in essence, the private institutions had a form of valuable social capital (Leadbeater, 1999; Svendsen,

Boutilier, & Wheeler, 2003) which they were willing to share in a partnership for mutual benefit to jointly increase business value in an international marketplace. The public institutions didn't take the particular opportunities offered by the private organization. Yet, the literature of business indicates that partnerships are useful for, among other things, "entering emerging markets" (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres, & Robinson, 2003a, p. 79).

The change in information technology that is described as a key facet of globalization (Svendsen, Boutilier, & Wheeler, 2003), also does not seem to be of huge significance to post-secondary education in BC. Although the literature of post-secondary education speaks to the competition created by for-profit online educational institutions, the interviewees from B.C. public institutions did not make particular references to it as being either a threat or an opportunity that they had considered. One public institution in this study had an existing partnership with a private institution which offered courses online. None of the private institutions interviewed were major online institutions.

A "Synthesis of Theories"

The findings of this study and the analysis above lend themselves to consideration of the "synthesis of theories of interorganizational collaboration" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39) proposed by Alter and Hage (1993). Those authors concluded that, in the context of business, "four factors are necessary for the development of collaboration between firms and agencies: the willingness to collaborate, the need for expertise, the need for funds, and the need for adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 42). Adaptive efficiency is defined "as the

length of time needed to develop a new product, times the amount of effort needed" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39).

If the four factors proposed by Alter and Hage (1993) are considered with the information gathered in this study about post-secondary partnerships, the prospects for partnerships between public and private institutions seem rather limited. Given the trust issues evident in the comments of interviewees, the evidence that there is a willingness to collaborate among the parties is limited. The expertise of the private sector may be unknown or not valued by the public sector. The need for funds may predominate in the private sector, although it is also important for the public sector. Finally, the "adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39) of the public institutions, considering the cycle of decision-making processes, and the constraints of both governance structures and unionization, as described in the academic literature of post-secondary education, may be limited.

Institutional Compatibility

When the concepts of complementarity, competition, individual institutional self-sufficiency, and "adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 39) among institutional types, are taken together and then combined with the typology of purposes of partnerships, they create, for any given proposed or actual partnership, a picture of institutional compatibility. This picture contributes to our understanding of why, in the presence of suitable attitudes regarding collaborative activities, certain institutions might become partners.

Institutional compatibility may account for the limited number of partnerships and the unidirectional nature of approaches, from private to public,

about partnerships. One of the findings of the study was that all approaches about partnerships were made by institutions in the private sector to institutions in the public sector. The breadth of programming and the multiple levels of credentials offered by some of the larger public institutions mean that they have little need for a partnership involving laddering. In fact, according to some interviewees, guaranteed laddering from a particular private institution would complicate the process in the public institution because the institution would have to save seats for private institution graduates.

Similarly, related to the other purposes of partnerships, the public institutions already have a wealth of physical assets which is much larger than the proprietary private institutions in B.C., and their larger size makes it much easier for them to work toward, if not achieve, economies of scale in at least some program areas. Public institutions already possess considerable credibility. In summary, the public institutions have significant self-sufficiency with regard to many of the purposes of partnerships.

Depending on the circumstances, this self-sufficiency gives them the upper-hand in any circumstance in which they might be placed in competition with private sector institutions. The public institutions simply have less need and, in some program areas, are already "whole" in themselves, with no complementing partner required.

When a lack of trust or negative attitude about private institutions, for any reason, is added to the potential partnership mix, the likelihood of a public institution seeking, or agreeing to, a partnership seems somewhat remote. This is consistent with the responses of interviewees in this study.

However, the approaches made by the private institutions were innovative,

including new laddering opportunities, new partners, new student groups, and new sources of international students.

Role of Government

Earlier chapters established that the B.C. government has a significant role in shaping the context in which both public and private post-secondary education institutions operate (Dennison, 1995b; Dennison & Schuetze, 2004; Plant, 2007), and thus the context for partnerships. The B.C. government is responsible for the public post-secondary system, its considerable funding, and its mechanisms for operation with regard to such matters as mandate, institutional type, articulation between institutions and transfer of credit, degree-granting, degree programs, data collection about institutional and programmatic outcomes, and mechanisms for interaction between the public post-secondary and health care systems. Over the last decade, the B.C. government has increasingly made it possible for private sector institutions to participate in some of the mechanisms (DQAB, BCCAT, and BCAHC) that are part of the post-secondary and health systems, and, in this way, has fostered modest integration of private institutions with the broader post-secondary system, as well as, to some extent, having changed the balance in the post-secondary marketplace (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004).

These changes increase the opportunities for institutions in the two systems to interact and, to a limited extent, learn about each other, and develop even the most nominal of relationships. This may be a prerequisite for partnerships as was discussed earlier in this chapter with reference to potential partners developing their knowledge of others.

In addition, the interviewee from the Ministry reported that the Ministry is actively trying to "level the playing field" with regard to private institutions. The intention seems to be to do this by ensuring that students are not penalized for choosing to attend a private institution.

The Ministry has established PCTIA as an arms-length quality assurance mechanism for private institutions offering career programs. Its role is currently more focused on administrative, rather than programmatic, considerations. It would be natural to think that this might give assurances to potential public partners about the quality of education offered by private institutions but, based on the comments of public sector interviewees, this does not seem to be the case. This lack of confidence as to whether PCTIA is sufficiently regulatory was reflected in the *Campus 2020: Thinking Ahead: The Report* (Plant, 2007) report about the B.C. post-secondary education system.

Both BCCAT and the Ministry's Degree Quality Assessment Board also attend to the quality of education of both public and private institutions in some way. Beyond that, it is significant that DQAB, in essence, manages the process whereby private sector institutions may offer degree programs, a notable entry-point into that marketplace (Dennison & Schuetze, 2004).

All of this is evidence that the B.C. government is engaged, as are governments elsewhere, in a struggle between fostering an educational marketplace in which there is freedom for organizations to do their business and to succeed or fail on their own merits (Altbach, 1998, p. 66; Lewis, Massey & Smith, 2001a, p. x; Zemsky, Wegner & Massy, 2006, p. 67), and the need for government to control resources and be accountable to the public (Altbach, 1998) for the funds it garners and forwards both directly to public educational

institutions, to other components of the post-secondary system (e.g., BCCAT) and to both public and private post-secondary institutions through students. The government mandate to protect the public extends to quality control of private institutions.

It appears that the B.C. Ministry, in consideration of health programs at the post-secondary level, has positioned itself somewhere between those competing demands. The underlying intention of government, as represented by the Ministry interviewee, seems to be in both directions simultaneously to some extent, freeing the marketplace and creating accountability measures.

In this study, the B.C. government interviewee indicated that the government does not intend to play a direct role in fostering partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions. This is consistent with the literature which was examined for this study – a government activity related to fostering partnerships between individual institutions was not a consideration. Nevertheless, one public sector interviewee in this study who reported about an existing partnership noted that government had made a significant recommendation about responsibility for instruction in that partnership. This is, interestingly enough, a direct intervention by government in a partnership. That intervention resulted in a cost increase for the public partner in the partnership.

A further observation is that the responses of the interviewee in the B.C. Ministry indicate that the provincial government does not view the publicly funded universities as being any different, or possessing a unique status, which makes them different than publicly funded colleges in regard to the context of post-secondary education. This is in contrast to the literature of post-secondary

education which clearly places publicly funded universities in a different category with a special mission with regard to creating and transferring knowledge (Altbach, 1992; Duderstadt & Womack, 2003) and a history of having been a "global" (Altbach, 1998, p. xvii; Currie, 1998a, p. 15) institution.

Public-Private Partnerships: Another Perspective

The public-private partnerships described in Chapter Two are a unique form of partnership in which a government is the public sector, and dominate, partner in an arrangement with a private sector organization to achieve public purposes. It should be noted that effectively achieving public purposes may also be a way for a government to achieve its own partisan purposes.

The literature about public-private partnerships of this nature has some applicability to the type of partnerships proposed in this study. However, there is a significant difference between the public-private partnerships described in the literature, and the type of partnerships addressed in this study. In the public-private partnerships described in the literature the element of competition is missing. Bettignies and Ross (2004) use the term "contracting-out" (p. 139) in describing public-private partnerships. The governments in public-private partnerships are not the competitors of the private sector organizations that they enter into partnerships with. In fact, government is the controlling partner.

It is clear from the remarks of interviewees in this study that the public and private institutions see themselves as being in competition, some more directly than others. The responses of interviewees seem to indicate that this is somewhat dependent on the geographic location of respective institutions.

Power

One similarity between the two types of partnerships that is relevant to this study is that of power. In the public-private partnerships described in the literature of business and discussed here, the government is the de facto ruling "partner." Governments are the larger organizations and are in possession of vast resources.

In this study, there is evidence in the remarks of private sector interviewees that the public institutions are seen as having the advantages of a larger base of activities, visibility in local communities, and stable funding, and are thus able to dominate. Although the private sector seems to have been the source of known approaches about partnerships, perhaps for them the advantages of a relationship with a well-resourced competitor outweigh the risks inherent in the power difference. It appears that the public institutions sometimes simply see no point in partnering with a small competitor and that the increase in business value would have to be fairly significant to do so.

Risk

In public-private partnerships of the type described in the literature, governments buy expertise in order to get a job done and to manage risk (Poschmann, 2003). Increasing business value (Ward, 2001) and reducing risk (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres & Robinson, 2003c; Ward, 2001) are the reasons at the core of all types of partnerships, although partnerships can also create their own risks (Bamford, Gomes-Casseres & Robinson, 2003c; Kuglin, 2002; Roussel, 2003)

The interviewees in this study certainly seemed to have identified the potential risks of partnerships with the other sector. It appeared that the public

institutions were more focused on the potential risks that would be created by a partnership with a private institution than on the value that might be created. This may partially explain why there were no reports of approaches about partnerships toward the private institutions.

Perhaps private institutions are more experienced in managing certain types of risk in entrepreneurial situations and are, therefore, less reticent to propose partnerships, particularly with what they see as the well-resourced public sector.

It is possible that the public sector institutions don't think that appropriate expertise resides in the private sector or don't see the value in the particular expertise possessed by the private sector institutions as being sufficient to warrant a partnership. Or, the lack of public sector interest in partnerships may be attributed to negative attitudes toward the private institutions.

Boundaries Between Public and Private Institutions

The responses of interviewees to several of the interview questions lend credence to the idea of boundaries between public and private institutions, originally described in Chapter Three, as being useful as a framework for understanding the type of partnerships which are the subject of this study. The responses of the interviewees indicate that these boundaries may have limited the instances when public and private institutions have actually worked together in a partnership or would do so.

Philosophy and Values

Of any of the boundaries between public and private institutions identified in this study, the one that was the most obvious, both in the literature and in the responses of interviewees, was the difference in philosophy of education between public and private institutions (Altbach, 1999a; Bok, 1993; Clark, 1983; Geiger, 1987; Lenington, 1996). As described earlier in this chapter, interviewees in this study made clear statements about their philosophical stance and that of their institution. Interviewees in both sectors certainly seemed to be aware of the difference in thinking and values between the two types of institution. None of the interviewees was apologetic for their philosophical stance although more than one interviewee at a private institution provided an explanation.

The matter of philosophy has an impact on potential partnerships: How can institutions with such fundamental philosophical differences work together in a partnership? Based on the ideas about philosophy of education described earlier in this chapter, philosophical compatibility could be added to the list of types of institutional compatibility.

In that light, should the question regarding partnerships become, "Can this difference simply be recognized by the public and private parties to a potential partnership and worked through or around without compromising their integrity?"

There is evidence in this study that this boundary does not, by itself, preclude a partnership. Interviewees described many examples of possible purposes of partnerships. Depending on the purpose of a proposed partnership,

the partnership could be tailored so that neither party is violating their philosophy while achieving the purpose of the joint activity with mutual benefit.

For example, consider the matter of institutional profit-making through a partnership between a public and private institution. A private institution which is in the business of education will almost certainly need or want to make a profit. Alternatively, a private institution might be willing to set a profit aside for one partnership in the interests of obtaining some other non-monetary advantage through the partnership which increases the value of the larger business enterprise. This study provides examples of public institutions being interested in partnerships to generate revenues, perhaps by receiving a portion of the higher fees that can be charged by the private institution to its students and remitted to the public institution, with the view to placing the revenue earned against the cost of curriculum development.

The example above is also an illustration of the growing similarities of public and private institutions and the entrepreneurial spirit which public institutions have adopted (Ruch, 2001; Sweet & Gallagher, 1996a). In fact, in this study, interviewees at several public sector institutions said that generating revenue was an absolute requirement of a proposed partnership.

Of course, the philosophical boundary is more fundamental than just profit-making. Writing about American higher education, Duderstadt (1999) noted that "many in the academy would undoubtedly view with derision or alarm the depiction of the higher education enterprise as an 'industry' or 'business' (p. 11). Ruch (2001), also in the American context, spoke to the "belief, deep within the consciousness of the traditional academy, that profits and the market are fundamentally antithetical to serving the needs of society and of

students" (p. 8). Clearly, publicly funded educational institutions have many broader purposes, as well as taking on the entrepreneurial activities from which revenues are generated.

Culture of Organizations

Ruch (2001), writing about post-secondary education, defined the culture of an organization as "an artifact of the shared values, attitudes, priorities, and practices of its members, and especially of its leaders" (p. 108). Ward (2001), writing about partnerships in business, defined an alliance culture, meaning a culture which fosters partnerships, as, "a state that embodies the organization's beliefs, values and norms around alliances" (p. 38) or partnerships. With respect to partnerships, there is a boundary between public and private institutions related to the culture of the organizations and the partnership culture.

One facet of this boundary which is addressed frequently in the academic literature is the culture of the university with its unique and historical "institutional autonomy" (Richardson, Bracco, Callan, & Finney, 1999, p. 2). The autonomy of public universities is two-fold: at the level of the institution, universities have been less subject to government control because of their historic purposes related to generation of knowledge, and; at the level of the professoriate which has considerable control within the institution, particularly with regard to academic matters.

In the B.C. context, the public universities certainly possess this autonomy and the (former) university colleges have taken on some of the characteristics of traditional university autonomy, particularly with regard to teachers being

involved in managing the academic direction of the institution and establishing research agendas.

