The author examines the changing philosophies of admission to post-secondary institutions within the context of open-door policies. He concludes that changing social, political and educational conditions have already forced a major relaxation of heretofore restrictive university admission policies to such a degree as to render these meaningless in an operational context. He suggests that continuing problems of Canadian university accessability, which have long been attributed primarily to restrictive admission policies, might be more profitably examined from other perspectives.

DONALD B. BLACK*

Open What! Some Personal Comments On Changing University Admission Requirements

Of the moment, the latest bête noire in higher education is open admission policy, that is, admission barriers are so reduced that any graduate of a high school may attend university regardless of program or academic qualifications. Educators are watching the experimental programs of The Open University in England and City University of New York (CUNY) with great interest. The same theme was evident at the 1971 Annual Meeting of the Canadian Service for Admission to College and University.[1] References to accessibility to higher education abound in the current literature and open admission is part of that picture.

To place these events into a logical perspective, one need only refer to Frank Bowles' UNESCO study, *Access to Higher Education*[2]. Bowles and his committee, upon examining access problems in a major cross-section of the world's nations at varying stages of their educational development, appeared to propose a common sequential progression leading towards full universality of education. Not only does this appear as differences now existing between nations, but the same developmental sequence has been apparent historically within nations. The reference sequence can be described as the movement upward in educational level of a point where selection must be made of those who will be permitted

*Department of Educational Psychology, The University of Calgary

[1]Marie Sivyer (Editor), *Proceedings: Annual Meeting Service for Admission to College and University 1971.* (Ottawa: Service for Admission to College and University, 1971.)

[2]Frank Bowles, *The International Study of University Admissions: Access to Higher Education, Volumes I & II.* (UNESCO and the International Association of Universities. New York: Columbia University Press, 1963.)

to continue their studies. For example, in some under-developed nations, selection in one form or another takes place beginning in Grade I. However, as education at any one level becomes universal, pressures appear on the next level to "open up". Over time, the selection or articulation point moves upward, and the educational pyramid gradually becomes more box-like or rectangular. In Canada, and certainly in Alberta, we have seen this progression upward until now, even high school graduation is approaching universality and social pressures are mounting to ease admission requirements to all post-secondary institutions.

The limiting factors that influence educational selectivity vary but they have included sex, accessibility to facilities and equipment, ability to pay, appropriate religious beliefs, availability of qualified teachers, socio-economic status of parents, political beliefs, and even academic aptitude and demonstrated ability. These function alone or in combination, and either overtly or covertly. Obviously, then, open admission is a logical outcome of educational development and is offered as one answer to social pressures to eliminate the selectivity of discriminatory aspects of education, such as those that emerge from "cultural deprivation."

It is interesting to note, however, that when selection is not an issue, curricular articulation remains but is rarely an issue for public debate. But at the same time, something appears to happen to the curriculum of the lower level. It becomes generalized or broad-based and aims to provide broad skills applicable to a number of program alternatives which will be available at some higher level. Conversely, when selection does take place at an articulation point, the curriculum below this point is likely to be greatly influenced by the nature of these same selection procedures, particularly when there is only one program route available at the next level. It needs only to be added that the lower level then gains its status on the basis of how many of its students "get through". (It is also noted that there is an accompanying tendency of the lower "preparatory" level to be stretched out time-wise.) The advent of the comprehensive high school represents the move towards a generalized program, and in Alberta, at least, the high school diploma is rapidly replacing the matriculation standing as the accepted school leaving certificate. Under such conditions, articulation or admissions criteria cannot help but lose their hard lines and distinguishability from one program to another.

If, as advocates of open admission imply, all admission requirements are basically bad, why did restrictive requirements come about in the first instance? The first reason is that there is some point, where for financial and/or physical reasons, the political unit cannot provide additional school places. Even the Open University in the United Kingdom placed a ceiling intake of twenty-five thousand students when it opened. Second, the universities, as responsible social institutions, have felt both a moral and financial obligation to students and to themselves to admit only those whose likelihood of success is reasonable. However, there is

the very real difference between admission policies which admit on the basis of those who would benefit most as distinct from those who are most likely to succeed. There is some evidence to suggest that the former, with no change in the university program *per se,* will have a higher failure rate. Those who support open admission argue that it is the right of the individual to choose even failure, not some institution's.

