Title

Continuing education in the California State University system: A case study exploration of the role and practices of one extended education unit

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/13k8d2mz

Author

Cassity, Justin Gregory

Publication Date

2013

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Continuing education in the California State University system:

A case study exploration of the role and practices of one extended education unit

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Justin Gregory Cassity

2013

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Continuing education in the California State University system:

A case study exploration of the role and practices of one extended education unit

by

Justin Gregory Cassity

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2013

Professor Christina Christie, Co-Chair

Professor Wellford Wilms, Co-Chair

Higher education is experiencing a time of unprecedented disruption. Growing public dissatisfaction, declining state and federal funding, increased state and federal regulation, and technological innovations threaten the academic core. The current climate provides new opportunities for core academic departments to partner with market driven continuing education units to reach new audiences, create relevant programs that students demand, and generate new revenue to offset reduced state funding. This study documents how staff and administrators within one continuing education (CE) unit describe best practices within their division. But this study also found that very little is known by the faculty within the traditional academic core departments about the CE unit or about how partnering with it could benefit them. Further, many faculty and administrators in the academic core hold negative perceptions of the CE unit. The

result is a lack of translation of knowledge and opportunities that could be used by core academic

departments to respond and adapt to disruptive external forces. In light of these findings, several

recommendations are offered to assist the university in harnessing the resources of the campus

CE unit to engage external constituents in the development of programs that respond to a real

need and position the university as an intellectual, social, and cultural resource within the

community.

The dissertation of Justin Gregory Cassity is approved.

Marvin C. Alkin

Jorja Jean Manos Leap

Christina A. Christie, Committee Co-Chair

Wellford W. Wilms, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2013

DEDICATION PAGE

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife who walked this path with me. It is so satisfying to have persevered through this endurance race together and to have crossed the finish line side by side. And to my beautiful boys, Joshua and Jude, this dissertation is a reminder to always pray and never give up.

I would like to express my love and appreciation to my parents who have always been my biggest fans. From junior high basketball to graduate school, they have always been there to root me on. They have taught me to give thanks to the Lord for He is good.

Finally, I would like to convey my deep gratitude and love to my mother and father-in-law. They deserve an honorary doctorate for all of the hours they spent taking care of us and our children so that we could complete this degree. We could not have done this without them, and I will be forever grateful.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to my committee members Dr. Marvin Alkin and Dr. Jorja Leap, for their insight during this process. I am particularly grateful for the advice, direction, and support provided by my committee co-chairs, Dr. Christina Christie and Dr. Buzz Wilms, who saw the potential in this study and challenged me to be bold.

This study would not have been possible without the support of the faculty, staff, and administrators who generously agreed to let me interview them. Their dedication and commitment to students give me hope that change is possible in higher education.

Lastly, I wish to thank Dr. Jose Galvan for his mentorship and genuine interest in my development as a person and a professional.

VITA

1997
> B.A., English
> Oklahoma Baptist University
> Shawnee, Oklahoma

1997-1998
> English as a Second Language Instructor
> ELS Language Centers
> Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

1998-2004
> Graduate Program Coordinator
> Departments of Chemistry & Biological Sciences
> Columbia University
> New York, New York

2001
> M.A., TESOL
> Hunter College, CUNY
> New York, New York

2004-2006
> Assistant Director, Admissions and Student Affairs
> School of Continuing Education
> Columbia University
> New York, New York

2006-2009
> Assistant & Associate Dean, Admissions
> School of Continuing Education
> Columbia University
> New York, New York

2009-2011
> Assistant Director, Graduate Unit
> Enrollment Services
> California State University, Long Beach
> Long Beach, California

2011-Present
> Assistant & Interim Dean
> College of Extended Studies and International Programs
> California State University, Los Angeles
> Los Angeles, California

CHAPTER 1: A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Problem

> The aim of education is to enable individuals to continue in their education.
> - John Dewey[1]

Serving over 427,000 students, the California State University (CSU) is the largest four-year university system in the nation. As articulated in the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education, the California State University (CSU) System received authority to enroll the top one third of the state's high school graduates. The 23 campuses that make up the CSU account for close to half of all bachelor's degrees awarded in the state of California and nearly one-third of all master's degrees (ICF International, 2010; The California State University, 2012a). The 1.96 million CSU bachelor's and master's recipients working in California earned over $120 billion in income according to 2008-09 data (ICF International, 2010). During the same period, the CSU injected $7.96 billion into the California economy through direct expenditures. Taken together, the enhanced earnings of CSU alumni along with CSU-related expenditures account for a total spending impact of $23 for every $1 the state invests in the CSU. These figures suggest that the success of this institution is critical to the prosperity of the state. Nevertheless, the current fiscal data for the system indicate that there has never been a time when the CSU has been asked to do so much with so little. In the last 10 years alone, tuition costs in the California State University system have risen over 280% (The California State University, n.d.). Put another way, students are now expected to pay 40% of the cost of their education whereas in 2001 the figure was only 15%. From a funding perspective the State of California

---

[1] Dewey, J. (1961). Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan.

allocated roughly $2.6 billion in 2001 to fund the CSU system. Ten years later that figure has

fallen to about $2.15 billion, and the number of students served has grown by 40,000 (The

California State University, 2012b). This shift in state funding priorities has cut the CSU budget

to the point where enrollment reductions and tuition increases are the predominant methods

utilized by the system to counteract the loss of state funding.