In this study, the interviewees from these two types of public institutions expressed little interest in partnerships with private institutions. In assessing why this might be the case, however, it is difficult to distinguish between negative responses to potential partnerships that were related to the culture of the organization based on traditional university autonomy and those that may have been the result of institutional self-sufficiency.

None of the private sector interviewees reported that they had approached the traditional universities with proposals for partnerships. The fact that all the private sector interviewees were in for-profit colleges may be significant here.

In this study, the public and private institutions that probably had more in common in terms of the culture of their organizations were the colleges. However, even that consideration is modest, given the inequality of size between the public and private colleges in this study, and the other fairly significant organizational differences including unionism. One source of commonality between the public and private colleges seemed to be their commitment to students and their interest in curriculum.

Administration/Management

As described in the review of the literature of post-secondary education, public and private institutions have some different modes of operation that must be considered in contemplating partnerships. Institutional governance, internal management processes, and decision-making processes were identified in the

literature as important differentiating factors. Private institutions, and particularly the smaller private institutions in Canada, were presented in the literature as having more flexibility in operations, and swifter decision-making processes (Gallagher & Sweet, 1997; Ruch, 2001) such that "a decision to modify a program to suit a particular training need can be made quickly and easily" (Sweet & Gallagher, 1999, p. 62).

Differences of this nature were also noted by interviewees in this study. One of the (then) university colleges commented on the elapsed time, measured in years, that would be required to add a new program to the strategic plan and the roster of institutional programs, and the, literally, years of discussion that had taken place in considering one potential partnership that they had been involved in.

One significant practical difference between public and private institutions that has a potential impact on partnerships is unionism. Neither the literature nor the interviewees in this study made much reference to this feature which is more predominant in public institutions. The presence of a union in an institution has the potential to make a partnership with another institution a non-starter. Depending on how a proposed partnership is structured, it may be seen as taking away work which legitimately belongs to union members.

Attitudes

As described earlier in this chapter, this study revealed a significant attitudinal boundary between public and private post-secondary institutions which probably had a negative impact in terms of establishing partnerships.

The attitudes of interviewees in the public sector toward the private sector ranged from disinterest to curiousity and from lack of knowledge to outright mistrust based on less than positive past experiences. The attitudes of interviewees from the private sector toward the public sector range from interest to scorn regarding the relative wealth of the public institutions and the perception of huge resources, ponderous processes, and exclusionary policies.

Based on the statements of interviewees in this study, the negative attitudes of public educators toward private post-secondary education that were documented in the literature of American post-secondary education (Keller, 2001; Ruch, 2001) seem to be abundant in British Columbia. Based on that literature, some of the negative attitudes among public educators in B.C. toward private education seem to be long held, firmly entrenched, and related to philosophies of education.

Perhaps more strongly than any other boundary, the attitudinal boundary has the potential to prohibit a partnership from starting or scuttle it in progress. This is because the people with these attitudes can be located at two levels: the leaders who have the power to agree to a partnership and the people who do the work of the partnership. This is very significant for the public institutions in which, as the literature of post-secondary education described, instructors and professors have considerable power. If, as Ohmae (1993) described in the business literature, business alliances are "a lot like marriage" (p. 49), then the findings about attitudes in this study indicate that there may be some reluctant brides in the public sector.

A problem with the attitudinal boundary is that negative attitudes take time and, probably, positive experiences to change. When the factor of trust is

considered, this study reveals that private institutions may have to work diligently to establish trust with their proposed partners in the public sector.

Accountabilities

There is a boundary between public and private sector institutions in terms of institutional accountabilities. However, the boundary is related to the difference in the nature of the accountabilities, and not in the absence of accountabilities for either sector.

Based on the responses of interviewees in this study, there are misconceptions among both sectors as to the accountabilities of the other sector. Some of the private sector interviewees believed that public sector institutions were free to act in any way they wished. Private sector interviewees described the heavy burden of accountabilities placed on them by both government regulation and PCTIA accreditation. Some expressed that the burden of accountabilities placed on private sector institutions was unfair.

It was beyond the scope of this study to examine the vast literature about institutional accreditation of either public or private education in detail. The examination of the B.C. context for post-secondary education provided the most information about the accountabilities created by government for private institutions through PCTIA.

The government interviewee described the efforts of government to "level the playing field" between public and private institutions. However, the motivation behind that was not to reduce the regulatory burden but to eliminate barriers to participation by private institutions and not penalize students for being in a private institution.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to use the findings of the study and applicable academic literature in order to develop a framework for an enhanced understanding of partnerships in health programs between public and private institutions. This chapter related some of the findings of the study such as the small number of existing partnerships, the unidirectional nature of the proposals for partnerships, the lack of trust between the public and private sector institutions, the negative attitudes between the two types of institutions, and the many possible purposes of partnerships to the academic literatures about business partnerships and post-secondary education.

As it was such a predominant finding, possible reasons for the mistrust and the negative attitudes of public and private institutions toward each other in this study were examined. The concepts of complementarity and competition, taken from the literature of business, were considered. The role of the self-sufficiency of institutions in determining the underlying need for partnerships was examined. A typology of partnership possibilities was created by grouping the responses of interviewees about the purposes of existing and potential partnerships, and examined for its similarity to the literature about business partnerships.

From these examinations of the findings and related literature, two approaches to understanding partnerships between public and private institutions have emerged or developed. One is the idea of institutional compatibility, based on attitudes, complementarity, competition, self-sufficiency, and adaptive efficiency, and types of purposes of partnerships, for working

together. The other is the idea of boundaries between public and private institutions.

It is clear that there are several well-founded boundaries between public and private institutions. These boundaries are significant, although not insurmountable, but would need to be addressed before partnerships are likely to develop.

CHAPTER EIGHT:

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary describing the study, states the conclusions that were reached, and makes recommendations for researchers, educators pursuing partnerships with counterparts in the other sector, and policy-makers in individual institutions and government.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to develop a framework to enhance our understanding of educational partnerships in health programs between public and private post-secondary educational institutions in British Columbia.

The impetus for the study came from the experience of the researcher, while working in a public institution in B.C., in facing many questions about how to respond to approaches from several private institutions about significant partnership opportunities involving health programs, and, more broadly, recognizing that the lack of integration between public and private institutions in post-secondary education in B.C. may very well have resulted in missed opportunities for the system as a whole.

To accomplish the main purpose of this study, an inductive approach in the interpretive/descriptive research paradigm (Merriam, 2002) was used, first drawing on concepts from the literature of two disciplines and then using interviews to obtain the perspectives of stakeholders.

The academic literature of the discipline of business about the business strategy known as partnerships was explored. This exploration encompassed the language used for partnerships in business, the modern context for business partnerships, and the purposes and functions of business partnerships. Attention was paid to the broadest level of purposes of business partnerships, increasing business value and reducing risk. The various features of business partnerships, as described in the literature, were documented. These included control and decision-making, culture and people management, leadership of partnership activities, conflict resolution and problem-solving, conflict of interest, and risk. Attention was paid to a unique component of the business literature which addressed public-private partnerships in which government was the direct, and the controlling, partner with a private sector business, although this type of arrangement was not found to be a direct fit with the public-private partnerships contemplated in the study.

The literature of post-secondary education about public and private post-secondary education was also reviewed. This literature was of limited use because, while private post-secondary education receives significant attention in different contexts worldwide, Canadian research in this area and literature about it is limited. However, the underlying philosophies of public and private post-secondary education, and the overlying global context affecting post-secondary education, were reviewed. The literature review examined the current organization of post-secondary education, including the types and purposes of institutions, and the systems they comprise. Finally, the differences between public and private institutions, with particular attention to Canada and referring to literature about post-secondary education in the United States, were

examined. Distinctions between the two types of institutions in terms of values, accountabilities, internal and external governance, the autonomy of faculty, arrangements for faculty, attitudes and cultural features, leadership, funding sources, niches served, and types of programs offered, were noted. From this review of the literature, it became evident that there are several significant boundaries, a boundary being defined for this study as the location of a change in context, between public and private post-secondary institutions. There are boundaries related to philosophy and values, culture of organizations, administration/management, attitudes, and accountabilities.

Layered onto the reviews of the literature, the B.C. context for post-secondary education was examined in considerable detail. Changes in the B.C. context between 2005 and 2008, the period of time during which the study moved from planning to final write-up, were examined, with the implications for partnerships being considered. The focus was on the role of government in post-secondary education in B.C.

With the findings from the two literature reviews and the background context information available to 2005, the data collection phase of the study was planned. It was determined that interviews would be used to obtain the perspectives of academic administrators about existing educational partnerships and the potential for partnerships. The majority of administrators were representatives of selected public and PCTIA-accredited private institutions offering health programs of the type which met specific Canadian National Occupation Classification criteria.

Interviews were held over a four month period in 2005 with representatives of 12 public and eight private institutions, as well as one

government representative, and two representatives of stakeholder organizations, specifically BCCCA and PCTIA. All private sector interviewees were from college-level institutions with public sector interviewees being from universities, the (then) university colleges, and colleges. Interviewees from both sectors were from locations around the province.

A key finding from the interviews conducted for this study was that there were limited interaction and few existing partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions in this area of endeavor in B.C., although those that existed were successful. Interviewees from both public and private institutions identified a broad range of ideas for partnerships and could cite some actual and potential advantages of, and benefits from, working with the other sector. Interviewees from both sectors described concerns about working with institutions in the other sector, although the concerns varied between sectors. There was one notable difference between replies: Concerns about the quality of the programming in the private institutions were noted by public institutions but not by private institutions.

Among public sector interviewees, significant negative attitudes about private sector institutions were demonstrated, including both a lack of trust of private institutions, and a philosophical distaste for private post-secondary education. This may provide an explanation for the finding that there are few existing partnerships and why approaches about specific partnerships at the institutional level were exclusively from private to public institutions.

Conclusions

This study demonstrates that there are many possibilities for partnerships of the type that were investigated and many impediments to their occurring. Academic administrators in both public and private post-secondary education institutions and representatives of related stakeholder organizations described a range of partnership activities that could take place. The possibilities for partnerships were arranged in a typology.

Although the concept of partnerships used in this study is derived from the academic literature of business, it does seem to have merit in the context of post-secondary education. It provides a unique perspective on increasing the value and reducing the risk associated with the post-secondary enterprise when public and private institutions choose to work together. The features of partnerships described in the literature provide a useful template for considering the functions that are important in an organized activity with mutual benefits.

Although many possibilities for partnerships were identified, the fact that few partnerships of the type being investigated were found to exist, and that all approaches about partnerships described in the study were uniformly from private institutions to public institutions, required attention. Consideration of the literature of post-secondary education, with a focus on private post-secondary education, along with the detailed responses of the interviewees in the study, showed that there were significant negative attitudes about private institutions. It was proposed that these attitudes stem from lack of knowledge about the potential partners, philosophical disagreement about post-secondary education, concerns about the quality of education in private institutions, and negative past experiences with private institutions.

From this study, two approaches to understanding partnerships between public and private institutions emerged. First, is the concept of boundaries, derived in part from the literature of post-secondary education and expanded through an analysis of the findings of the study. There is evidence from this study of important, and very real, boundaries between public and private institutions in the areas of philosophy and values, the culture of institutions, administration/management, attitudes, and accountabilities. It seems entirely possible that these boundaries can be successfully challenged. If they are not, few partnerships are likely to be developed or exist successfully on either institutional or system levels.

A related conclusion is that, for the purpose of pursuing partnerships, there is a need to consider the compatibility of particular institutions for working together. The notion of institutional compatibility comprises the elements, described in the academic literature of business, of attitudes, complementarity of skills and resources, competition, institutional self-sufficiency, and adaptive efficiency (Alter & Hage, 1993), as they are demonstrated by the potential partner institutions, and considering the purposes of the partnerships being contemplated.

Potential partners at both institutional and system levels can use the boundaries and the elements of institutional compatibility as a screen and a framework for considering potential partnerships.

Recommendations

From this study there are recommendations for researchers, education administrators who are managing health programs, and policy-makers in institutions and government.

Recommendations for Researchers

Several research directions may flow from this study. One direction would be to conduct a similar study in another discipline. Some of the constraints associated with the requirement for accreditation of many health programs, and the requirement for clinical experiences, may have limited the number of existing partnerships. Thus, there may be utility in conducting a similar study in a discipline in which there are fewer external requirements already imposed. An example might be the discipline of business.

Another research direction is to simply increase the quantity and availability of information about private post-secondary education institutions beyond the very modest current levels. The information derived from this type of research could, depending on its outcomes, mitigate some of the negative attitudes about private institutions which seem to preclude partnerships in the eyes of public sector institutions.

It may also be useful to research the typology of partnerships with the intent of determining whether partnerships with a particular purpose are better suited to some types of institutions or some institutional circumstances than others.

A different study could explore whether there are different perspectives among public sector representatives about partnerships with private sector

institutions depending on whether they are commenting on for-profit institutions or not-for-profit institutions.

Another research direction would be to further explore the nature of institutional compatibility in partnerships in post-secondary education, examining questions as to what factors foster successful public/private inter-institutional work of this type. A case study approach, making observations about a limited number of both successful and unsuccessful partnership arrangements, may be suitable. More in-depth exploration of the notions of complementarity, competition, individual institutional self-sufficiency, and "adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p.42), as considered in this study, would be appropriate.

Another direction for research would be to further define, explore and extend the use of the concept of boundaries, and particularly, mechanisms that can be used to negotiate the boundaries. In this sense, negotiating the boundaries would mean having acknowledged the existence of the boundaries and the need to deal with them, not negotiating about the existence of the boundaries. This research direction could be accomplished by focusing on one or more of the boundaries identified in this study, and making observations in another partnership setting, about what strategies might be used to negotiate these boundaries.

Recommendations for Educators/Educational Administrators

Educators and educational administrators who find themselves approached or who themselves see merit in pursuing a partnership with an educator in the other sector may want to consider the components of institutional

compatibility referenced specifically in this study, including complementarity, competition, individual institutional self-sufficiency, and "adaptive efficiency" (Alter & Hage, 1993, p. 42), and what the partnership is intended to accomplish.

In addition, such educators will want to give consideration as to how to deal with, or negotiate, the boundaries between prospective institutional partners as described in the framework. This will not necessarily be an easy task. Recognition of the importance of the boundaries to a given partnership is the first step. This requires considerable sensitivity to boundaries by those working day-to-day at the operational level in a partnership. It also requires that senior educational administrators acknowledge the importance of the task of tending to boundaries and the need to support that activity as partnerships evolve.