The third reason for selective devices, prerequisite requirements, relates in part to the previous point of moral responsibility. Not surprisingly, the rigidity of adherence to, and the degree of specificity of, prerequisite requirements relates inversely to the ratio of the number of places available to the number of candidates. While some university admission requirements defy rationalization in any form, for the most part they are deemed essential to further study and to the efficient and economic operation of the universities' programs of study.

Finally, selection may well be based on projected manpower needs. In Canada, as in many other nations, controlled economies go against the prevailing political philosophies. From an educational point of view, directive or informative manpower policies are either non-existent or are darkly kept secrets. Control of intake becomes a matter of individual choice. Presumably, as at the time of writing, with surpluses of teachers, nurses, chemists, psychologists, geologists, and now Protestant clergy in the labor market, theoretically we should see fewer admissions to these particular programs. On the other hand, nations with clear-cut manpower policies may and do curtail admissions to meet national targets as we see happening in some of the newer nations of Africa. Unfortunately, some of these same nations have ignored supportive educational development at lower levels to build prestige-giving universities with the net result that often their graduates cannot find work.

To return to the point in question, real or otherwise, overt or covert, manpower policies cannot help but create an educational elitism, and this usually results in differential preparation of students long before the actual articulation point. For example, the now-departed British 11+ examinations were long criticized on their very basis. This was also a characteristic of the comprehensive high school when these were first introduced but now with increasing maturity, there has been a weakening of the "streaming" concept — or at least the banks between the streams are getting very marshy, to continue an analogy. This, however, has not come about directly as a result of government edict, but rather from public pressure, from the willingness of universities to liberalize admission policies, and lastly, from the emergence of other post-secondary institutions as significant elements in the educational structure.

Pike, in a recent monograph, *Who Doesn't Get to University — and Why?*[3], suggests that public concern with problems of educational

[3]R. M. Pike, *Who Doesn't Get to University — And Why: A Study on Accessibility to Higher Education In Canada.* (Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada. Ottawa: The Runge Press Limited, 1970.)

equality at all levels is a prime cause of the changes noted above. Certainly, the higher proportion of high school students graduating has made the leaving certificate the *sina quo non* for entry to the labor force. Moreover, the sheer numbers of students has, besides increasing university enrollments, forced the expansion of established post-secondary institutes, such as the technological institutes, and encouraged the development of new ones, such as the community colleges. These latter institutions have minimal entrance requirements and they are politically viable in that they are local in location and government. Not surprisingly, Tillery and his associates working in the United States have found that the distribution of ability achievement and family background in the two-year colleges closely parallels that found in the high school.[4] (It is also interesting to note that 54% of the students in this study aspired to a university degree or better!) The increasing availability of such colleges will speed the continued rise in the base level of educational universality. Such events have already placed the universities under two different kinds of pressures: competition for students from the available pool of graduates (and in this, they have long competed among themselves as well!); and acceptance of student transfers from the post-secondary institutions. These pressures have been further amplified by most Canadian provincial governments placing the funding of all post-secondary institutions on what is essentially a per-student-enrolled basis.

The universities, being rational entities concerned as much with survival as to holding to the *status quo,* have met these pressures in two ways. First, in the competition for students, they have liberalized their admission requirements markedly, and second, although not quite as dramatic, they are easing the conditions of transfer with credit from other post-secondary institutions. The first has gone ahead on the basis that admissions research has shown for the past quarter of a century that there is no great difference from a validity point of view, among various conventional admission formats. Beginning in the late thirties with the Eight-Year-Study[5], most dramatically after World War II with the DVA students, and more recently with the non-matriculated adult admission programs[6], it is abundantly evident that traditional admission requirements are a myth as exclusive predictors of university success. The evidence strongly supports the thesis that universities by liberalizing their admissions have gained in the long run rather than lost. Notwithstanding, there can be no denying that, for many academics, the rigorous prescription of admission requirements still ranks very high in their scale of what makes a particular university prestigious.

---

[4]D. Tillery, B. Sherman, and D. Donovan, *SCOPE Four State Profiles, Grade Twelve 1966, California, Illinois, Massachusetts, North Carolina.* (The Centre for Research and Development in Higher Education and College Entrance Examination Board: New York, 1966.)

[5]Dean Chamberlain, *et al., Did They Succeed in College?* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1942.)

[6]S. A. Perkins, "Success of mature age students in university studies." *Alberta Journal of Educational Research,* XVII:2 (June, 1971) pp. 105-111.