The state of California risks serious economic consequences for its budget decisions.

According to the Public Policy Institute of California, the state faces a shortage of one million

college graduates by 2025 (Johnson & Sengupta, 2009). As Johnson and Sengupta argue, this

shortfall in college graduates ultimately translates into an under-qualified workforce, lower tax

revenues, and reduced economic growth for the state. All of these realities beg the question: How

can the CSU expand access to students in the face of enrollment reductions and state funding

cuts?

While public institutions of higher education have faced state budget cuts in the past,

many see the current budget environment brought on by the recent recession as the "new

normal." A report by the Lumina Foundation (2010) entitled, "Navigating the 'New Normal,'"

makes the argument that traditional cost-cutting strategies (spending cuts and tuition increases)

utilized in previous downturns will be insufficient given the damage caused by what many are

calling the Great Recession (Greenwood, 2007). Instead, these challenging times, call for a

fundamentally different approach to these external forces of change. Rather than seeking to

buffer the academic core from the world outside their gates, universities increasingly find

themselves needing to be responsive to changes in the external environment in order to remain

vital (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). While this is not a new idea, it is one that has been

traditionally met with resistance from within academia (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Gumport,

2001; Lohmann, 2005; Wilms & Zell, 2002). However, with the recent assaults on higher education we appear to be entering a period of punctuated equilibrium where rapid change is possible (Doyle, 2010).

Divisions of continuing education within four-year institutions provide a possible template for navigating these turbulent times (McGaughey, 1992). Four characteristics, in particular, make the continuing education model worth examining. First, continuing education (CE) units have a long history of working with adult or nontraditional learners (Bash, 2003; National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). Second, CE units, because of their mission to serve students at the margins of academia, have harnessed the power of innovation to adapt to the needs of students and the demands of the market (Bash, 2003). Third, CE units by educating adults play a critical role in helping employees and employers remain competitive in the global labor market. Last, as self-supported units unsubsidized by state funding, CE units have a long history of working with external partners, responding to market needs, and working with tight budgets (McGaughey, 1992; National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). The thread tying all of these characteristics together is the fact that funding for continuing education is dependent upon a market in which students pay. Because of their self-supporting status, CE units must be attentive and adaptive to the educational needs of their immediate environment in order to survive. Thus, student demand for programs rather than state support contributes to the success of the operation.

The Role and Significance of Continuing Education

From the very beginning CE units have made it their mission to serve those who were unable to devote themselves to full-time academic work because of their need to work.

Continuing education's track record with adult learners is significant because this population is now the "new majority" (Kasworm, Sandmann, & Sissel, 2000, p. 449). In fact, the conception of the typical college student as an 18-year-old high school graduate, attending a four-year college, residing in the dorm, and enrolling full-time without interruption has been out of touch with reality since at least the early 1970s (Adelman, 1998; Borden, 2004; Levine & Cureton, 1998; Nunley, 2007). Levine and Cureton (1998) point out that this enduring image of the traditional student only represents 16% of the higher-education population in the United States. Providing more detail to this picture, data compiled by the National Center for Education Statistics reveal that about 39% of today's postsecondary students are self-supporting adults over the age of 24; 38% attend school part-time; around 40% work full-time; and 27% have children of their own (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). Nevertheless, images of young co-eds passing through tree-lined walkways and well-manicured lawns fill the space in our minds occupied by our idea of university life. These shared notions still influence the way that postsecondary education is delivered in America, in that the institutions that make up our system of higher education are organized to serve the needs of this group (Gessner, 1987; Kasworm et al., 2000; Kazis et al., 2007; Pusser et al., 2007). Everything from the academic calendar to course meeting patterns to instructional pedagogy is structured to fit the needs of the 16% of students who are full-time, unemployed, young adults. While this model may have been effective when our nation's colleges and universities served a relatively small, homogenous student body, it must now evolve to meet the needs of the new majority, whom Soares (2013) refers to as "post-traditional learners." Using U.S. Census Bureau data, Soares estimates the size of the post-traditional population around 80 million, over one quarter of the entire U.S. population. The sheer size of this potential audience, not to mention the unique needs and demands they bring to

the academic context, should give higher education leaders pause as they consider their institutions' curriculum, instructional delivery, academic calendar, student services, and nearly every other assumption they have about postsecondary education. Fortunately, CE units can provide guidance to their parent organizations in just how to serve this population.