Finally, there would be merit in further utilization of concepts from the literature of business in examining educational partnerships. Specifically, educators and educational administrators may choose to use the features of partnerships, described in Chapter Two, as a framework for detailed planning of partnerships.

Recommendations for Policy-Makers

Policy-makers in two settings, bureaucrats in government and administrators in individual public and private institutions, may be able to make use of some of the specific findings of this study. These findings include that partnerships between public and private institutions can exist and be successful, that a variety of purposes could conceivably be met by partnerships, and that there are boundaries that must be dealt with in order for partnerships to be achieved.

However, any use of the findings of the study, at either the institutional level or the broader level at which government operates, need to be predicated on a belief that partnerships have at least the potential for outcomes of value to individual institutions and/or to the broader system in which the institutions conduct their business.

Given the seemingly broadly-held current negative attitudes about post-secondary institutions in the private sector, and precepts about the autonomy of public institutions and the academic freedom of those who work in them, government would find it difficult to mandate partnerships between individual public and private institutions. As a result, there may be more utility in government signaling to institutions that such partnerships are, at minimum, acceptable and may have value in achieving a variety of outcomes. As noted in Chapter Seven, the B.C. government could foster positive movement toward partnerships by continuing integrative actions which give a place to private institution in the post-secondary system, acknowledges their unique contribution in an integrated system and in the broader context of the economy, describes the accountability mechanisms they are subject to, and brings them into contact with public institutions so that, over time, trust based on merit can be established and constructive working relationships can evolve. In British Columbia, and probably elsewhere in Canada, it would also be the role of government to work to enhance the credibility of the quality control/accreditation mechanisms for private institutions so that there can be confidence in their work.

However, there should be no illusions that existing negative attitudes can be changed quickly, particularly when there are deeply-held philosophical stances behind them and considerable emotion attached to them.

More specifically regarding partnerships, government could initially foster system level partnerships that require the input of both public and private institutions. An example of a system level partnership could be, as in one example from the study, a curriculum development project with involvement from both public and private sectors.

In an era of an increasing shortage of funds for the growing task of providing post-secondary education, government may very well consider having lower level programming offered by the private sector laddering into upper level programs at public institutions, perhaps with a modest subsidy to the private institutions in exchange for some sort of quality guarantee, thus increasing the funds available for upper-year programming to the public institutions in acknowledgement of the cost and complexity of offering that level of programming. This would spread government funds further using some of the principles of the public-private partnerships described in the literature of business. The partnership could be between government and the private sector institution or between public and private institutions regarding laddering.

* * * * * * * *

Some readers may feel, given the relationship dynamics between public and private institutions described in the earlier chapters of this thesis, and the lack of a significant number of existing partnerships in the context of postsecondary health programs in B.C., that the idea of partnerships in that context is hopeless. This final chapter was written from the perspective that partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions have the potential to be worthwhile, although not without challenges for

implementation. Clearly, partnerships create work and are not the cure for all ills but leaving the possibilities they present, and the purposes they might achieve unexplored, may result in lost opportunities because of unchallenged boundaries.

REFERENCES

Adamuti-Trache, M., & Sweet, R. (2008). Vocational training choices of women: Public and private colleges. *Gender and Education, 20*(2), 167-182

Alan, J.R. (1999). *Public-private partnerships: A review of literature and practice.* Public Policy Paper No. 4.) Regina, SK: Saskatchewan Institute of Public Policy, University of Regina.

Altbach, P.G. (1992). Patterns in higher education development: Toward the year 2000. In R.F. Arnove, P.G. Altbach, & G.P. Kelly (Eds.), *Emergent issues in education: Comparative perspectives* (pp. 39-55). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Altbach, P.G. (1998). *Comparative higher education: Knowledge, the university, and development.* Greenwich, Conn.: Ablex.

Altbach, P.G. (1999a). Comparative perspectives on private higher education. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st Century* (pp. 1-14). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Altbach, P.G. (1999b). Preface. In P.G. Altbach (Ed.), *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st Century* (pp. vii-viii). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Alter, C., & Hage, J. (1993). *Organizations working together.* London: SAGE Publications.

Annandale, R. (2008, September 9). Name change, status boost: Five B.C. post-secondary schools are upgraded to 'university' designation. *Metronews,* p. 12.

Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. (2004). *About AUCC.* Retrieved August 30, 2004, from http://www.aucc.ca/about_us/index_e.html

Auld, D. (1996). *Expanding horizons: Privatizing universities.* Toronto: University of Toronto.

Auld, D. (2005). *Selling postsecondary education: The role of private vocational and career colleges.* (C.D. Howe Institute Commentary No. 219). Ottawa: Renouf Publishing.

Bamford, J.D., Gomes-Casseres, B., & Robinson, M.S. (2003a). Collaborating with competitors. In J.D. Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 77-87). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bamford, J.D., Gomes-Casseres, B., & Robinson, M.S. (2003b). Introduction: What is alliance strategy? In J.D. Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 1-15). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bamford, J.D., Gomes-Casseres, B., & Robinson, M.S. (2003c). Managing risk. In J.D. Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 36-44). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bamford, J.D., Gomes-Casseres, B., & Robinson, M.S. (2003d). Putting strategy before structure. In J.D. Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 63-74). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Bennett, J., & Jayes, S. (1998). *The seven pillars of partnering: A guide to second generation partnering*. London: Thomas Telford.

Bery, V., & Bowers, T.A. (1993). Rebuilding an alliance. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 67-78). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bettignies, J., & Ross, T.W. (2004). The economics of public-private partnerships. *Canadian Public Policy, 30*(2), 135-154.

Bleeke, J., & Ernst, D. (1993a). Manager's choice. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 11-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bleeke, J., & Ernst, D. (1993b). The death of the predator. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 1-16). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Bleeke, J., & Ernst, D. (1993c). The way to win in cross-border alliances. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 17-34). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Blustain, H., Goldstein, P., & Lozier, G. (1999). Assessing the new competitive landscape. In R.N. Katz & Associates (Eds.), *Dancing with the devil: Information technology and the new competition in higher education* (pp. 51-71). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bok, D. (2003). *Universities in the marketplace: The commercialization of higher Education*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

British Columbia Academic Health Council. (2004). *Practice education survey final report: Planning for sufficient & appropriate student placements for health professional students in BC*. Retrieved February 21, 2009, from

http://www.bcahc.ca/docs/BCAHC_Placement_Survey_Final=Report.pdf

British Columbia Academic Health Council. (2008a). *Mission.* Retrieved June 23, 2008, from http://www.bcahc.ca/BCAHC_page.asp?pageid=722

British Columbia Academic Health Council. (2008b). *Practice Education Committee.* Retrieved February 21, 2009, from http://www.bcahc.ca/BCAHC_page.asp?pageid=73

British Columbia Career Colleges Association. (2005). *BCCCA member search results.* Retrieved May 7, 2005, from http://www.bccca.com/search_results.cfm

British Columbia Career Colleges Association. (2009). *BCCCA.* Retrieved February 21, 2009, from http://www.bccca.com

British Columbia Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors. (2002). *Letter of November 25 from John Gilbert, Chair, to Ministry of Advanced Education and Ministry of Health Planning.* Presented to meeting of March 24, 2004. Meeting held in Richmond, British Columbia.

British Columbia Committee of Health Sciences Deans & Directors, Working Group (2004). *Impact of private educational institutions offering health science programs in the BC post-secondary education: An issues paper. Draft minutes of meeting of March 24, 2004.* Meeting held in Richmond, British Columbia.

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2004a). *"Accredited" institutions.* Retrieved May 29, 2004, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/system/accredited.html

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2004b). *Transferring credit between private and public institutions in BC.* Retrieved June 22, 2004, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/system/pubprivate.html

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2007a). *Recording block transfer agreements with PCTIA-accredited institutions: Policy and Process.* Draft 1.3. Vancouver, BC: BCCAT.

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2007b). *Transferring credit between private and public institutions in B.C.* Retrieved December 19, 2007, from http://bccat.bc.ca/transfer/private.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2008a). *A brief history of the BC transfer system.* Retrieved June 23, 2008, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/transfer/history.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2008b). *Articulation: 2006 Articulation Committee meeting summary*. Retrieved July 20, 2008, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/articulation/summary06.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2008c). *Articulation: Articulation committees*. Retrieved July 20, 2008, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/articulation/index.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2008d). *Institutional Contact Person Committee*. Retrieved July 20, 2008, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/icp.members.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2008e). *Transferring credit between private and public institutions in BC*. Retrieved June 23, 2008, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/transfer/private.cfm

British Columbia Council on Admissions & Transfer. (2009). *BC Transfer Guide*. Retrieved February 17, 2009, from http://bctransferguide.

British Columbia Government Employees Union. (2008). *BCGEU – Who we are*. Retrieved July 25, 2008, from http://www.bcgeu.bc.ca/about_us

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2004a). *Board appointed to oversee Private Career Trainers*. Retrieved June 22, 2004, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/branches/privateinstitutions/informationbulletin_170504.htm p. 1

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2004b). *IV. British Columbia public institution applied degrees*. Retrieved October 4, 2004, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/bcpublic/websection4degreeprogramcriteria.pdf

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2004c). *Degree granting authorization*. Retrieved June 22, 2004, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/welcome.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2004d). *Ministry of Advanced Education Service Plan*. Retrieved March 3, 2004, from http://www.gov.bc.ca/prem/popt/service_plans/srv_pln/aved/strat_cont.htm pp. 1-3.

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2004e). *Private institutions and developmental programs branch*. Retrieved March 5, 2004, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/branches/privateinstitutions/welcome.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2005a). *Accreditation*. Retrieved January 14, 2005, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/privatecareertraining/accreditation.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2005b). *New degrees create more choices for B.C. Learners.* Retrieved January 10, 2005, from http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/nrm_news_releases/2005MAE0001-000002.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2005c). *Private career training.* Retrieved January 10, 2005, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/privatecareertraining/welcome.html

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2005d). *Private post-secondary education.* Retrieved January 10, 2005, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/branches/privateinstitutions/privatepsed/welcome.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2005e). *Registration.* Retrieved January 14, 2005, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/privatecareertraining/registration/htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2006). *Response to the February 2006 Throne Speech.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/speeches/coell/throne_march_06.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008a). *News release: Premier announces Fraser Valley's First University.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2008OT0096-000572.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008b). *News release: Province to establish Capilano University.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2008OTP0105-000604.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008c). *News release: Province to establish Kwantlen Polytechnic University.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2008OTP0098-000585.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008d). *News release: Province to establish Vancouver Island University.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://2.news.gov.bc.ca/news_releases_2005-2009/2008OTP0103-000595.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008e). *Response to the February 2006 Throne Speech: Advanced Education Minister Murray Coell Legislature of British Columbia March 6, 2006.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/speeches/coell/throne_march 06.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008f). *Degree authorization:*

Degree Quality Assessment Board – Use of external experts. Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/board/external-experts.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008g). *Degree authorization: Degree Quality Assessment Board – Membership.* Retrieved April 26, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/board/boardmembers.htm#brianGillespie

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008h). *An overview of B.C.'s Public Post-Secondary Institutions.* Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http::/ /www.aved.gov.bc.ca/institutions/welcome.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008i). *About the Ministry.* Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http::/ /www.aved.gov.bc.ca/organization

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008j). *Post-secondary institution proposal system. Recommendations and decisions.* Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://sam.educ.gov.bc.ca/servlet/page?_pageid=64&_dad=sam&_schema=SAM

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education. (2008k). *Higher learning and the labour market in a changing world: Environmental scan for British Columbia.* Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/labourmarketinfo/reports/higherlearningenvironmentalscan.08.pdf.

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. (2008a). *British Columbia Degree Quality Assessment Board 2006/2007 Annual Report April 1, 2006 – March 31, 2007.* Retrieved September 11, 2008 from www.aved.gov.bc.ca/degree-authorization/board/documents/DQAB_Annual_Report_2006-07.pdf

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. (2008b). *Centre for Curriculum Transfer & Technology.* Retrieved July 20, 2008, from http:/www.aved.gov.bc.ca/c2t2

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. (2009a). *An overview of B.C.'s public post-secondary institutions.* Retrieved April 28, 2009, from http://www.gov.bc.ca/institutions/universities.htm

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development. (2009b). *Student Aid B.C.* Retrieved April 17, 2009, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/studentaidbc/apply/eligibility/schooleligibility.htm#private

British Columbia Ministry of Advanced Education, Training, and Technology. (1999). *Principles of educational partnerships.* (Letter from Deputy Minister to Presidents of BC Post-Secondary Education Institutions).

British Columbia Ministry of Education, Skills and Training, Colleges and Program Planning Branch. (1997). *System-level program planning and rationalization: Discussion paper.* Victoria: British Columbia Ministry of Education, Skills and Training.

British Columbia Ministry of Education, Skills and Training and the Centre for Curriculum, Transfer & Technology. (1997). *Report of the working committee on public-private articulation agreements.* Retrieved May 28, 2004, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/pubs/wcppaa.html

British Columbia Ministry of Health Services. (2005). *Legislation and professional regulation.* Retrieved February 12, 2005, from http://www.healthservices.gov.bc.ca/leg/index.html#professions

British Columbia Ministry of Health Services. (2008). *Legislation and professional regulation.* Retrieved August 24, 2008, from http://www.health.gov.bc.ca/leg/index.html#professions

Brown, R. C. (2000, November). *Working together as a system? Challenges and opportunities for the BC post-secondary system in the first decade of the new millenium.* Paper presented at the November 4, 2000, meeting of The Advanced Education Council of B.C. Retrieved May 29, 2004, from http://www.bccat.bc.ca/pubs/brown.pdf

Butler, D., Grosjean, G., & Sork, T.J. (2008). *Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership and Policy, Department of Education Studies, Self-Study Report.* Vancouver, Canada: The University of British Columbia, Faculty of Education.

Canadian Information Centre for International Credentials. (2008). *Fact Sheet No. 5 Quality Assurance Practices for Postsecondary Institutions in Canada.* Retrieved June 23, 2008, from http://www.cicic.ca/en/page.aspx?sortcode=2.16.20.20

Career College Central. (2007). *CIBT Education Group acquires Sprott-Shaw Community College.* Retrieved July 19, 2008, from http://www.careercollegecentral.com/press-releases/cibt-education--group-acquires-sprott-shaw-community-college/

Charbonneau, L. (2007). Provinces push new degree guidelines/Les provinces veulent des lignes directrices. *University Affairs, 48*(7), 32-35.