The issues of transfer to the universities from other post-secondary institutions are two fold: admission and credit. Of these, admission is no longer a major issue. Most universities will accept some courses of such transfers in lieu of designated Grade XII subjects. The matter of transfer of courses from other post-secondary institutions for credit towards a degree does remain a contentious issue. However, as negotiations continue, there is an obvious trend on the part of the universities to accept more and more of these courses.

One further aspect should be examined, namely, the changing structures of higher education. In Alberta, as everywhere else it seems, numerous Royal Commissions and studies of higher education have been conducted within the past fifteen years. The Cameron Commission of the late fifties[7] provided the impetus for admission policy change and the introduction of the true community college concept. The Stewart *Study on Junior Colleges* (1965)[8] of the mid-sixties, while appearing to be a retrograde step in its title, was perhaps most significant although the report itself has been largely unheralded. At the risk of gross oversimplification, it proposed a university/junior college configuration (with local variations) not unlike the California 40-60 plan. The latter proposed that the first two years of a degree program would have over-all enrollments such that forty percent would be enrolled in the universities proper while the remaining sixty percent would be enrolled in transfer programs in the community colleges. This distribution would ease university problems of expansion by permitting them to concentrate on the more demanding and costly upper division and graduate programs. The net effect of this has been to see the first two years of an Arts and Science program offered in several Alberta community colleges. The final group, the Worth Commission, aims to predict the shape of Alberta education at the turn of the century. It has not reported officially other than through press releases. Any final judgment must come with the report proper.

Alberta universities, under the circumstances outlined, can use admissions to turn two ways, ignoring for a moment the *status quo*. First, they can revert to elitist admission policies. The timing for such a move has never been better. University enrollments, for a variety of reasons, are not keeping up with projections. Further, there seems to be a growing resentment on the part of governments and public about the costs and actual operation of universities, particularly in light of reluctance of the latter to be relevant. More important, and this comes from both inside and outside the university, elitist admission policies would meet the growing concern about the rapid expansion of class sizes, the

---

[7]Senator Donald Cameron, Chairman, *Report of the Royal Commission on Education in Alberta.* (Edmonton: The Queen's Printer, 1959.) Chapter 19, "The Community College", in particular.

[8]A. Stewart, *Special Study on Junior Colleges.* (The Third Interim Report of the Survey Committee on Higher Education, Government of Alberta, Edmonton. December, 1965.)

increasing impersonalization of student/professor relations, and the clear trend away from the contemplative-inquiry aspects of university study as opposed to the training of professionals. It is not intended to explain these and other concerns other than to comment that from public pressure and by their own design, the universities have been obliged to become mass-production educational institutions. No one will deny that this has increased the quantity of graduates but the effect on quality, if any, still has to be determined. Perhaps the most rational and convincing of those who decry the decline of traditional higher education has been Fritz Machlup[9, 10]. He calls not so much for a decreased educational effort as for a restructuring of institutional functions from kindergarten through post-secondary (tertiary) education to a new and truly higher education program. Yet, notwithstanding the particular case for stiffening university admissions, it seems highly unlikely that the universities will be allowed to revert to elitist institutions in the foreseeable future for three reasons. First, the universities in their present forms are geared for expansion. They must first retain and then sustain certain minimum enrollments if they are to have viable programs of an interdisciplinary nature. Second, the very financing of universities is such as to force enrollment increases to meet spiralling operating costs and to justify capital expenditures. Finally, provincial governments cannot politically afford to permit the establishment of enrollment quotas, for it is readily evident that the public is primarily committed to equality of educational opportunity if not its quality. Unfortunately, by their statements and actions, "the student left" has convinced provincial governments and ordinary citizens alike that the universities are breeding grounds for political and social insurrection. This belief has been used directly or indirectly as a threat to reduce university grants on the basis that "an idle mind is the devil's workshop" for both student and professor alike. Unfortunately, whenever there have been reductions in government grants, these have not been accompanied by permission to place enrollment quotas for any but the paramedical group where such quotas have always been permitted.

The second alternative, total open admission, appears to have greater potential appeal. Under it the universities, like the community colleges, would take all high school graduates. The argument is that the university, as but one of a number of post-secondary institutions, should be treated no differently from the others. The decision to attend should be that of the student rather than that of the institution itself. Such a position is based on several assumptions. First, it is assumed that adequate facilities and staff can be made available to all who would use them. Second, it assumes equal accessibility in terms of both geographical proximity and/or financial support. Third, there is

[9]Fritz Machlup, "Longer education: Thinner, broader, or higher." *Proceedings of the 1970 Invitational Conference on Testing Problems.* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, Oct. 31, 1970.) pp. 3-13.