CE units, because of their historic orientation toward students on the periphery of academia, have learned to adapt and innovate to meet the needs of students and the demands of the market. In order to serve students at the margins, divisions of continuing education have had to rethink their schedules, their pedagogy, and their course delivery methods, among other things, to meet the needs of the post-traditional student. Remarking on this dynamic, Bash writes: (2003)

> Such learners constantly bring new experiences into their classrooms based on their own current work and life challenges. As a consequence, the core features of adult-learner programs and classes in terms of content and pedagogy tend to be organic and ever-changing. The needs of adult students are likely to shift more dramatically than those of their younger classmates, where theoretical rather than practical applications may be appropriate. Indeed, instructors in adult-learning programs typically find themselves facing a kaleidoscope of change because it is at the very core of the adult-learner experience (pp. 35-36).

As Bash suggests, CE units cannot hide from change because it is part and parcel of the adult learner experience. Consequently, the experiences of CE units can be instructive to the parent organization as it seeks to address changes in the external environment.

Another factor contributing to continuing education's responsiveness to market needs is its status as a self-support division (Beder, 1984; McGaughey, 1992). Without a guaranteed stream of funding from the central administration, CE units have to ensure that the programs they offer meet a specific public need that can generate sufficient revenue to cover any related costs. Ironically, continuing education's history of responding to resource insecurity can now be

illustrative to those in the academic core, who may find that they can no longer depend on state appropriations to fund their programs and services.

The literature concerned with economic development and education (Brown, 1995; Carnevale, 1991; Kazis et al., 2007; Kirsch, Braun, Yamamoto, & Sum, 2007; Pusser et al., 2007) makes a compelling argument that our nation has transitioned from a post-industrial economy where a high school diploma was sufficient for an unskilled laborer to secure a living wage, to a knowledge economy where continued education is essential to stay ahead of changing local and global workplace requirements. In his book *The World is Flat,* Thomas Friedman (2007) attributes this shift, in part, to the coming together of the personal computer and fiber optic cable, whereby individuals no matter how remote can collaborate and compete with other individuals for work and wages. This Copernican revolution now requires each of us, to quote Friedman, to answer the question: "Where do *I* as an individual fit into the global competition and opportunities of the day, and how can *I,* on my own, collaborate with others globally" (p. 11). Evidence of this shift can be seen in America's shrinking manufacturing sector. In 1950, manufacturing's share of total employment was 33% whereas in 2003, it was approximately 11% (Kirsch et al., 2007). This trend is significant because the manufacturing jobs of the past were accessible to most workers possessing a high school diploma. Unfortunately, the future of this type of employment is bleak. Projections indicate that the 20 jobs expected to suffer the greatest declines by 2014 require only on-the-job training, while 90% of the fastest growing jobs require some form of postsecondary education (Hecker, 2005; Kazis et al., 2007; Strawn, 2007). For 21st century jobs, additional and continuing postsecondary education is needed (Brown, 1995). According to Strawn (2007), the existing pool of skilled workers among adults aged 18-44 is equal to the next 17 years of high school graduates. Strawn's analysis also indicates that roughly

6

two-thirds of the 2020 workforce in America is already beyond elementary and secondary education. Indeed, we cannot overlook the population of adults who are already in the workforce and in need of continuing education (Jones & Kelly, 2007; Kazis et al., 2007; Strawn, 2007).

While the role of bachelor's degree granting institutions in preparing the next generation of workers is unquestionably important, continuing education's role in training incumbent workers is essential in ensuring that employees and, in turn, employers have the necessary skills to remain competitive in the global marketplace. Unfortunately, the current system of higher education was designed for 18-year-old high school graduates living on campus and attending full-time, rather than financially independent, part-time students, who would be considered "employees who study" and not "students who work" (Kazis et al., 2007, p. 1).

In contrast to traditional academic programs, CE units have historically focused on training existing workers rather than preparing the future workforce (Norman, 2006; Vicere, 1985). This role is clearly articulated in the mission of the CSU Extended University:

> To meet California's economic and workforce development needs, increase access to educational opportunities by serving broader constituencies, develop alternative instructional delivery systems, develop new programs, provide personal and lifelong learning opportunities, generate new revenues, and support international educational experiences (The California State University, 2003).

In this capacity, CE units are positioned to serve the post-traditional learner.