Clark, B.R. (1983). *The higher education system: Academic organizations in cross-national perspective.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Clark, B.R. (1986). Foreword. In R. L. Geiger (Ed.), *Private sectors in higher education: Structure, function, and change in eight countries.* Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Clark, B.R. (2000). Developing a career in the study of higher education. In J.C. Smart & W.G. Tierney (Eds.). *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research, XV,* (pp. 1-38). New York: Agathon Press.

Clift, R. (2006). *Kingston College scandal reveals BC government's failures.* Retrieved October 23, 2006, from http://www.cufa.bc.ca/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=92&itemid=44

Coleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Currie, J. (1998a). Globalization as an analytical concept and local policy responses. In J. Currie & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 15-20). London: SAGE Publications.

Currie, J. (1998b). Introduction. In J. Currie, & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 1-13). London: SAGE Publications.

Dennison, J. D. (1991). *Conflicting views of postsecondary education – Governments vs. institutions: A brief to the commission on university governance.* Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia.

Dennison, J. D. (1995a). Community college development in Canada since 1985. In J. D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 13-104). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dennison, J. D. (1995b). Introduction. In J. D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 3-12). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dennison, J. D. (1995c). Organization and function in postsecondary education. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 121-140). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dennison, J.D. (1996). Introduction. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Community colleges in Canada* (pp. 3-6). Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba.

Dennison, J.D. (1997). Higher education in British Columbia, 1945-1995: Opportunity and diversity. In G.A. Jones (Ed.), *Higher education in Canada: Different systems, different perspectives* (pp. 31-58). New York: Garland.

Dennison, J.D. (2006). From community college to university: A personal commentary on the evolution of an institution. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 36*(2), 107 – 124.

Dennison, J.D., Forrester, G., & Jones, G. (1996). A study of students from academic programs in British Columbia's community colleges. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Community colleges in Canada* (pp. 7-21). Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba.

Dennison, J.D., & Gallagher, P. (1986). *Canada's community colleges: A critical analysis.* Vancouver: The University of British Columbia Press.

Dennison, J.D., & Levin, J.S. (1996). Goals of community colleges in Canada: A 1987 perspective. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Community colleges in Canada* (pp. 23-37). Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba.

Dennison, J.D., & Schuetze, H. (2004). Extending access, choice, and the reign of the market: Higher education reforms in British Columbia, 1989-2004. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 34*(3), p. 13 - 38.

Dickinson, E. (1957). *Complete poems of Emily Dickinson.* Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Doherty-Delorme, D., & Shaker, E. (Eds.). (2002). *Missing pieces III: An alternative guide to Canadian post-secondary education.* Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Doz, Y.L., & Hamel, G. (1998). *Alliance advantage: The art of creating value through partnering.* Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Duderstadt, J.J. (1999). Can colleges and universities survive in the information age? In R.N. Katz & Associates (Eds.). *Dancing with the devil: Information technology and the new competition in higher education* (pp. 27-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Duderstadt, J.J. (2000). New roles for the 21st Century university. *Issues in Science and Technology, 16*(2), pp. 37-44.

Duderstadt, J.J., & Womack, F.W. (2003). *The future of the public university in America: Beyond the crossroads.* Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Eckel, P.D., & King, J.E. (2006). United States. In J. J. F. Forest, & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 1035-1050). Dordrecht: Springer . Retrieved April 17, 2009, from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/ubc/docDetail.action?docID=10221672

Education Management Corporation. (2009). *Education Management Corporation - Locations*. Retrieved April 28, 2009, from http://www.edmc.com/locations

Ernst, D. (2003). Envisioning collaboration. In J.D. Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 19-29). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Evans, K. (2006). *Going global with the locals: Internationalization activity at the university colleges in British Columbia.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver.

Federation of Post Secondary Educators. (2004). *Member locals*. Retrieved October 26, 2004, from http://www.fpse.ca/locals/index.html

Federation of Post Secondary Educators. (2008). *Member locals*. Retrieved June 24, 2008, from http://www.fpse.ca/about/Locals#locals

Fisher, D., & Rubenson, K. (1998). The changing political economy: The private and public lives of Canadian universities. In J. Currie, & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 77-97). London: Sage Publications.

Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., Evans, K., Shanahan, T., Jones, G., Trottier, C., & Bernatchez, J. (2004). *Market ideology and educational policy in Canadian higher education: The changing boundary between the public and private sectors in British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec, 1990-2003*. Paper presented at the 2004 Conference of the Centre for Higher Education Research, The University of British Columbia. Published in 2009: Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., Jones, G. and Shanahan, T.The political economy of post-secondary education: a comparison of British Columbia, Ontario and Quebec. *Higher Education*, 57(5), pp. 549-566.

Fisher, D., Rubenson, K., & Schuetze, H. (1994). *The role of the university in preparing the labour force: A background analysis.* Vancouver: Centre for Policy Studies in Education, The University of British Columbia.

Galan, N.V. (2001). Throwing down the gauntlet: The rise of the for-profit education industry. In B. Lewis, C. Murray, & R. Smith (Eds.), *The tower under siege: Technology, policy, and education* (pp. 11-28). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Gallagher, P. (1995). *Changing course: An agenda for REAL reform of Canadian education.* Toronto, ON: OISE Press.

Gallagher, P. (1995). Promise fulfilled, promise pending" In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 256-274. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Gallagher, P., & Sweet, R. (1997). Intermediate skill development in British Columbia: Policy options for a post-industrial era. The *Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 27*(2,3), 181-212.

Gaskell, J. (1988). Policy research and politics. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 34*(4), 403-417.

Geiger, R.L. (1986). *Private sectors in higher education: Structure, function and change in eight countries.* Ann Arbor, Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Geiger, R. L (1987). *International Council for Educational Development Conference Report: Privatization of Higher Education* (Wingspread Racine, Wisconson, June 15-18). Princeton, N.J.: International Council for Educational Development.

Gerybadze, A. (1994). *Strategic alliances and process redesign: Effective management and restructuring of cooperative projects and networks.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

Goldsmith, M. (2003). Changing role of leadership: Building partnerships inside and outside the organization. In L. Segil, M. Goldsmith, & J. Belasco (Eds.), *Partnering: The new face of leadership* (pp. 3 -8). New York: ANACOM.

Gomes-Casseres, B. (1996). *The alliance revolution: The new shape of business rivalry.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Green, T.F. (1994). Policy questions: A conceptual study. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 2*(7), 1-11.

Grenier, S. (1995). Survey of private training schools in Canada. *Education quarterly review, 2*(3), 50-62.

Guba, E.G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (2004). Competing paradigms in qualitative research: Theories and issues. In Hesse-Biber, S.N., & Leavy, P. (Eds.), *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice* (pp. 17-38). New York: Oxford University Press.

Hagel III, J., and Brown, J.S. (2005). Productive friction: How difficult business partnerships can accelerate innovation. Harvard Business Review, *83*(2), 82-91.

Hearn, A. (2002). Corporate U thrives on alienated scholars. *CAUT Bulletin, 49*(6), p. A14.

Human Resources and Social Development Canada. (2007). National Occupational Classification (NOC) 2006. Retrieved December 1, 2007, from http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/en/workplace skills/noc/index.shtml.

Jones, G. A. (1997). A brief introduction to higher education in Canada. In. G.A. Jones (Ed.), *Higher education in Canada: Different systems, different perspectives* (pp.1-8). New York: Garland.

Jones, G. A. (2006). Canada. In J. J. F. Forest, & P. G. Altbach (Eds.), *International handbook of higher education* (pp. 627-645). Dordrecht: Springer . Retrieved April 17, 2009, from http://site.ebrary.com/lib/ubc/docDetail.action?docID=10221672

Katz, R.N. (1999a). Competitive strategies for higher education in the information age. In R.N. Katz & Associates (Eds.), *Dancing with the devil: Information technology and the new competition in higher education* (pp. 27-49). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Katz, R. N. (1999b). Preface. In R.N. Katz & Associates (Eds.), *Dancing with the devil: Information technology and the new competition in higher education* (pp. xiii-xxiii). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Keller, G. (2001). Forward. In R.S. Ruch, *Higher ed, Inc.: The rise of the for-profit university* (pp. ix-xi). Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.

Kinser, K. & Levy, D.C. (2005). *The for-profit sector: U.S. patterns and international echoes in higher education*. PROPHE Working Paper #5. Retrieved April 18, 2009, from http://www.albany.edu/dept/eaps/prophe/publications/paper/html#

Krubasik, E., & Lautenschlager, H. (1993). Forming successful strategic alliances in high-tech businesses. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 55-65). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kuglin, F.A. (with Hook, J.) (2002). *Building, leading, and managing strategic alliances: How to work effectively and profitably with partner companies*. New York: American Management Association.

Lang, D.W. (2002). There are mergers, and there are mergers: The forms of inter-institutional combination. *Higher Education Management and Policy, 14*(1), 11-50.

Leadbeater, C. (1999) *Living on thin air: The new economy*. New York: Penguin Group.

Lechuga, V.M. (2006). *The changing landscape of the academic profession: The culture of faculty at for-profit colleges and universities*. New York: Routledge.

Lenington, R.L. (1996). *Managing higher education as a business*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Levin, J. (1995). The challenge of leadership. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 105-120). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Levine, A. (2001). Privatization in higher education. In H.M. Levin (Ed.), *Privatizing education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, efficiency, equity, and social cohesion?* (pp. 133 –148). Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Levine, A. E. (2000). The future of colleges: 9 (sic) inevitable changes. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* October 27, B 10, 1-5. Retrieved September 28, 2004, from http://education.gsu.edu/ctl/Programs/Future_Colleges.htm .

Levy, D. C. (1999). When private higher education does not bring organizational diversity. In P. G. Altbach (Ed.), *Private Prometheus: Private higher education and development in the 21st century* (pp. 15-43). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Lewis, B., Massey, C., & Smith, R. (2001a). Preface. In Lewis, B., Massey, C., & R. Smith (Eds.), *The tower under siege: Technology, policy, and education* (pp. vii-xii). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens's University Press.

Lewis, B., Massey, C., & Smith, R. (2001b). A call to arms: Promises and politics of telelearning technologies. In Lewis, B., Massey, C., & Smith, R. (Eds.), *The tower under siege: Technology, policy, and Education* (pp. 3-10). Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queens's University Press.

Li, C. (2006). *Canada's private colleges: The lesser known players in postsecondary education.* Ottawa: Ministry of Industry.

Linder, S.H. (2000). Coming to terms with the public-private partnership: A grammar of multiple meanings. In P. Vaillancourt Rosenau (Ed.), *Public-private policy partnerships* (pp. 19-35). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

MacLeod, A. (2003, September 18-24). Schooled in disappointment: Dissatisfied students, fired staff, and a whole new era of private education. *Monday Magazine, 29*(38). Retrieved from http://mondaymag.com/monday/editorial/38_2003/features.htm

Maher, P. C. (1998). *A matter of degree: Private higher education in British Columbia and Alberta.* Unpublished master's thesis, The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Marshall, D. (2004). Degree accreditation in Canada. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 34*(2), 69-96.

McMillan, J.H. (2002). Understanding and evaluating educational research. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Prentice Hall.

McWilliam, C.L. (1996). Innovation and enrepreneurship in colleges. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Community colleges in Canada* (pp. 61-77). Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, University of Manitoba.

Merriam, S. B. (2002). *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mount, J., & Belanger, C. (2001). "Academia Inc": The perspective of university presidents. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 31*(2), 135-166.

National Association of Career Colleges. (2004). *About NACC.* Retrieved July 12, 2004, from http://www.nacc.ca/

National Association of Career Colleges. (2008). Active and associate members - British Columbia. Retrieved July 29, 2008, from http://www.nacc.ca/aabc.shtml

Ohmae, K. (1993). The global logic of strategic alliances. In J. Bleeke & D. Ernst (Eds.), *Collaborating to compete: Using strategic alliances and acquisitions in the global marketplace* (pp. 35-54). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Orton, L. (2003). *A new understanding of postsecondary education in Canada: A discussion paper.* Ottawa: Statistics Canada.

Owen, S.L. (1995). Organizational culture and community colleges. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity: Canada's community colleges at the crossroads* (pp. 141-168). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Paquet, G. (1990). Training and development: The shadow higher education system in Canada. In R. Watts (Ed.), *Post-secondary: Preparation for the world of work* (pp. 189-202). Halifax, NS: Halifax Institute for Research in Public Policy.

Palmer, V. (August 8, 2008). World Trade University only serves up degrees of embarrassment. *The Vancouver Sun,* p. A3.

Palys, T. (2003). *Research decisions: Quantitative and qualitative perspectives* (3rd ed.). Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Pearsall, J., & Trumble, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Oxford English reference dictionary.* Vol. XI. Oxford,England: Oxford University Press.

Perkins, J.A. (1987). Preface. In R.L. Geiger, *Privatization of higher education:*

International trends & issues (pp. v, vi). Princeton, NJ: International Council for Educational Development.

Plant, G. (2007). *Campus 2020: Thinking ahead: The report.* Victoria, BC: Government of British Columbia.

Poschmann, F. (2003). *Private means to public ends: The future of public-private partnerships* (Commentary No. 183). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: C.D. Howe Institute.

Pusser, B. (2002). Higher education, the emerging market, and the public good. In P.A. Graham & N.G. Stacey (Eds.), *The knowledge economy and postsecondary education: Report of a workshop* (pp. 105-126). Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Private Career Training Institutions Agency. (2005a). *PCTIA list of accredited institutions as of Feb. 7, 2005.* Retrieved February 8, 2005, from http://www.pctia.bc.ca/search/AccreditedInstitutions.htm

Private Career Training Institutions Agency. (2005b). *PCTIA list of registered institutions as of Feb 7, 2005.* Retrieved February 8, 2005, from http://www.pctia.bc.ca/search/RegisteredInstitutions.htm

Private Post-Secondary Education Commission of British Columbia. (2004a). *Accreditation.* Retrieved June 22, 2004, from http://www.ppsec.bc.ca/accreditation.html .

Private Post-Secondary Education Commission of British Columbia. (2004b). *PPSEC profile.* Retrieved June 22, 2004, from http://www.ppsec.bc.ca .