[10]Fritz Machlup, *The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States.* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1962.)

the assumption that any high school student is capable of benefitting equally from study in any one of the post-secondary institutions and that the students will select themselves on the basis of interest and perceived academic capabilities. Finally, there is the very big assumption that the increased university failure/dropout rates will be acceptable to students as the price paid for eased admission requirements. It is also implied that the public, industry, other universities, and even the students themselves will find the graduates of such institutions acceptable in the first place. All this, of course, is purely speculation for these matters cannot be really evaluated until such policies are actually introduced on a major scale in some pioneering institution.

It is worthwhile to examine each of these assumptions in turn. First, there can be no denying that the absolute size of the freshman intake would increase and that some of the students who are not now admissible would thrive in the university setting. It is also true that if university "standards" are to be kept reasonably the same, the overall failure/dropout rate would increase and particularly for this now-admissible group. The costs of failure, although never mentioned, are very high and very direct. The question, however, is not one of failure *per se* nor even of the costs of failure to student and institution alike, but the moral position to give equal opportunity to each high school graduate to try even if it ends in failure.

One question that should be asked is, "How many students will be added to the pool?" Will open admissions encourage more students to continue their education? Pike has estimated that in Canada from 75-80% of qualified high school qualified matriculants continue their education beyond high school.[11] To illustrate this point more fully with some very crude figures for the Alberta 1969-70 school year[12], of all students writing the June Departmentals and August Supplementals, 11,300 obtained a high school certificate of which 7,100 would be admissible to Alberta universities. In the fall of 1970, the combined university freshman intake was 7,900 students while the community colleges admitted another 2,000; the nursing schools, 550; and the technological institutes, 3,700. These are only full-time student figures and exclusive of any part-time enrollments. This total, it is noted, far exceeds the number of admissible graduates even if the January class of 969 high school diploma graduates is included. The reason for this lies chiefly with the intakes of both adults and students who have stayed out a year or more before returning. On the other hand, the 1970 Annual Report of the Department of Education reports that of 16,500 Grade XII students canvassed, about half planned to work while the remainder planned to continue their schooling in some form. For this particular class, which actually graduated the year previous, 10,200 graduated with

[11]Pike, *op.cit.*, p. 26.

[12]These data and those following are based on data given to the Committee to Articulate University and High School Programs, and the Annual Reports of the Alberta Department of Education as noted.

diplomas of which 7,100 were admissible to an Alberta university. It seems clear, first, that the proportion of high school graduates who go directly into the labor force is relatively small, and second, that the major loss of students occurs before graduation. To rephase, open admission to the university would not basically change the pool of available high school graduates but it could well change the distribution of enrollments within the other post-secondary institutions. More important, the community colleges have programs designed to accommodate those students who seek to complete their high school graduation while continuing post-secondary study. Coupled with their offering of remedial subject work plus transfer programs, and their ability to do so in small classes in their students' home locale, the community college should have great appeal. It makes good sense, for these obvious reasons, to consider the community college programs as feeder institutions for the university equal to the high schools.

The assumption of unlimited provision of facilities is at variance with the facts. No consideration has been of the relative cost per student between the university and community college programs. The universities, however, do base facilities and staffing necessary upon current high school enrollments and on the expectancy that they will receive a reasonable and consistent share of the graduating class pool. They also see the work of the university as extending beyond just the provision of instruction by creating a center for independent study to extend the frontiers of man's knowledge, and to a lesser extent, as a service agency to the community at large. The provincial governments in recent days, for a variety of reasons, have tended to favor postures which emphasize the teaching aspect of the university at the expense of its research. This has been done by open attacks on the quality of existing teaching and on the supposedly low utilization rates of university buildings. Such attacks, here as elsewhere, are forcing many universities into trimester and quarter systems with no apparent concern for increased operating costs. There seems to be two assumptions of questionable validity as the basis of such actions. First, by changing admission to "open door," vast numbers of students will now become suddenly available to use the additional spaces and facilities. The evidence to date would suggest that this is not likely to happen, and particularly so if the high schools fully adopt generalized programs which will mean a universal three year high school diploma with a uniform graduating date. It assumes no growth of the community colleges nor developing uniqueness to their programs. Therefore, while the universities could well admit a January class, the enrollments of such classes are likely to be so small as to make the full scale offerings of such programs economically questionable. Second, there is the matter of the programs themselves. Most university courses reflect some sequential/prerequisite format. Any multi-entry date basis necessary to fully utilize 12 month teaching operation of the university will create major problems in the staffing of courses and particularly those at the senior levels. This could be offset to a degree