As self-supported units unsubsidized by state funding, CE units have a long history of working with external partners, responding to market needs, and working with tight budgets (McGaughey, 1992; National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). Because of their self-supporting status, CE units must be attentive and adaptive to the educational needs of their surrounding market in order to survive. While their status places them in the precarious position of not possessing a guaranteed stream of state general fund dollars, it serves to ensure

that new and existing programs respond to a genuine student demand. Ultimately, the successes

of the CE units can bear fruit for the university as a whole. On this point, McGaughey (1992)

notes:

> Increasingly, host organizations are called on to develop stronger linkages and affiliations
> with external agencies. The experiences of the adult and continuing education unit, which
> has had to develop such relationships for survival, can now be useful in the host
> organization's attempts to establish the same kind of linkages (p. 48).

In this domain, the university can leverage the practices of the CE unit and learn from its

experience.

Continuing Education in the CSU

Each year the 23 CE units that make up the CSU Extended University process over

250,000 enrollments without state general fund allocations (The California State University,

2010a). From its beginnings in 1857 as an evening, continuing education program for in-service

teachers in San Francisco to its current manifestation as a division/college at each of the CSU

campuses, the Extended University has played a role in educating Californians since before the

creation of the CSU System (Salner, 1988). At the heart of its mission from those early days has

been the education of adult students. Summer sessions, evening and weekend courses, off-

campus centers, and distance education are tools that CE units have utilized to serve this

audience.

Unlike their counterparts in the University of California System, CE units within the CSU

System have the authority to offer programs that lead to a bachelor's or master's degree in what

is referred to as special sessions. CSU Executive Order 1047 lays out the parameters for special

sessions programs:

Special sessions are a means whereby the instructional programs of the CSU can be provided to matriculated students on a self-support basis at times and in locations not supported by State General Fund appropriations. Such offerings shall be consistent with the CSU mission and applicable laws and regulations. Academic standards associated with all aspects of such special sessions are identical to those of comparable instructional programs (The California State University, 2010b).

Degree programs offered through the CE unit are known as self-supporting, that is, they do not receive state general fund monies, but rather rely on student tuition dollars. These programs provide an avenue for academic departments to offer their existing degree programs or even a completely new program of study without exhausting their increasingly scarce state funding. Departments have a number of reasons for offering a self-support program such as: serving a previously unreached audience within the community, developing new and innovative curriculum, providing opportunities for faculty to earn income to supplement their state teaching salary, and generating new revenues, which can be used to hire additional faculty and offer more course sections to better serve students in state supported degree programs.

For the CE unit to offer a degree program it must have the approval and faculty support of the academic department in which the respective curriculum resides. For example, a master's program in nursing offered through self-support would be taught by the existing faculty within the nursing department, utilizing the existing program's curriculum, perhaps with some modifications to meet the needs of the prospective audience. For its part the CE unit is responsible for program administration, i.e. fiscal management, student support services (admissions, registration, financial aid, etc.), and marketing. An important point to emphasize here is that academic departments cannot independently offer special session programs; they must partner with the CE unit for their administration. Moreover, with recent reductions in state funding, departments often do not have the resources to mount new programs with their general fund budget allocation. Consequently, they are turning to their campus CE unit as a partner for

new initiatives. In this way, the academic department and the CE unit are joined at the hip in all aspects of the educational enterprise. When done well this partnership can result in pedagogical innovation and increased access for students. It can also result in a clash of cultures between the traditional academic core and the more entrepreneurial CE unit.

Alternative Approaches

Some have championed for-profit institutions and community colleges (Breneman, Pusser, & Turner, 2006; Hassler, 2006; Honick, 1995; Kazis et al., 2007; Kelly, 2011; Morey, 2004; Seiden, 2009) for their ability to adapt to the needs of post-traditional students, and rightly so. Because almost 40% of post-traditional students work full-time and 27% have children of their own, distance learning, flexible schedules, and career-training opportunities make two-year and for-profit institutions a good fit for this population (National Center for Education Statistics, 2009). However, recent investigations into recruiting practices and student loan default rates have raised concerns about the business practices of the for-profit education sector (Blumenstyk, 2010; Field, 2010; Keller, 2011; Lewin, 2011a, 2011b). In addition, the low cost of community college credit, budget cuts and enrollment reductions at public universities, along with budget cuts in the community college system have created bottlenecks in the system, making it difficult for students to gain access to necessary coursework in a reasonable time to facilitate transfer or degree completion (Johnson, 2011; Taylor, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Elaborating on this phenomenon California Community Colleges Chancellor Jack Scott indicated in a recent "State of the Community Colleges" address that the system had been forced to reduce course offerings by approximately 20% to offset budget cuts (Rivera, 2012). Scott also noted that student enrollment in the California Community College system had decreased by more than 300,000 students since 2009 as a result of recent reductions. This perfect storm of factors has

resulted in the cancellation of programs and even entire summer sessions, thus making community colleges an unreliable resource for students seeking to advance their careers or further their education (Boggs, 2004; Gordon & Holland, 2010). Furthermore, the data on community colleges reveal an uneven record in advancing the educational goals of their students. Studies indicate that only 18%-26% of transfer-focused students actually make the transition to a four-year institution (Horn & Lew, 2007; Sengupta & Jepsen, 2006; Shulock & Moore, 2007). Among those students pursuing an associate's degree, fewer than 1 in 10 actually achieve their goal (Sengupta & Jepsen, 2006).While community colleges have a long history of serving adult and nontraditional learners, their ability to continue meeting the needs of this group is now threatened.