Private Career Training Institutions Agency. (2008). *PCTIA list of registered institutions* Retrieved June 24, 2008, from http://pctia.bc.ca/search/registeredinstitutions/htm

Private Career Training Institutions Agency. (2009). *PCTIA Board members.* Retrieved April 28, 2009, from http://www.pctia.bc.ca/board_bios.htm

Quest University Canada. (2006). *Annual report 2005-2006.* Squamish, BC: Quest University Canada.

Rae, Peter. (1996). New directions: Privatization and higher education in Alberta. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education,* 26(2), pp. 59-80.

Richardson R.C., Bracco, K.R., Callan, P.M., & Finney, J.E. (1999). *Designing state higher education systems for a new Century.* Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization.* London: SAGE Publications.

Rosenau, P. (2000). The strengths and weaknesses of public-private policy partnerships. In P. V. Rosenau (Ed.), *Public-private policy partnerships* (pp. 217-241). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Roussel, C. (2003). Finding joint value. In J.D,Bamford, B. Gomes-Casseres, & M.S. Robinson (Eds.), *Mastering alliance strategy: A comprehensive guide to design, management, and organization* (pp. 30-35). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Rubenson, K., & Schuetze, H.G. (2000). Introduction: Towards the knowledge society. In K. Rubenson & H.G. Schuetze (Eds.), *Transition to the knowledge society: policies and strategies for individual participation and learning* (pp. xi-xix). Vancouver, BC: Institute for European Studies.

Ruch, R.S. (2001). *Higher ed, Inc.: The rise of the for-profit university*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Schuetze, H.G. & Day, W.L. (2001). *Post secondary education in BC 1989–1998: The impact of policy and finance on access, participation, and outcomes.* Vancouver: Centre for Policy Studies in Higher Education and Training, The University of British Columbia.

Shack, P. (1987). Address on policy. In D.R. Jones & J. Anwyl (Eds.), *Privatizing higher education: A new Australian issue* (pp. 19-27). Melbourne, Australia: The Centre for the Study of Higher Education, University of Melbourne.

Schofield, J.W. (2007). Increasing the generalizability of qualitative research. In M. Hammersley, (Ed.), Educational research and evidence-based practice, (pp. 181-203). London: Sage.

Siblock, S.J. (2007). *Private career training institution enrolment in British Columbia: A sector report for the year 2006.* Burnaby, BC: Private Career Training Institutions Agency.

Singleton, R. A., & Straits, B.C. (2001). Survey interviewing. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context & method* (pp. 59-82). London: SAGE Publications.

Skolnik, M. L. (2006). *Postsecondary system design and governance: A background paper prepared for the Ministry of Advanced Education Campus 20/20 project regarding the future of British Columbia's postsecondary education system.* Retrieved April 15, 2008, from http:/www.aved.gov.bc.ca/campus2020/documents/postsecondary_design_goverance.pdf

Skolnik, M.L., & Jones, G.A. (1992). A comparative analysis of arrangements for state coordination of higher education in Canada and the United States. *The Journal of Higher Education, 63*(2), pp. 121-142.

Slaughter, S. (1998). National higher education policies in a global economy. In J. Currie, & J. Newson (Eds.), *Universities and globalization: Critical perspectives* (pp. 45-70). London: Sage Publications.

Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policies, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press.

Svendsen, A.C., Boutilier, R.G., & Wheeler, D. (2003). *Stakeholder relationships, social capital and business value creation: Research report*. Toronto, ON: The Canadian Institute of Charter Accountants.

Sweet, R. (1993). A profile of vocational training schools. *The Canadian Journal of Higher Education, 23*(3), pp. 36-63.

Sweet, R. (1996a). Proprietary schools in Canada, *Education Quarterly Review, 3*(1), pp. 31-42.

Sweet, R. (1996b). Vocational preparation for the new workforce: The private training option in Manitoba. *The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education, 10*(1), pp. 67-88.

Sweet, R., & Gallagher, P. (1999). Private training institutions in Canada: New directions for a public resource. *Journal of Education Administration and Foundations, 13*(2), pp. 54-77.

Trow, M. (1996). Continuities and change in American higher education. In A. Burgen (Ed.), *Goals and purposes of higher education in the 21st Century* (pp. 24-36). London: J. Kingsley Publishers.

Ward, S. (2001). *Partner or perish?: The case for strategic alliances*. Ottawa, ON: Conference Board of Canada.

Ward, D. (2007, January 25). Founder of new university in Squamish unconcerned by warning from China. Vancouver, BC: *The Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved April 16, 2008, from http://www.questu.ca/administration/news_media/news_archive.php?id=27.

Watson, J.A. (2008). *Private career training institutions Act*. Retrieved February 25, 2008, from http://www.aved.gov.bc.ca/publications/documents/PCTIA/Review.pdf.

Webster's new collegiate dictionary. (1981). Toronto: Thomas Allen & Son.

Weingartner, R.H. (1999). *The moral dimensions of academic administration.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Wilms, W. (1987). Proprietary schools: Strangers in their own land. *Change, 19*(1), pp. 11-22.

Winston, G. C. (1999). For-profit higher education: Godzilla or Chicken Little? *Change, 31*(1), pp. 12 – 19.

Wolf, A. (2002). *Does education matter?: Myths about education and economic growth.* London: Penguin Books.

Wolfe, D. A. (2000). Globalization, information and communication technologies, and local and regional systems of innovation. In K. Rubenson & H. G. Schuetze (Eds.), *Transition to the knowledge society: policies and strategies for individual participation and learning* (pp. 147-162). Vancouver, BC: Institute for European Studies, The University of British Columbia.

Zemsky, R., Wegner, G.R., & Massy, W.F. (2006). *Remaking the American university: Market-smart and mission-centered.* New Brunswick, N.J. Rutgers University Press.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Public Post-Secondary Institutions in B.C. Offering Health Programs in 2005

In February, 2005, there were 23 public institutions funded by the government of British Columbia which offered health programs as defined for this study. These institutions are listed below. This list does not include public institutions from other jurisdictions which offer health programs which are available to BC residents and do not require those residents to leave the province to complete, for example, Athabasca University. The complete list of publicly funded institutions included:

British Columbia Institute of Technology
Camosun College
Capilano College
College of New Caledonia
College of the Rockies
Douglas College
Justice Institute of British Columbia
Kwantlen University College
Langara College
Malaspina University College
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology
North Island College
Northern Lights College
Northwest Community College
Okanagan College (includes some programs of the former Okanagan University College)
Selkirk College
Simon Fraser University
Thompson Rivers University [replaced the former University College of the Cariboo and the Open Learning Agency (British Columbia Open University)]
University College of the Fraser Valley
University of British Columbia (Has two campuses: Vancouver and Okanagan;The Okanagan Campus offers some of the programs of the former Okanagan University College)
University of Northern British Columbia
University of Victoria
Vancouver Community College

The three publicly funded institutions which were excluded from the above list because they did not offer health programs as defined for this study are listed below.

Institute of Indigenous Government
Emily Carr Institute of Art & Design
Royal Roads University

In 2008, the government of British Columbia passed legislation which changed the names and mandates of five institutions as follows:

Capilano College became Capilano University
Kwantlen University College became Kwantlen Polytechnic University
Malaspina University College became Vancouver Island University
University College of the Fraser Valley became University of the Fraser Valley
Emily Carr Institute of Art & Design became Emily Carr University

As of June, 2008, the complete list of publicly funded institutions consisted of 11 universities, three institutes, and 11 colleges. These included:

British Columbia Institute of Technology
Camosun College
Capilano University
College of New Caledonia
College of the Rockies
Douglas College
Justice Institute of British Columbia
Kwantlen Polytechnic University
Langara College
Vancouver Island University
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology (absorbed the Institute of Indigenous Government)
North Island College
Northern Lights College
Northwest Community College
Okanagan College
Selkirk College
Simon Fraser University
Thompson Rivers University
Fraser Valley University
University of British Columbia
University of Northern British Columbia
University of Victoria
Vancouver Community College
Emily Carr University
Royal Roads University

Appendix B. Private Post-Secondary Institutions in B.C. Offering Health Programs in 2005

In February, 2005, there were 22 private post-secondary institutions which offered health programs, as defined for this study. The list included 21 private post-secondary institutions which were accredited by the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), and one other private institution, Trinity Western University, which was not required to be PCTIA-accredited in order to be degree-granting.

Academy of Learning
BC College of Optics
Cambridge College of Technology
Canadian Family Resource Institute and Career College
Canadian Health Care Academy
CDI College of Business, Technology & Health Care
Discovery Community College
Excel Career College
Gateway Careers
MTI Community College
Native Education Center
Omni College
Pro-Soft Training Institute
ProCare Institute
Sprott-Shaw Community College
Stenberg College
Thompson Career College
Trend College (Kelowna) Inc.
Trinity Western University
Vancouver Career College
West Coast College of Health Care
Vancouver Central College

Appendix C. Characteristics of Private and Out-of-Province Institutions Applying to Offer Degrees Under DQAB in July, 2008

Name of Institution	Head Office in B.C.		Head Office out side B.C.			Accredited with PCTIA (June, 2008)	BCCAT Status (Program or Institutional Members) (July, 2008)
	Private: For-Profit	Private: Not-for-profit	Public in own Juris-diction	Private: For-Profit	Private: Not-for-profit		
Adler School of Professional Psychology				X		Not listed	Not listed
Alexander College (was Vancouver Central College)	X					Yes, as Vancouver Central College	Program member
Athabasca University			X			Not listed	Not listed
City University of Seattle					X	Yes	Not listed
Columbia College	X					Not listed	Institutional member
Fairleigh Dickinson University					X	Not listed	Program member

Name of Institution	Head Office in B.C.		Head Office out side B.C.			Accredited with PCTIA (June 2008)	BCCAT Status (Program or Institutional Members) (July 2008)
	Private: For-Profit	Private: Not-for-profit	Public in own Juris-diction	Private: For-Profit	Private: Not-for-profit		
Gonzaga University - Jesuit					X	Not listed	Not listed
Lawrence Tech University					X	Not listed	Not listed
Learning Wise University Canada West	X					Yes, only University Academies	Program member
New York Institute of Tech					X	Not listed	Not listed
Oklahoma City University Methodist					X	Not listed	Not listed
Quest University Canada		X				Not listed	Program member
Sprott-Shaw University				X		Not listed	Program member
Trinity Western University		X				Not listed	Not listed
University of Oregon			X			Not listed	Not listed

Name of Institution	Head Office in B.C.		Head Office out side B.C.			Accredited with PCTIA (June 2008)	BCCAT Status (Program or Institutional Members) (July 2008)
	Private: For-Profit	**Private: Not-for-profit**	**Public in own Juris-diction**	**Private: For-Profit**	**Private: Not-for-profit**		
University of Phoenix				X		Not listed	Not listed
Upper Iowa University*							

Sprott-Shaw Community College is now considered to be an institution outside of B.C. as it is owned by an off-shore company.

* The proposal to DQAB of Upper Iowa University proposal was denied.

Appendix D. British Columbia Institutional Members of the Association of Canadian Community Colleges (ACCC) in August, 2004

This list of B.C. institutions is based on information from ACCC's website on August 2, 2004. It includes public and private institutions; Columbia College is the only private institution.

Camosun College
Capilano College
College of New Caledonia
College of the Rockies
Columbia College
Douglas College
Emily Carr College of Art and Design
Justice Institute of British Columbia
Kwantlen University College368
Langara College
Malaspina University College
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology
North Island College
Northern Lights College
Northwest Community College
Okanagan University College
Selkirk College
Thompson Rivers University
University College of the Fraser Valley
Vancouver Community College

Appendix E. British Columbia Institutional Members of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC) in August, 2004, and July, 2008

The information below was taken from AUCC's website on August 2, 2004, and July 29, 2008.

In both 2004 and 2008, the AUCC had 92 members across Canada.

In 2004, the AUCC had 12 members from British Columbia. Trinity Western University was the only BC member which was a private institution. It is a not-for-profit university.

By 2008, the AUCC continued to have 92 members but only 10 were from British Columbia. Other than changes to the names of four institutions, two public universities/university colleges which had been members were subsumed by other institutions.

Member in 2004	**Change by 2008**
British Columbia Open University	Subsumed by Thompson Rivers University
Emily Carr Institute of Art and Design	Became Emily Carr University
Malaspina University College	Became Vancouver Island University
Okanagan University College	Subsumed by the University of British Columbia
Royal Roads University	
Simon Fraser University	
Trinity Western University	
University College of the Cariboo	Became Thompson Rivers University
University College of the Fraser Valley	Became Fraser Valley University
University of British Columbia	
University of Northern British Columbia	
University of Victoria	

Appendix F. Clusters of Information Related to Interview Questions for Interviewees at Post-Secondary Institutions

Information Required	Interview Questions
Existing Partnerships	Does your institution have one or more partnerships, related to health programs, with a public/private post-secondary education institution? Please describe the partnership(s). What are the purposes and intended outcomes of the partnership(s)? What have the benefits been: For your institution? For the other institution? In general, what are/would be the advantages of working in partnership with an institute in the public/private sector? What issues, if any, have arisen related to the partnerships?
Evolution of Partnerships and Processes in Partnerships	***Regarding an existing partnership(s):*** How did the partnership(s) begin? What processes have worked well in the partnership(s)? What factors helped the partnership(s) proceed? What issues, if any, have arisen related to the partnership(s)?

Information Required	Interview Questions
Evolution of Partnerships and Processes in Partnerships (cont'd)	***Regarding proposed partnership(s):*** Have you approached/been approached by a private/public post-secondary educational institution with a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? Did a partnership evolve from your proposal? Why did the partnership(s) not proceed? What were the barriers? What factors helped the partnership(s) proceed? In general, what issues could arise from working in partnership with an institution in the public/private sector?
Possibilities for Partnerships	What strategic outcomes could you see your organization achieving through partnerships with a public/private institution? What potential partnerships, if any, between individual public and private post-secondary educational institutions, for example, between your own institution and a private institution, could you envision? Have you been approached by a private/public post-secondary educational institution about a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? Please describe the partnership(s) you/the other proposed, if different from the one(s) you have already described.