if the students themselves were prepared to accelerate their programs by attending full years. By so doing they could graduate in three years with a degree which now normally takes four years. (It is assumed here that the universities will not expand the program length to meet the amount of time available!) Although it is now theoretically possible to do just this, students have not availed themselves of this opportunity, probably because most feel some obligation to earn money during the summer to assist in financing their education. In time this particular agrarian tradition of Alberta education could be dissipated but only with massive government financial support to a degree markedly improved over that which currently exists.

Accessibility to university and open admissions are not synonymous. Open admission policies provide only for increased academic accessibility. But, under open admission, any university would be obligated to provide preparatory courses for its programs where prerequisites are required. There are two ways out of this situation. The universities could follow the model of the CUNY colleges and admit to the university but not to specific programs until the necessary prerequisites have been satisfied. This practice is already followed in many American institutions and to a degree in the author's university where it is now possible to have admittance requirements but not program prerequisites. The student, then, takes make-up "100" series courses often for credit. Such course offerings are limited. Enrollments have been small and, therefore, such courses have been costly to operate. The other possibility is also being practiced extensively in Alberta at this time. It involves close liaison with the community colleges which offer transfer and come-up programs and, in other ways, have programs designed for such make-up purposes. Many universities have further eased transfer problems with community colleges and technological institutes to credit such courses taken outside programs for which formal agreements now exist guaranteeing acceptance for credit, which was what the Stewart Report had recommended.

Accessibility is also a matter of geography. Lolita Wilson[13] has shown that the likelihood of attendance at the University of Alberta, Edmonton, was higher if the students were graduates of high schools within a certain radius of Edmonton. Further, once this "radius of convenience" is passed, the likelihood of attending bore no relationship to distances of the graduands' high schools from the university center. This is given as one of the justifications for the introduction of the community college program. Willington[14] in his study of this problem in the United States reports a ratio of high school graduates to freshmen to be .70. Citing

---

[13]L. Wilson, "How many Alberta matriculants regiser as freshmen at the University of Alberta?" *Alberta Journal of Educational Research,* IV:2 (June, 1958) pp. 109-113.

[14]W. W. Willingham, "Free Access Colleges: Where they are and whom they serve." *College Board Review,* 76 (Summer, 1970) pp. 6-14.

Bashaw[15], he attributes this ratio in part to the proximity of the attended college. He writes:

> It is reasonably assumed that a marginal student is more likely to attend a nearby college where he can live at home, work part time, and attend classes under conditions that commuting status permits.[16]

He reports that 42% of all Americans are now within 45 minutes commuting time (25 miles) of a free access college. He further defined a free access college as one in which the annual tuition was less than $400 and at least one third of their freshman class ranked in the bottom half of the graduating class. Within these basic guidelines, the picture of geographical accessibility to Alberta's post-secondary institutions for segments of the population is shown below:

Center	Facilities			Population within 25 mile radius*	
	Univ.	Com. Coll.	Tech.	N	%
Edmonton	2**	2***	1	505,666	32.1
Calgary	1	1	1	403,872	25.6
Lethbridge	1	1	—	72,995	4.6
Red Deer	—	1	—	60,616	3.8
Medicine Hat	—	1	—	31,497	2.0
Grand Prairie	—	1	—	22,635	1.4
Camrose	—	1	—	26,350	1.7
Total	4	8	2	1,123,631	71.3
Total Population of Province				1,567,549	

*Based on Alberta Government 1970 Census figures.
**Includes Athabasca University.
***Includes both MacEwan College and Concordia College.

Recognizing the crudeness of these figures and the way they were compiled, it is clear nonetheless that at least seventy percent of Alberta's population is now within easy commuting distance of major post-secondary institutions. These figures do not include agricultural colleges at Vermillion and Fairview, and Schools of Nursing at Lamont and Vegreville, all of which are beyond the 25 mile distance from the centers noted above in the table. Further, other than possibly the north-east sector of Alberta, it is difficult to imagine where a new post-secondary institution could be built with a sufficient population base from which to draw students.