The Project

It is important for the practices of CE units to be made available throughout the CSU system. These data may help the institutions within the CSU improve their services for all students and not just adult learners. To gather these data, I conducted a case study at one CE unit within the CSU. The campus engaged in the study was selected based on an analysis of CSU Extended University enrollment and revenue data. These data indicate that the institution was among the top ten performers in both enrollments and revenue in the most recent year for which data is available. In addition to these quantitative considerations, the site was selected on the basis of its potential for generating opportunities to learn. Stake (1995) reminds us that "The first criterion should be to maximize what we can learn" (p. 4). Given these characteristics, the site chosen for the study presents a unique opportunity.

The study is guided by and seeks to answer the following questions:

11

1. How do directors of CE units and their staff define success for their organization?
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?
4. *Do they think that practices employed in the CE unit could be adapted to work for them? If so, how?*

Studying the Problem

To answer these research questions, I conducted a case study of one CE unit within the California State University system. The literature supports the use of case studies as a method for investigating a phenomenon in depth as it plays out in a particular site (Creswell, 2009). While this approach does not lend itself to establishing generalizability, it is well-suited for "developing an adequate description, interpretation, and explanation of [a] case" (Maxwell, 2005, p. 71). Maxwell (2005) sheds light on the role of qualitative inquiry by drawing a distinction between what he calls "variance theory," i.e., quantitative methods and "process theory," i.e., qualitative methods. The former is concerned with demonstrating a relationship or correlation while the latter is concerned with how or why things happen. Similarly, Creswell asserts that "the value of qualitative research lies in the particular description and themes developed in context of a specific site" (Creswell, 2009, p. 193). This is a descriptive exploratory study involving in-depth interviews with staff in the CE unit as well as various administrators and faculty in the academic core who have interactions with the unit. The goal of the study is to diffuse throughout the campus in question and the CSU system the knowledge, practices, and innovations developed in continuing education and thereby increase the system's capacity to respond to changes in the external environment.

Public Engagement

The intent of this study is to diffuse relevant findings throughout the campus participating in the research and the CSU system. This diffusion of knowledge consists of both theoretical and practical learnings. Elaborating on this notion, Elden and Chisholm (1993) write: "[D]iffusion also occurs via new methods by which participants are directly involved in creating new knowledge which they then act on, involve others, and a more direct process of diffusion occurs" (p. 130). Accordingly, I have presented the findings to campus stakeholders at the case study site.

Upon completion of the study, the dean of Extension invited me to meet with her leadership team to facilitate a discussion of the findings and their implications for the division. Key to this discussion was addressing the perceptions of faculty and administrators from the academic core, even the negative perceptions, and then moving on to develop a plan of action for the future. After I led the group through a discussion of the findings, the dean and I challenged the group to think through how they could engage the rest of the division in the change process. Toward this end, the team decided to create action teams and task them with addressing various questions/problems raised by the study. For example, one question that surfaced was "How can Extension improve its communications and outreach to faculty?" The team charged with this question will be responsible for doing its own research and developing a plan.

To facilitate engagement, I will soon present the study's findings at a divisional All-Staff Meeting. The goal of this meeting is to involve staff at all levels in charting Extension's future. Given that the participants involved in this activity are individuals for whom the findings are of

professional relevance, the likelihood of change and dissemination is increased. Data collected

and analyzed through this study will provide a foundation for real world action.

Although the exigencies of this study did not allow sufficient time for me to meet with

stakeholders in the academic core to discuss my findings, I plan to continue working with the site

toward the end of engaging stakeholders across the campus in determining the role that

Extension should play in the institution's future.

CHAPTER 2: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Drastic reductions in state spending for higher education in California have left public institutions like the California State University System with few options for ensuring access to education outside of enrollment cuts, tuition increases, and occasional administrative efficiency gains. Unfortunately, depending on these measures alone could ultimately limit access for many students. While public institutions of higher education have faced state budget cuts in the past, many see the current budget environment brought on by the recent recession as the "new normal." Accordingly, these times, call for a fundamentally different approach to these external forces of change. Rather than seeking to buffer the academic core from the world outside their gates, universities will need to be proactive about changes in the external environment if they are to remain vital.