Information Required	Interview Questions
Possibilities for Partnerships cont'd	What was the nature of the partnership? What were the purposes and intended outcomes? What would the benefits have been: For your/the other institution?
Government Role	What role, if any, should and could government (i.e., the Ministry of Advanced Education) take in fostering partnerships, related to health programs, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?
The Respondent and the Organization	What is your title in your current position? How long have you worked with this organization? Have you worked in the opposite sector? Have you been involved in partnerships with private post-secondary educational institutions? Please confirm which health programs are currently offered by your organization on a regular basis. Would you please provide any documentation you are able to regarding existing or proposed partnerships, and contact information?

Appendix G. Interview Questions for Interviewees at Public Post-Secondary Institutions

1. What, if any, questions do you have about the Consent Form?
(*Consent Form will be provided prior to the interview.*)

2. Are you ready to sign the Consent Form?

3. Does your institution currently have one or more partnerships, related to health programs, with a private post-secondary education institution?

If *no*, go to Question 4.
If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s):

What are the purposes and intended outcomes of the partnership(s)?
How did the partnership(s) begin?
What have the benefits been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?
What processes have worked well in the partnership(s)?
What factors helped the partnership proceed?
What issues, if any, have arisen related to the partnership(s)?

4. Have you approached a private post-secondary education institution with a proposal for a partnership related to health programs?

If *no*, go to Question 6.
If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s) you proposed, if different from the one(s) you have already described.

What was the nature of the partnership?
What were the purposes and intended outcomes?
What would the benefits have been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?

5. What happened as a result of your proposal?
Did a partnership evolve from your proposal?

If *no*, Why did the partnership(s) not proceed? What were the barriers?
If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership(s) proceed?

6. Have you been approached by a private post-secondary education institution about a proposal for a partnership related to health programs?

If *no*, go to Question 8.
If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s) proposed by the other institution, if different from the partnership(s) you have already

described.

What was the nature of the partnership?
What were the purposes and intended outcomes?
What would the benefits have been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?

7. What happened as a result of the proposal by the other institution? Did a partnership evolve from the proposal?

If *no*, Why did the partnership not proceed? What were the barriers?
If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership proceed?

8. What potential partnerships, if any, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions, for example, between your own institution and a private institution, could you envision?

(Refer to the ideas for potential partnerships in the cover letter/Consent Form. Please note that the cover letter/Consent Form does not provide an exhaustive list.)

9. What strategic outcomes could you see your organization achieving through partnerships with a private institution?

10. In general, what are/would be the advantages of working in partnership with an institution in the private sector?

11. In general, what issues could arise from working in partnership with an institution in the private sector?

12. What role, if any, should and could government (i.e. the Ministry of Advanced Education) take in fostering partnerships, related to health programs, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

13. Background information about you and your organization:

What is your title in your current position?
How long have you worked with this organization?
Have you worked in the opposite sector (i.e. the private sector)?
Depending on previous replies, Have you been involved in partnerships with private post-secondary education institutions?

Please confirm which health programs are currently offered by your organization on a regular basis.
(*Interviewer will provide a draft list for review at the time of the proposed interview*).

14. Would you please provide any documentation you are able to regarding existing or proposed partnerships, and contact information?

Appendix H. Interview Questions for Interviewees at Private Post-Secondary Institutions

1. What, if any, questions do you have about the Consent Form?
(*Consent Form will be provided prior to the interview.*)

2. Are you ready to sign the Consent Form?

3. Does your institution currently have one or more partnerships, related to health programs, with a public post-secondary education institution?

If *no*, go to Question 4.
If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s):

What are the purposes and intended outcomes of the partnership(s)?
How did the partnership(s) begin?
What have the benefits been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?
What processes have worked well in the partnership(s)?
What factors helped the partnership proceed?
What issues, if any, have arisen related to the partnership(s)?

4. Have you approached a public post-secondary education institution with a proposal for a partnership related to health programs?

If *no*, go to Question 6.
If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s) you proposed, if different from the one(s) you have already described.

What was the nature of the partnership?
What were the purposes and intended outcomes?
What would the benefits have been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?

5. What happened as a result of your proposal?
Did a partnership evolve from your proposal?

If *no*, Why did the partnership(s) not proceed? What were the barriers?
If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership(s) proceed?

6. Have you been approached by a public post-secondary education institution about a proposal for a partnership related to health programs?

If *no*, go to Question 8.

If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s) proposed by the other institution, if different from the partnership(s) you have already described.

What was the nature of the partnership?
What were the purposes and intended outcomes?
What would the benefits have been:
For your institution?
For the other institution?

7. What happened as a result of the proposal by the other institution? Did a partnership evolve from the proposal?

If *no*, Why did the partnership not proceed? What were the barriers?
If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership proceed?

8. What potential partnerships, if any, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions, for example, between your own institution and a public institution, could you envision?

(Refer to the ideas for potential partnerships in the cover letter/Consent Form. Please note that the cover letter/Consent Form does not provide an exhaustive list.)

9. What strategic outcomes could you see your organization achieving through partnerships with a public institution?

10. In general, what are/would be the advantages of working in partnership with an institution in the public sector?

11. In general, what issues could arise from working in partnership with an institution in the public sector?

12. What role, if any, should and could government (i.e. the Ministry of Advanced Education) take in fostering partnerships, related to health programs, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

13. Background information about you and your organization:

What is your title in your current position?
How long have you worked with this organization?
Have you worked in the opposite sector (i.e. the public sector)?
Would you describe your institution as being for-profit or not-for-profit?
Depending on previous replies, Have you been involved in partnerships with (public/private) post-secondary education institutions?
Please confirm which health programs are currently offered by your organization on a regular basis. (Interviewer will provide a draft list for review at the time of the proposed interview).

14. Would you please provide any documentation you are able to regarding existing or proposed partnerships, and contact information?

Appendix I. Interview Questions for Government Bureaucrat

1. What, if any, questions do you have about the Consent Form?

2. Are you ready to sign the Consent Form?

3. What is the Ministry's position, if any, with regard to partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions?

4. What role does government intend to take with regard to partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

5. How, from the perspective of government, would partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions be beneficial to BC, the post-secondary education system, individual education institutions, and students?

6. What are the most significant barriers to partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

7. Are you aware of any partnerships related to health programs between individual public/private post-secondary education institutions?

> If *no*, go to Question 10.
> If *yes*, Please describe the nature of the partnerships, their purposes (if known), their outcomes (if known), and benefits (if known)..

8. Do you have any documentation about these partnerships that you would be able to share with me?

9. Would you be able to give me the names of the contact persons) in the partnering institutions?

10. What forms of potential partnerships, if any, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions, can you envision?

11. I would like to obtain or confirm some background information with you:

> What is your title in your current position?
> How long have you worked with this organization?
> Have you worked in a public or private post-secondary education institution?

Appendix J. Interview Questions for Representatives of Stakeholder Organizations

1. What, if any, questions do you have about the Consent Form?

2. Are you ready to sign the Consent Form?

3. What is your organization's position, if any, with regard to partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions?

4. What role does, or could, your organization play with regard to partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

    4.a. Does your organization support such partnerships?
    If *no*, go to Question 5.
    If *yes*, How could your organization actively foster such partnerships?

5. How, from the perspective of your organization, would partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions be beneficial to BC, the post-secondary education system, individual education institutions, and students?

6. What are the most significant barriers to partnerships between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

7. Are you aware of any partnerships related to health programs between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions?

    If *no*, go to Question 10.
    If *yes*, Please describe the nature of the partnerships, their purposes (if known), and their outcomes (if known).

8. Do you have any documentation about these partnerships that you would be able to share with me?

9. Would you be able to give me the names of the contact persons in the partnering institutions?

10. What forms of partnership, if any, between individual public and private post-secondary education institutions, can you envision?

11. I would like to obtain or confirm some background information with yo:

    What is your title in your current position?
    How long have you worked with this organization?
    Have you worked in a public or private post-secondary education institution?

Appendix K. Health Programs in Public Post-Secondary Institutions in Spring/Summer, 2005

The names of programs which were considered to be health programs as defined for this study are shown in the chart below in italics. The lists are intended to be inclusive of health and health-related programs as listed by the institutions.

It should be noted that many of the colleges which are listed as offering programs leading to a baccaulaureate degree in nursing do so within a collaborative arrangement with other institutions which may involve sharing curriculum and with one partner having the degree-granting function.

Institution	Programs
British Columbia Institute of Technology	*Adult Echocardiography* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Biomedical Engineering* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Part-time, Associate Certificate* *Full-time/Cooperative Learning, Bachelor of Science* *Breast Imaging* *Part-time/Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Cardiology* *Distance Education, Certificate* *Full-time/Part-time/Distance Education, Diploma of Technology* *Cardiovascular Technology* *Part-time/Distance Education, Diploma of Technology* *Clinical Genetics Technology (Post-Diploma Program)* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Clinical Research* *Part-time/Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Computed Tomography* *Part-time, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Critical Care Nursing Specialty (Combined Critical Care/Emergency Option)* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Critical Care Nursing Specialty (Post Anesthetic Recovery Option)* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate*

Institution	Programs
British Columbia Institute of Technology	*Critical Care Nursing Specialty (Standard Option)* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Degree Transfer in Science and Technology* *Full-time, Statement of Completion* *Diagnostic Medical Sonography (Post Diploma Program)* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Electroneurophysiology Technology* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Emergency Nursing Specialty (Combined Emergency/Critical Care Option)* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Emergency Nursing Specialty (Standard Option)* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Environmental Health (Public Health Inspection)* *Full-time, Bachelor of Technology* *Food Safety* *Part-time, Associate Certificate* *Food Technology* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Forensic Science Technology (Essentials of Criminalistics, General Studies Option)* *Part-time, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Forensic Science Technology (Forensic Science Studies Option)* *Part-time, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Health Care Management Level 1* *Distance education, Certificate* *Health Care Management Level 2* *Distance education, Certificate* *Health Care Quality Movement* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Health Informatics Technology Management* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *High Acuity Specialty Nursing* *Part-time, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Magnetic Resonance Imaging* *Distance Education Certificate* *Management (Health Specialty Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Medical Imaging* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Medical Laboratory Science* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology*

Institution	Programs
British Columbia Institute of Technology	*Medical Laboratory Science – Professional Qualifying Program* *Full-time, Certificate of Technology* *Medical Office Assistant* *Part-time, Associate Certificate* *Medical Radiology Technology* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Neonatal Nursing Specialty (Option One)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Neonatal Nursing Specialty (Option Two)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Nephrology Nursing Specialty* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Nuclear Medicine Technology* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Nurse Practitioner (Adult)* *Part-time/Distance education, Graduate Certificate* *Nursing* *Full-time, Bachelor of Technology* *Occupational Health Nursing Specialty* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Occupational Health and Safety* *Distance education, Certificate* *Occupational Health and Safety* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology* *Pacemaker Technology* *Distance Education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Pediatric Nursing Specialty (Critical Care Option)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Pediatric Nursing Specialty (Standard Option)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Perinatal Nursing Specialty (Perinatal-Neonatal Option)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate)* *Perinatal Nuring Specialty, (Perinatal – Perioperative Option)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Perinatal Nursing Specialty (Standard Option)* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Perioperative Nursing Specialty* *Distance education, Advanced Specialty Certificate* *Prosthetics and Orthotics* *Full-time, Diploma of Technology*

Institution	Programs
British Columbia Institute of Technology	*Radiation Therapy* *Full-time, Bachelor of Technology* *Registered Nurse First Assistant* *Full-time/Part-time, Statement of Completion* *Specialty Nursing (Critical Care – Combined Critical Care/.Emergency Option)* *Distance Education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Critical Care – Post Anesthetic Recovery Option)* *Distance Education, Bachelor of Technology)* *Specialty Nursing (Critical Care Nursing – Standard Option)* *Distance Education, Bachelor of Technology)* *Specialty Nursing (Emergency Nursing – Combined Emergency/Critical Care Option)* *Distance Education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Emergency Nursing – Standard Option)* *Distance Education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Neonatal – Option One)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Neonatal – Option Two)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Nephrology Nursing)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Occupational Health Nursing)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology)* *Specialty Nursing (Pediatric – Critical Care Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Pediatric – Standard Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Perinatal – Neonatal Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Perinatal – Perioperative Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Perinatal – Standard Option)* *Distance education, Bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (Perioperative Nursing)* *Distance education, bachelor of Technology* *Specialty Nursing (High Acuity Nursing – Stand* *Part-time/Distance education, Bachelor of Technology*

Institution	Programs
Camosun College	*Certified Dental Assisting, Community Health Worker, Dental Hygiene, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Capilano College	*Access to Practical Nursing, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Rehabilitation Assistant,* Medical Office Assistant, Bachelor of Music Therapy
College of New Caledonia	*Practical Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Medical Laboratory Technology Science, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Dental Assisting, Dental Hygiene*
College of the Rockies	*Certified Dental Assisting, Practical Nursing, Access to Practical Nursing, Resident Care/Home Support Attendant, Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Douglas College	*Dental Assisting, Dispensing Optician, English as a Second Language Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Health Information Services, Psychiatric Nursing (Diploma, Advanced Diploma), Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Justice Institute of British Columbia	*Health Emergency Management, Primary Care Paramedic, Advanced Care Paramedic*
Kwantlen University College	*Graduate Nurse Refresher, Graduate Nurse Refresher with English as a Second Language, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Bachelor of Science in Nursing,* Health Unit Coordinator, Gerontology-Based Therapeutic Recreation
Langara College	*Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Nursing Transition, Kinesiology*
Malaspina University College	*Dental Assistant, Dental Hygiene, Health Services Administration in Long Term and Community Care, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing, Bridging to Practical Nursing for Home Support/Resident Care Attendant Graduates, Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology	*Aboriginal Community and Health Development*
North Island College	*Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing, Baccalaureate of Science in Nursing*
Northern Lights College	*Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing*
Northwest Community College	*Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Okanagan College	*Certified Dental Assistant, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing, Therapist Assistant*

Institution	Programs
Selkirk College	*Pharmacy Technician, Gerontology, Bachelor of Science in Nursing,* Nursing Unit Clerk, Advanced Medical Transcription
Simon Fraser University	*Bachelor of Science in Health Sciences, Master's Degree in Public Health with two options: Interdisciplinary, and Global Health; Diploma in Global Health*
Thompson Rivers University	*Respiratory Therapy, Anaesthesia Technology Cardiovascular Perfusion, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Medical Lab Assistant, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Bachelor of Health Science (Respiratory Therapy),*
University College of the Fraser Valley	*Certified Dental Assistant, Dental Hygiene, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant, Practical Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
University of British Columbia	*Audiology, Speech-Language Pathology, Dental Hygiene, Dentistry, Food, Nutrition and Health, Human Kinetics, Medicine, Medical and Laboratory Sciences, Midwifery, Nursing, Occupational Therapy, Pharmaceutical Sciences, Physical Therapy*
University of Northern British Columbia	*Aboriginal Health Sciences, Rural and Northern Nursing, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Northern Medical (MD), Masters of Science in Community Health, Masters of Science in Nursing, Disability Management*
University of Victoria	*Health Information Science, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Post RN BSN, Master of Nursing (several options), PHD in Nursing*
Vancouver Community College	*Access to Practical Nursing, Acute Care Skills for Home Support/Resident Care Attendants, Caring for Persons with Dementia (Part-time), Community Pharmacy Assistant, Certified Dental Assisting (Distance delivery), Certified Dental Assisting, Dental Hygiene, Dental Hygiene Access for CDA's, Dental Reception Coordinator, Dental Technology, Denturist, Home Support./Resident Care Attendant, Home Support/Resident Care Attendant (ESL), Hospital Pharmacy Technician (Part-Time), Hospital Unit Coordinator, Medical Laboratory Assistant, Medical Laboratory Assistant Upgrade (Part-time),* Medical Office Assistant, Medical Secretary, Medical Transcriptionist, Nursing Unit Clerk, *Occupational/Physical Therapist Assistant (Rehab Assistant), Autopsy Technician, Pharmacy Technician, Practical Nurse Refresher, Practical Nursing, Practical Nursing, Resident Care Attendant Upgrade (Part-Time), Sterile Supply Technician*

Appendix L. Health Programs in Private Post-Secondary Institutions

The information in this Appendix is based on information received from October, 2004, to December, 2005.