Accessibility could well be based on economic feasibility, particularly for the thirty percent not within commuting distance of an existing post-secondary institution and the third not within the same distance to a university for the last two years of their programs. Pike, cited

---

[15]W. L. Bashaw, "The effect of community junior colleges on the proportion of the local population who seek higher education." *Journal of Educational Research*, 58:7 (March, 1965) pp. 327-329.

[16]Willington, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

earlier, has made the case for the close relationship of financial factors to sociological factors and these, in turn, to attendance at university. Low income families are found more frequently in the rural areas where the life style and mores of the rural/small town and village community are markedly different from those in the urban areas. If the latter are ignored, financial assistance seems critical to post-secondary educational accessibility if only to the extent of subsidization of transportation costs for the low income student within commuting distance, and housing costs for those from outside. Further, the California experience cited by Medsker and Tillery[17] strongly suggests that not only is the marginal student likely to attend a local community college, he is likely to be the one in greatest financial need. Yet for all this there remains some doubt that even with direct economic assistance, including a leveling of fees across all post-secondary institutions, the proportion of high school graduates attending post-secondary institutions would change markedly in Alberta without further increases in the numbers of community colleges. This author agrees with Pike's contention that by the time that a student graduates, the needy and impoverished student will long have left high school. In Alberta, this is the untapped pool and the one to which the community colleges should best appeal.

One further point on this matter before closing this discussion. The Open University in Britain represents a concept which may have greater relevance for Alberta than the CUNY plan, particularly in light of the population distribution of the "outer third." In many ways, this program is like an extension program in that it takes the university to the student. To offset problems of intensity, the course terms are longer by two weeks and laboratory parts of courses are a matter of intensive study for one or two weeks at centers throughout the serviced area. Extensive use of TV and tutors is planned. In all, the plan had such appeal that forty-three thousand expressed an interest to the extent to ask for information.[18] The first intake, however, consisted of only 24,700 students.

The differing concept of junior college versus university lower division work had never been clear in Alberta until the advent of the community college concept. The latter has done much already to change public expectancies of such institutions, yet it remains a matter of fact that these colleges still have heavy enrollments (about half) in university transfer programs. This suggests that a status hierarchy still exists among post-secondary institutions. This may also be because college role differentiation from that of the university is still not clear to all. There can be no denying that in the past with the universities as the primary trainers of technicians, Canadians have often been over-educated

---

[17]L. L. Medsker and D. Tillery, *Breaking the Access Barriers: A Profile of Two Year Colleges.* (Fourth of a Series of Profiles Sponsored by The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970.)

[18]Information given in conversation, at Ottawa, April 22, 1971, with D. J. Clinch, Deputy Secretary and Registrar, The Open University, Bletchley, England.

and under-trained for the jobs that industry has made available. It is also clear that employers are now beginning to find that the graduates of both the community colleges and technological institutes are equally well-prepared for employment and often with less company investment in training time. It remains to be seen whether the public, in turn, expects and will demand that these particular institutions maintain and develop these unique qualities.

To sum up, much is being written about open admission policies to our universities. There are many rational grounds for such policies but in actual fact, is this really the answer to a real problem? Is access being denied to university programs on the basis of admission requirements? It would appear that with the current liberalization of university admission requirements and the emergence of the community college with strong and flexible university transfer programs, academic accessibility to the university is not a problem. Admittedly, university admission via the community college creates a two step process but it does not preclude eventual university admission. For at least thirty percent of the population of Alberta, geographical accessibility to post-secondary institutions could be a problem, especially when coupled with low income which is often associated with rural living. It would seem that the two problems of geographic and economic accessibility are probably more significant in Alberta than academic accessibility, since in both instances, and recognizing the nature of the province's polygot population, the full role of sociological factors is not clear.

In the final analysis, the ultimate guideline should be that those who are best equipped to do a certain eductional job should do it. The advent of the community college does offer unique opportunities for both the universities and technological colleges to do that which they best do with all the economic and social advantages associated therewith. It is also clear that all post-secondary education must be an integrated co-operative operation. Open admission policies under these terms do make for interesting discussion but are of questionable practicality even under the weight of crude empirical examination. Are not pressure for university open admissions but indicative of deeper, more far-reaching problems concerning the concepts of a conventional stereotyped institution in a changed society? Perhaps these problems could be better approached by the consideration and introduction of non-traditional study programs at the university level. In so doing, it may be then possible to treat cause rather than symptom.