Divisions of continuing education provide a possible template for anticipating and navigating turbulent times (McGaughey, 1992). Four characteristics, in particular, make the continuing education model worth examining. First, CE units have a long history of working with adult or nontraditional learners (Bash, 2003; National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). Second, CE units, because of their mission to serve students at the margins of academia, have harnessed the power of innovation to adapt to the needs of students and the demands of the market (Bash, 2003). Third, CE units by educating adults play a critical role in helping employees and employers remain competitive in the global labor market. Last, as self-supported units unsubsidized by state funding, CE units have a long history of working with external partners, responding to market needs, and working with tight budgets (McGaughey, 1992; National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). Because of their self-

supporting status, CE units must be attentive and adaptive to the educational needs in their immediate environment in order to survive.

For someone unfamiliar with the field of continuing education, the boundaries of the field can be hard to identify. Areas of inquiry include adult learning theory, continuing professional education, workforce development, and lifelong learning for retirees, to name just a few. To lend focus to this study, I will emphasize continuing education's efforts in meeting students' needs by adapting and responding to changes in the external environment. However, I will first provide an introduction to the history, development, and changing roles of continuing education. This foundation is essential to understanding the importance and influence of the field in meeting the needs of the changing workforce. Having established the place of continuing education in higher education, I will explore some of the recurring themes and approaches that previous research in the field has yielded. A number of studies have explored the role of continuing education in establishing linkages between the university and the community, thereby connecting the parent institution to important feedback from the external environment. Based on this feedback from the outside world, administrators and program developers can design educational programs that link the resources of the institution with the resources of the public to pursue a common goal. To assist the university in reaching these goals, researchers have explored the various methods CE units can employ to design successful programs. Other research has investigated the organizational structures of CE units to determine their influence on the success of the division. Another strand of research has focused on the competencies required for successful leaders of CE units. In what follows, I will provide an overview of the various approaches taken in the research in order to contextualize my inquiry into whether the practices of CE units can assist the

university's academic core in responding to the disruptive forces confronting higher education today.

Definition of Terms

Before embarking on a review of the literature on continuing education, I believe it is important to point out that the field lacks a common definition for the work carried out under its banner. Loch (2003) catalogs just some of the titles under which continuing education operates: "workforce development, community education, continuing education and economic development, extended studies, communiversity, metropolitan college, corporate and community education, extended education, continuing studies, lifelong learning, continuing education and training services, university outreach, and many more" (p. 42). Given the diversity within the nomenclature, opportunities for confusion when discussing the field frequently surface. Even the professional association that represents the field, the University Professional & Continuing Education Association (UPCEA), has struggled with this lack of uniformity. Originally founded as the National University Extension Association, UPCEA changed its name in 1980 to the National University Continuing Education Association and in1996 to the University Continuing Education Association only to change it again in 2010 to its current manifestation.

In order to avoid some of this confusion, I will provide short definitions for some of the terms used in this study. Three terms require definition, for they have unique meanings, although they are often used interchangeably. These terms are continuing education, university extension, and extended education.

- **Continuing education** is used as the umbrella term to describe the credit and non-credit offerings for adult learners on a college or university campus (Hein, 1992). This work is

referred to by a variety of names including: adult education, nontraditional education, extension, and lifelong learning, among others. This term is also used within certain professional fields (accounting, medicine, law, etc.) to refer to ongoing educational training, also known as continuing professional education, as it is required by licensing boards within the profession. However, for the purposes of this study, I will use Hein's definition. Finally, to avoid confusion, I will use the term continuing education (CE) unit to describe the division of the institution that carries out the work of adult education at the college or university.

- **University extension** as it was originally conceived represented the attempts of universities, first in England and eventually in America, to "extend" or carry knowledge to working class adults who were unable to attend university. The term is still used at some institutions, e.g., Harvard University, the University of California system, and many other public research universities, as the name of the continuing education division on campus.
- **Extended education**, extended studies, extended university, and extended learning are used synonymously with university extension, the idea being the extension of the university and its intellectual, social, and cultural resources to the broader community.

Serving Adult and Post-traditional Learners

While much has been written regarding the educational innovations and outcomes of community colleges (Carnevale & Desrochers, 2001; Vaughan, 2006) and for-profit institutions (Berg, 2005; Breneman, Pusser, & Turner, 2006; Kelly, 2011; Morey, 2004), the work of CE units in expanding access to knowledge and, in particular, meeting the educational needs of adult learners in the workforce is not as well-documented. In addition, the work or mission of

continuing education is not well understood (Loch, 2003). Operating at the margins of the

university, these divisions are alternately viewed as a program potpourri or a cash cow

(McGaughey, 1992). Given these misconceptions, it is important to revisit the original purpose

of university extension as well explore its evolving role within higher education in order to

understand the function that continuing education serves in responding to the external

environment and serving adult learners

Dating back to its beginnings at Cambridge University, university extension served the

needs of adult learners (Browning, 1887; National University Continuing Education Association,

1990). Even before the official start of the Cambridge program in 1873, faculty at the university

were delivering lectures to men and women at off-campus locations. An article in *Science*

magazine describing the new program at Cambridge reports that "It occurred to some energetic

men, especially to Professors Stuart and Sidgwick, that the university should attempt to influence

the education of the country not only by examinations, but by direct teaching" (Browning, 1887,

p. 61). Around the same time in the United States, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and

Johns Hopkins University, among others, were offering evening lectures for the general public.