The names of programs which are considered to be health programs as defined for this study are shown in the chart below in italics.

Institution	Programs
Academy of Learning	*Pharmacy Technician, Long Term Care Aide*, Resident Care Aide**, Medical Office Assistant, Medical Office Assistant with Advanced Medical Transcription Specialty or Unit Clerk Specialty, Dental Administrative Assistant
BC College of Optics	*Dispensing Optician/Contact Lens Fitter* (also called *Ophthalmic Dispensing & Contact Lens Fitting)*
Cambridge College of Technology	*Pharmacy Technician, Resident Care Attendant*
Canadian Family Resource Institute	*Nurses Aide, Resident Care Attendant**
Canadian Health Care Academy	*Chairside Dental Assistant, Practical Nursing, Psychiatric Aide,* Medical Office Assistant
CDI College of Business, Technology and Health Care	Programs offered in BC: *Personal Support Worker/Resident Care Aide*, Pharmacy Technician, Rehabilitation Therapy Assistant*
Discovery Community College	*Residential/Home Care Attendant, Practical Nurse Access,* Medical and Dental Office Assistant, Community Support Worker
Excel Career College	*Long Term Care Aide*, Sterile Supply Technician,* Personal Support Worker
Gateway Careers Inc.	*Long Term Care Attendant*, Resident Care Attendant**
MTI Community College	*Long Term Care Aide*, Pharmacy Technician, Level II Dental Assistant, Medical Lab Assistant,* Medical Office Assistant

Institution	Programs
Native Education Center	*Sun Circle Elder Care (Home Support Attendant and Resident Care Aide*)*
Omni College	For Canadian students: *Health Care Aide*, Canadian RN Exam Preparation* For international students: *RN Licensure Exam Preparation, Live-In Caregiver*
Pro-Soft Training Institute	*Long Term/Continuing Care Aide*, Pharmacy Technician,* Medical Office Assistant
ProCare Institute	*Health Care Aide (Combined Skills)**
Sprott-Shaw Community College	*Pharmacy Technician, Assisted Living/Resident Care Attendant*, Practical Nursing, Practical Nursing Access, Pharmacy Technician,* Medical Office Assistant, Community Support Worker, Spa Therapy
Stenberg College	*Pharmacy Technician, Practical Nursing, Resident Care Attendant, Hospital Support Specialist, Medical Lab Assistant,* Community Health Care, Unit Clerk, Medical Office Assistant
Thompson Career College	*Pharmacy Technician*
Trend College (Kelowna) Inc.	*Resident Care Attendant*
Trinity Western University	*Bachelor of Science in Nursing*
Vancouver Career College	*Resident Care Attendant, Medical Pharmacy Assistant, Practical Nursing,* Community Healthcare, Medical Office Assistant,
Vancouver Central College	*Residential Care Attendant, Community Healthcare Worker*
West Coast College of Health Care	*Dental Assistant Level II, Pharmacy Technician, Resident Care Attendant, Medical Laboratory Assistant, Therapy Assistant,* Medical Office Assistant, Nursing Unit Coordinator

* The program titles used in this chart are the titles that appear in documentation from the private institutions. These titles may vary from the titles that the public institutions, as a group, give to similar programs. Through provincial articulation processes, the public institutions all try to use the same titles for their programs, particularly when there is a "provincial" curriculum, so that students and employers are not confused. This has not been the practice for the private institutions. As an example, programs which are similar to the Resident Care Attendant program offered by the public institutions, are variously entitled Long Term Care Aide, Long Term/Continuing Care Aide, Resident Care Aide, Residential Care Attendant, Long Term Care Attendant, Health Care Aide, and Assisted Living/Resident Care Attendant, in the private institutions.

The work of a Medical Office Assistant (MOA) is not considered to be work in health care in the NOC classification. However, administrators at private post-secondary institutions consistently referred to the program to prepare MOA's as a health program. The MTI Community College Medical Office Assistant program is classified as a job in "Other Assisting Occupations in Support of Health Services."

The list below provides a summary of programs which are considered to be health programs in the private institutions, based in the information above.

Assisted Living/Resident Care Attendant
Bachelor of Science in Nursing
Canadian RN Exam Preparation
Chairside Dental Assistant
Dental Assistant Level II
Dispensing Optician/Contact Lens Fitter
Health Care Aide
Health Care Aide (Combined Skills)
Hospital Support Specialist
Level II Dental Assistant
Long Term Care Aide
Long Term Care Attendant
Long Term/Continuing Care Aide
Medical Pharmacy Assistant
Medical Laboratory Assistant
Nurses Aide
Personal Support Worker/Resident Care Aide
Pharmacy Technician
Practical Nursing
Psychiatric Aide
Rehabilitation Therapy Assistant
Resident Care Aide
Resident Care Attendant
Residential Care Attendant
Residential/Home Care Attendant
Sun Circle Elder Care (Home Support Attendant and Resident Care Aide)
Therapy Assistant

Appendix M Contact/Participation Completed at Eligible Public Post-Secondary Institutions

Institution	Contacted	Participation Completed
Anonymous	Yes	Yes
British Columbia Institute of Technology	Yes	Yes
Camosun College	Yes	Yes
Capilano College	No	-
College of New Caledonia	Yes	Declined
College of the Rockies	Yes	Yes
Douglas College	Yes	Yes
Justice Institute of British Columbia	No	-
Kwantlen University College	Yes	Yes
Langara College	No	-
Malaspina University College	Yes	Yes
Nicola Valley Institute of Technology	No	-
North Island College	Yes	Yes
Northern Lights College	Yes	Yes
Northwest Community College	No	-
Okanagan College	No	-
Selkirk College	Yes	Yes
Simon Fraser University	No	-
University College of the Fraser Valley	Yes	Declined
University of British Columbia	Yes	Yes

Institution	Contacted	Participation Completed
University of Northern British Columbia	Yes	Yes
University of Victoria	No	-

Appendix N. Contact/Participation Completed at Eligible Private Post-Secondary Institutions

Institution	Contacted	Participation Completed
Academy of Learning	Yes (x2 locations)	Yes (X2 locations)
BC College of Optics	No	N/A
Cambridge College of Technology	No	N/A
Canadian Family Resource Institute and Career College	No	N/A
Canadian Health Care Academy	Yes	Yes
CDI College of Business, Technology & Health Care	Yes	No
Discovery Community College	Yes (x2 interviewees)	Yes (x2 interviewees)
Excel Career College	No	N/A
Gateway Careers	Yes	No
MTI Community College	Yes	No
Native Education Centre	No	N/A
Omni College	Yes	Yes
Pro-Soft Training Institute	No	No
ProCare Institute Inc.	Yes	No
Sprott-Shaw Community College	Yes	No
Stenberg College	Yes	Yes
Thompson Career College	Yes	Yes
Trend College	Yes	Yes
Trinity Western University	Yes	No
Vancouver Central College	No	N/A

Institution	Contacted	Participation Completed
Vancouver Career College	Yes	Yes
West Coast College of Health Care	No	N/A

Appendix O. Interviewees at Post-Secondary Institutions and Stakeholder Organizations

Public Post-Secondary Institutions

Name	Title	Institution
Anonymous		Not to be named
Elisabeth Riley	Dean, School of Health Sciences	British Columbia Institute of Technology
Thelma Midori	Dean, School of Health & Human Services	Camosun College
Doug McLachlan	Senior Instructional Officer	College of the Rockies
Joy Holmwood	Dean, Health Sciences	Douglas College
Judith McGillivray	Provost and Vice President Learning	Kwantlen University College
Laureen Styles	Dean, Health & Human Services	Malaspina University College
Dr. Martin Petter	Vice President Education	North Island College
Marjo Wheat	Asst. Principal/Program Director	Northern Lights College
Angus Graeme	Dean, School of Health & Human Services and School of Renewable Resources	Selkirk College
Dr. John Gilbert	Principal, College of Health Disciplines	The University of British Columbia
Dr. Howard Brunt	Vice-President Academic and Provost	University of Northern British Columbia

Private Post-Secondary Institutions

Name	Title	Institution
Steve Whiteside	Director	Academy of Learning, Vancouver-Broadway Station Branch
Derek Hamill	President	Canadian Office, Academy of Learning
Melanie Hull	Coordinator	Canadian Health Care Academy
Lois McNestry	Executive Director	Discovery Community College
Patrick Kelly	Director of Regulations & Programs	Discovery Community College
Ron Burke	Director	Omni College

Private Post-Secondary Institutions

Name	Title	Institution
Jeremy Sabell	Executive Director	Stenberg College
Geoff Collier	School Administrator	Thompson Career College
Terry Geisbrecht	President	Trend College
Sarina Corsi	Director, Curriculum Development	Vancouver Career College

Stakeholder Organizations

Monica Lust	Executive Director	British Columbia Career Colleges Association
Jim Wright	Registrar	Private Career Training Institutions Agency
Anonymous		Ministry of Advanced Education, Province of British Columbia

Appendix P. Contact/Participation Completed at Stakeholder Organizations

Institution	Contacted	Participation Completed
BC Ministry of Advanced Education	Yes (Contacted potential interviewees at three Branches)	Yes (Interviewed a representative of one Branch)
Private Career Training Institutions Agency	Yes	Yes
British Columbia's Career College Association	Yes	Yes

Appendix Q. The University of British Columbia, Behavioral Research Ethics Board, Certificates of Approval, May 5, 2005, and August 21, 2006

The University of British Columbia
Office of Research Services and Administration
Behavioural Research Ethics Board

Certificate of Approval

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	DEPARTMENT	NUMBER
Sork, T.J.	Educational Studies	B05-0327

INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT

CO-INVESTIGATORS:

Reed, Diane, Educational Studies

SPONSORING AGENCIES

Unfunded Research

TITLE:

Challenging Boundaries: An Exploration of Models for Educational Partnerships Between Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions Offering Health Programs in BC

APPROVAL DATE	TERM (YEARS)	DOCUMENTS INCLUDED IN THIS APPROVAL:
MAY - 5 2005	1	April 4, 2005, Contact letter / Consent form / Questionnaires

CERTIFICATION:

The protocol describing the above-named project has been reviewed by the Committee and the experimental procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

Approval of the Behavioural Research Ethics Board by one of the following:
Dr. James Frankish, Chair,
Dr. Cay Holbrook, Associate Chair,
Dr. Susan Rowley, Associate Chair
Dr. Anita Hubley, Associate Chair

This Certificate of Approval is valid for the above term provided there is no change in the experimental procedures

The University of British Columbia
Office of Research Services and Administration
Behavioural Research Ethics Board

Certificate of Approval

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR	DEPARTMENT	NUMBER
Sork, T.J.	Educational Studies	**B05-0327**

INSTITUTION(S) WHERE RESEARCH WILL BE CARRIED OUT

CO-INVESTIGATORS:

Reed, Diane, Educational Studies

SPONSORING AGENCIES

Unfunded Research

TITLE:

Challenging Boundaries: An Exploration of Models for Educational Partnerships Between Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions Offering Health Programs in BC

APPROVAL RENEWED DATE	TERM (YEARS)
AUG 21 2006	1

CERTIFICATION:

The request for continuing review of the above-named project has been reviewed and the procedures were found to be acceptable on ethical grounds for research involving human subjects.

Approved on behalf of the Behavioural Research Ethics Board
by one of the following:
Dr. Peter Suedfeld, Chair,
Dr. Jim Rupert, Associate Chair
Dr. Arminee Kazanjian, Associate Chair

This Certificate of Approval is valid for the above term provided there is no change in the experimental procedures

Appendix R. Letter of Initial Contact

[UBC LETTERHEAD]
[Date]

[Name and title of prospective participant]
[Institution and address of prospective participant]

Dear :

Project Title: Challenging Boundaries: An Exploration of Models for Educational Partnerships Between Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions Offering Health Programs in British Columbia

My name is Diane Reed. I would like to invite you to participate in a research project which has the purpose of exploring existing and possible models or frameworks for educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions offering selected health programs on a regular basis in British Columbia.

I am currently a graduate student at the University of British Columbia, completing the requirements for the Doctor of Education (EdD) in Educational Leadership and Policy. This research project forms the thesis component of the degree.

The study will foster a better understanding of the range and forms of educational partnerships that currently exist, and ideas about possibilities for partnerships, in addition to a further understanding of the work of public and private educational institutions and the health programs they offer. The study will result in the development of a model or framework for use by these institutions when undertaking partnerships. This study may provide direction for government policy that encourages and supports innovative, mutually-beneficial partnerships in the post-secondary sector, particularly those related to meeting the need for access to high quality health programs.

For this project, examples of partnerships between public and private post-secondary education may include, but are not limited to, such activities as: transfer credit for specific courses or programs; offering learning opportunities for student audiences in countries with which one institution has not had experience; jointly offering a program of studies in a manner in which each institution takes instructional responsibility for a pre-selected set of courses toward a common credential offered by one or both of the institutions; support for degree-granting activities by a private institution from a public institution which has extensive experience in managing degree programs; joint planning and/or development of courses and/or programs and/or curricula for a specified student group; creating

professional development opportunities for faculty; joint community development activities; and, joint research activities.

At this time, I am asking 20 senior academic administrators in public and private post-secondary education institutions accredited by the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA), as well as representatives in other stakeholder organizations, to participate in interviews for this study. Interview questions are attached for your review. The selection of institutions from which representatives will be interviewed is based on the range of health programs offered, the type of institution (e.g. university, college), and the institution's location. As a senior academic administrator in an institution which has the characteristics required for the study, or in a related stakeholder institution, you are being asked to participate in the study.

If you agree to participate in this study, your participation could take up to 2.5 hours. As a participant in this study, I would be asking you to:

- Review and sign a Consent Form about your participation in the study and return it to me at the time of the interview.
- Advise me if your institution/organization has a research ethics review process which would apply to this project and provide direction to meeting the requirements of the process.
- Review the proposed interview questions, and consider the answers you may provide.
- Participate in an audiotaped in-person or phone interview that will last approximately one hour.
- Review a transcript of your interview in order to add and/or delete any information. Note: You are not required to review the transcript, however, you will be given the opportunity to do so.
- Possibly participate in a follow-up in-person or phone interview of about 30 minutes in order to clarify information or obtain additional information after an initial analysis of information from a number of interviews has been completed.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If at any time you wish to withdraw your contribution to the research, you may do so without experiencing any penalty or negative consequences.

Only the research committee for this project, consisting of Dr. Tom Sork as Principal Investigator, two other UBC professors, myself, and, for a limited time, the trancriptionist, will have access to the raw information you provide. The transcriptionist will sign a waiver pledging to maintain the information as confidential.

If you participate in this study, your name, with your job title and institutional name, will be listed in an Appendix of the thesis. The information from the interviews presented in the thesis will not be attributed to a specific person, except with the written permission of that

person, unless the information is already in the public record. However, it will be important in the thesis to be able to attribute selected information or quotes to types of institution, for example, public or private, college or university. It is possible that readers of the completed thesis will try to infer that specific statements came from specific sources, however, that would be speculation on their part.

Please note that, at completion, a thesis is a public document. One risk to participants, which could also be a benefit, is that the thesis will contain ideas and examples from a variety of sources about existing or possible partnerships. The risk to participants is that they may find that other institutions may adopt their approach. The benefit is that they too may be able to adopt something of value from the work of other institutions.

Following the successful defense of the thesis, you will be provided with a copy of the *Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations* chapter. The entire dissertation will be available in the UBC library system should you wish to review it in its entirety. I will also have two copies available for circulation to interested parties.

Dr. Thomas Sork, Professor, Department of Educational Studies (2044 Lower Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2, 604-822-5702 tom.sork@ubc.ca) is my research supervisor and the Principal Investigator. Dr. Sork can be contacted should you have any concerns regarding this research. If you have any concerns about your treatment or your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598. Throughout this research project, I am available at [*personal information removed*] and at (604) [*personal information removed*]. I would be pleased to answer any inquiries you may have concerning the project.

Thank you for considering this request. I will contact you in one to two weeks to determine whether you are willing to participate in this study.

Sincerely,

Diane Reed

Attach.

Appendix S. Letter of Consent

[UBC LETTERHEAD]
[Date]

[Name and title of prospective participant]
[Institution and address of prospective participant]

Dear _____,

Project Title: "Challenging Boundaries: An Exploration of Models for Educational Partnerships Between Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions Offering Health Programs in British Columbia"

My name is Diane Reed. I am currently a graduate student at the University of British Columbia, completing the thesis requirement for the Doctor of Education (EdD) in Educational Leadership and Policy. This research project forms the thesis component of the degree.

Thank you for indicating your interest in participating in my research project, named above. The purpose of this project is to explore the range and forms of existing and possible models or frameworks for educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions offering selected health programs in British Columbia, in addition to fostering a further understanding of the work of public and private education institutions and the health programs they offer. The study will result in the development of a model or framework for use by these institutions when undertaking partnerships. This study may provide direction for government policy that encourages and supports innovative, mutually-beneficial partnerships in the post-secondary sector, particularly those related to meeting the need for access to high quality health programs.

For this project, examples of partnerships between public and private post-secondary education may include, but are not limited to, such activities as: transfer credit for specific courses or programs; offering learning opportunities for student audiences in countries with which one institution has not had experience; jointly offering a program of studies in a manner in which each institution takes instructional responsibility for a pre-selected set of courses toward a common credential offered by one or both of the institutions; support for degree-granting activities by a private institution from a public institution which has extensive experience in managing degree programs; joint planning and/or development of courses and/or programs and/or curricula for a specified student group; creating professional development opportunities for faculty; joint community development activities; and, joint research activities.

As a participant in this study, you are either a senior academic administrator in a public or private post-secondary education institution accredited by the Private Career Training Institutions Agency (PCTIA) which has the characteristics

required for the study as described in my earlier letter, or a senior representative in a related stakeholder institution, such as the Ministry of Advanced Education, the PCTIA, the BC Council on Admissions & Transfer, or the BC Academic Health Council.

Your participation may take up to 2.5 hours. I will be asking you to:

- Review and sign this Consent Form about your participation in the study and return it to me at the time of the interview.
- Advise me if your institution/organization has a research ethics review process which would apply to this project and provide direction to meeting the requirements of the process.
- Review the proposed interview questions (attached), and consider the answers you may provide.
- Participate in an audiotaped in-person or phone interview which will last approximately one hour.
- Review a transcript of your interview in order to add and/or delete any information. Note: You are not required to review the transcript, however, you will be given the opportunity to do so.
- Possibly participate in a follow-up in-person or phone interview (about 30 minutes) in order to clarify information or obtain additional information after an initial analysis of information from a number of interviews has been completed.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. If at any time you wish to withdraw your contribution to the research, you may do so without experiencing any penalty or negative consequences.

Only the research committee for this project, consisting of Dr. Tom Sork as Principal Investigator, two other UBC professors, and myself, as well as the trancriptionist, will have access to the raw information you provide. The transcriptionist will sign a waiver pledging to maintain the information as confidential.

You are being asked to sign this Consent Form before your participation in this project. You should know that the names of participants, with their job titles and institutional names, will be listed in an Appendix of the thesis. The information from the interviews presented in the thesis will not be attributed to a specific person, except with the written permission of that person, unless the information is already in the public record. However, it is important in the thesis to be able to attribute selected information or quotes to types of institution, for example, public or private, college or university.

It is possible that readers of the completed thesis will try to infer that specific statements came from specific sources, however, that would be speculation on their part. If participants provide information about existing partnerships which is already a matter of public record, it will be handled accordingly.

Please note that, at completion, a thesis is a public document. One risk to participants, which could also be a benefit, is that the thesis will contain ideas and examples from a variety of sources about existing or possible partnerships. The risk to participants is that they may find that other institutions may adopt their approach. The benefit is that they too may be able to adopt something of value from the work of other institutions.

Following the successful defense of the thesis, you will be provided with a copy of the *Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations* chapter. The entire thesis will be available in the UBC library system should you wish to review it in its entirety. I will also have two copies available for circulation to interested parties.

Dr. Thomas Sork, Professor, Department of Educational Studies (2044 Lower Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z2, 604-822-5702 tom.sork@ubc.ca) is my research supervisor and is the Principal Investigator. Dr. Sork can be contacted should you have any concerns regarding the undertaking of this research. If you have any concerns about your treatment or your rights as a research subject, you may contact the Research Subject Information Line in the UBC Office of Research Services at 604-822-8598. Throughout this research project, should you need to contact me at any time, I am available at (604) [*personal information removed*] or by email at [*personal information removed*]. I would be pleased to answer any inquiry you may have concerning the procedures for the project.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the requirements and procedures of the study, have had an opportunity to ask questions about the study, and that you consent to participate.

Your signature below also indicates that you have received a signed copy of this Consent Form for your own records.

_____

Print Name Signature Date

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research project. I hope that this project results in a greater number and range of educational partnerships between public and private post-secondary education institutions with benefits for both the institutions and the British Columbians they serve.

Sincerely,

Diane Reed

Appendix T. Additional Questions for Participants in Interview Pilot Process

Cover Letter

- Please comment on your reaction to the cover letter?
  Prompts:
  - In the cover letter, was the purpose of the study clear ?
  - In the cover letter, was the description of the process for the interview clear ?
  - In the cover letter, was the role of the interviewee clear?
- What, if any, of the language used in the cover letter reflected bias with regard to either public or private sector post-secondary education institutions?
- What concerns do you think a prospective interviewee might have about the interview based on the cover letter?
- What changes, if any, would you recommend for the cover letter?

Interview Questions

- How could the interview questions be clarified, if at all?
- Are there any questions which have a bias, in either language or intent, for or against either public or private post-secondary education institutions. Be specific. How could the questions be changed to remove bias?
- What was the impact on you, as the interviewee, of receiving the interview questions in advance? Would you consider the impact to be favorable for:
  - you as the interviewee?
  - the quality of the information collected from you as the interviewee?
- Would you recommend that all interviewees receive the questions in advance?
- What changes, if any, to the interview questions might you suggest? Why?
- What questions, if any, could be added? Why?
- What questions, if any, might be removed? Why?
- If you had questions about the interview process and the questions, did you feel that you were given an opportunity to ask the questions?
- If you had questions about the interview questions, did you feel that you were given an opportunity to ask the questions?
- Was the interviewer able to answer your questions satisfactorily?
- What actions could the interviewer have taken to make you more comfortable regarding any aspect of the interview?
- What concerns do you think an interviewee might have about the interview?

Opportunity to Review the Transcript of the Interview

- As an interviewee, what was your reaction to the possibility of reviewing the transcript?
- Did you review the transcript? If so, how long did it take you to review the transcript?
- Now that some time has passed since the interview, please provide any additional comments you may have about it, the role of the interviewee, or the interview questions?

Appendix U. Changes to Interview Questions from Pilot to Final Version

Note: The changes from the pilot version are in bold font.

Questions in Pilot	Questions in Final Version
3. Does your institution currently have one or more partnerships, related to health programs, with a (public/private) post-secondary education institution(s)? If *no*, go to Question 4. If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s).	3. Does your institution currently have one or more partnerships with a (public/private) post-secondary education institution(s)? If *no*, go to Question 4. If *yes*, Please, describe the partnership(s). **What are the purposes and intended outcomes of the partnership(s)?** **How did the partnership(s) begin?** **What have the benefits been?** **For your institution?** **For the other institution?** **What processes have worked well in the partnership?** **What factors helped the partnership proceed?** **What issues, if any, have arisen related to the partnership(s)?**
4. Have you approached a (public/private) post-secondary education institution with a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? If *no*, go to Question 6. If *yes*, What was the nature of the partnership you proposed, its purposes, intended outcomes, and benefits?	4. Have you approached a (public/private) post-secondary education institution with a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? If *no*, go to Question 6. If *yes*, Please describe the partnership(s) you proposed, if different from the one(s) you have already described. What was the nature of the partnership? What were the purposes and intended outcomes? What ***would the benefits have been?*** **For your institution?** **For the other institution?**

Note: The changes from the pilot version are in bold font.

Questions in Pilot	Questions in Final Version
5. What happened as a result of your proposal? Did a partnership evolve from your proposal?	5. What happened as a result of your proposal? Did a partnership evolve from your proposal? If *no*, Why did the partnership(s) not proceed? What were the barriers? If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership(s) proceed?
6. Have you been approached by a (public/private) post-secondary education institution about a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? If *no*, go to Question 8. If *yes*, go to the question below. What was the nature of the partnership proposed, its purposes, and its intended outcomes?	6. Have you been approached by a (public/private) post-secondary education institution about a proposal for a partnership related to health programs? If *no*, go to Question 8. If *yes*, **Please describe the partnership(s) proposed by the other institution, if different from the one(s) you have already described?** What was the nature of the partnership? What were the purposes and intended outcomes? **What would the benefits have been?** **For your institution?** **For the other institution?**
7. What happened as a result of the proposal? Did a partnership evolve from the proposal by the other institution(s)?	7. What happened as a result of the proposal by the other institution? Did a partnership evolve from the proposal? **If *no*, Why did the partnership not proceed? What were the barriers?** **If *yes*, What factors helped the partnership proceed?**
11. In general, what problems could arise from working in partnership with an institution in the public/private sector?	11. In general, what **issues** could arise from working in partnership with an institution in the private/public sector?

Appendix V. Transcriptionist Confidentiality Agreement

[ON UBC LETTERHEAD]
[Date]

[Name and address of prospective transcriptionist]

Project Title: "Challenging Boundaries: An Exploration of Models for Educational Partnerships Between Public and Private Post-Secondary Education Institutions Offering Health Programs in British Columbia"

Dear _____,

My name is Diane Reed. I am currently a graduate student at the University of British Columbia, completing the thesis requirement for a Doctor of Education degree. This research project forms the thesis component of the degree.

Thank you for agreeing to be the transciptionist for my research project.

You are already aware that the information provided by individuals who agree to be interviewed is considered to be confidential. I am, therefore, requesting your assistance in maintaining the confidentiality of the information you transcribe for this project.

The procedure I am requesting that you agree to and follow is that:

- The audiotapes of interviews that you receive related to the project should be kept in a location that is not normally accessed by others until the audiotapes are returned to me.

- The information on the audiotapes must not be discussed with others.

- After a final paper copy of the transcribed version of each audiotaped interview, and the electronic version of the transcribed information have been returned to me, all other paper or electronic copies must be destroyed in a manner which makes the information inaccessible to all others.

Thank you for assisting with this work and using the procedure outlined above to maintain the confidentiality of the information received from interviewees.

Your signature below indicates that you have read and understood the requirements and procedures above, and you consent to adopting the procedures.

Your signature below also indicates that you have received a signed copy of this Confidentiality Agreement.

_____

Print Name Signature Date

Please feel free to contact me at any time as we work together.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Diane Reed