In addition, individual faculty members from many universities were offering lectures to large

audiences eager to learn. Capturing the essence of this new educational phenomenon, *Harper's*

Weekly offered this explanation: "University extension contemplates opening to all the people of

the State opportunities which are now open to few, and to do it for the same reason that it

supports the free school, namely, that it makes better American citizens" (1891, p. 259). The

growing public interest in university extension led to the formation in 1890 of one of the first

professional organizations in this field, the National Society for the Extension of University

Teaching. In one of their early publications (The American Society for the Extension of

University Teaching, 1898), the Society articulates one of the tenets of university extension at the time:

> [I]t is especially valuable because an eminently practical people can be trusted to get information that will be directly useful, but the University Extension lectures teach what the people would otherwise be slow to acquire, what is yet of the first importance, as the state needs not only skilled workmen but intelligent citizens (p. 7).

Contributing to the expansion of higher education in the United States and the development of the American form of university extension, the passage of the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890 led to the establishing of the nation's land grant colleges and universities (National University Continuing Education Association, 1990; Stubblefield & Keane, 1989). According to the First Morrill Act (1862), the interest from the sale of public lands was to be used to establish at least one college in each participating state whose mission would be "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life." By stipulating that the mission of the land-grant colleges be the education of the "industrial classes" the vision behind the Morrill Acts mirrored that of university extension: the expansion of access to knowledge for the general public. Considered one of the best examples at the time of university extension in the American context, the University of Wisconsin and its leadership envisioned one of the roles of the modern research university to be that of service to the community through the dissemination of knowledge, and one of the principle methods for achieving this mission was through extension work (National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). Elaborating on this notion at the inaugural meeting of the National University Extension Association, Charles Van Hise, President of the University of Wisconsin, framed the mission of university extension within the broader mission of the university:

"If a university is to have as its ideal, service on the broadest basis, it cannot escape taking on the function of carrying knowledge to the people. This is but another phraseology for University Extension…" (National University Continuing Education Association, 1990, pp. 22–23).

This notion of opening the doors of knowledge to the world outside of the academy has been a hallmark of university extension.

At no time were the doors flung wider than at the close of World War II. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944, also known as the G.I. Bill, led to an influx of adult learners at university campuses as over one million veterans in 1946 alone enrolled and began to take advantage of the legislation (Berg, 2005). This period would mark the beginning of the higher education boom in our nation (Lazerson, 1998). During the period between 1949 and 1989, enrollments at American colleges and universities increased from 2.66 million to 13.54 million (Lazerson, 1998). As more Americans entered the postsecondary education system and as the workplace demanded higher skill levels from employees, postsecondary education became a prerequisite and new attention was given to ongoing education throughout one's career in order to keep up with workplace demands and global labor competition (Brown, 1995). Accordingly, the role of continuing education has evolved to address this need.

Engine for Innovation

Continuing education merits study not only for its historic emphasis on educating post-traditional learners but also for its history of championing innovation within higher education. The literature highlights the role of CE units as engines for innovation (Archer, Anderson, & Garrison, 1999; Garrison, 2001; Kohl, 2010; Sandeen & Hutchinson, 2010). In this role, CE units often serve as test laboratories for new programs as well as new educational technologies (National University Continuing Education Association, 1990). In fact, Moroney (2007) argues

that "[i]nnovation is not part of an optional or alternative model; it is inherent to any viable model of continuing education" (p. 76). Shannon and Schoenfeld (1965) provide evidence of the field's creative output by cataloguing the entities and organizations with origins in university extension. This list includes: vocational schools, community colleges, branch campuses, professional organizations, lecture bureaus, traveling library service, public health associations, welfare departments, little theaters, municipal reference centers, discussion clubs, school standards agencies, debate societies, and urban leagues.

This emphasis on innovation is due in part to the precarious position CE units occupy within the academic landscape (Bash, 2003). Often marginalized within their institutions for being perceived as less academically rigorous or too vocational in their mission, CE units bear the added burden of being financially self-supporting (Hein, 1992; Rohfeld, 1996). As Bash (2003) points out, "[T]heir very existence relies on their flexibility, responsiveness, and willingness to think less conventionally. They are constantly forced to address the challenges they face with creativity and innovation – in other words, to be entrepreneurial" (p. 35). This pressure to remain relevant, to remain solvent, for that matter, ensures that CE units are outward facing and in touch with the needs of the community, i.e., their market.

Continuing Education and Workforce Development

Given its mission to serve adult learners, continuing education plays a role in equipping the workforce. Much has been written about the changing economy and its impact on the educational requirements of the modern workforce (Brown, 1995; Carnevale, 1991; Kazis et al., 2007; Kirsch et al., 2007; Pusser et al., 2007; Rachal, 1989). Carnevale (1991) documents the development of the global economy from preindustrial craft production to industrial mass

production to what he calls the "new economy." According to Carnevale, the new economy "retains the volume and productivity standards of mass production and marries them to the craft standards of quality, variety, customization, convenience, and timeliness" (p. 4). This marriage of volume and quality, Carnevale contends,

> requires a more highly skilled workforce. Worker's skills need to be both broader and deeper especially at the point of production, service delivery, and at the interface with the customer in order to meet new competitive standards and to complement flexible organizational structures and technology (p. 10).

In order to stay relevant in this new economic landscape, workers have no choice but to pursue continuous learning both on the job and in the classroom.

Engaging the External Environment

A defining characteristic of continuing education is its responsiveness to and partnership with stakeholders in the external environment. Their distinctive mission is to extend the programs and the resources of the university to the general public. Nevertheless, this cooperation is not merely an end in itself. Beder (1984) contends that it is, instead, a response to four characteristics of continuing education programs: resource insecurity, the need for flexibility, the need for autonomy from the parent institution, and organizational insecurity. As self-supporting organizations that typically do not receive state funding, divisions of continuing education must find ways to acquire their own resources. In order to secure resources, CE units must be able to identify and adapt to market and learner demands as they present themselves or risk forfeiting opportunities to a more nimble competitor. In addition to the pressure exerted by external competition, continuing education agencies must operate with a measure of autonomy from the rules and structures of the parent organization while they simultaneously vie for legitimacy in its eyes. To justify themselves, they must generate revenue on the one hand while also maintaining

a level of academic rigor representative of the university in which they are situated. Given these varied and sometimes competing demands, CE units have had to forge, out of necessity, strong relationships with local, state, and federal institutions as well as private corporations to develop programs and ensure steady revenue streams (Beder, 1984).

Bash (2003) also examines the role of continuing education *vis a vis* the external environment, claiming that it is the population (adult learners) served by CE units that require them to adapt. Whereas in the past institutions of higher education could dictate the manner in which students engaged with the academy, competition for the growing number of adult learners has forced institutions to adapt to student needs. Given their experience working with adult learners, CE units are well aware of the distinct needs of this population. In fact, Bash contends that

> [i]nstructors and administrators involved with adult learning programs tend to be change agents because of the very nature of the students they teach. The entrepreneurial response required to serve this population results from adult students' dynamic lifestyles and their experiences beyond the campus. Such learners constantly bring new experiences into their classrooms based on their own current work and life challenges (p. 35).

Through these interactions with adult learners, CE units develop important connections outside of academia. These ties provide a means for institutions to obtain feedback from the environment, which in turn protects the organization from ossification and irrelevancy.

Regarding this role, McGaughey asserts "[i]t is often the continuing education unit that has established the strongest ties to the community. This linkage paves the way for other collaborative arrangements" (1992, p. 48). Examples of such partnerships include grants from local hospitals to provide onsite training to nurses and other health professionals; agreements with area workforce investment boards (WIBs) to provide skills re-training to displaced workers so that they can reenter the workforce; and contracts with the Department of Defense to offer

fully-accredited degree programs tailored to the needs of men and women in the armed forces. Through these collaborations, not only do the participants learn and develop, according to McGaughey, but so does the CE unit as it struggles to adapt to the requirements of the changing student population. However, the learning, if given the opportunity to work its way deeper into the institution, can ultimately go beyond the CE unit to affect the parent organization, where "[t]he experiences of the adult and continuing education unit, which has had to develop such relationships for survival, can now be useful in the host organization's attempts to establish the same kind of linkages" (p. 42).

Shannon and Wang (2010) present a model of how CE units can help their host institution establish linkages with the community. The authors present a case in which a division of continuing education was approached in the wake of Hurricane Katrina by faith-based community groups as well as emergency response organizations to serve as an honest broker around the issue of advanced preparation for disaster response. Although the CE unit possessed no expertise of its own related to the issue, it established itself as the convener and coordinator of the project. The authors contend that the CE units is uniquely positioned to link the resources of the university with the resources and needs of the community to pursue a common mission. In this role, the CE unit fosters university-community engagement by brokering partnerships between the parent institution and the public. Shannon and Wang set forth a blueprint for engagement initiatives, providing a list of steps continuing education professionals can take to strengthen university-community partnerships:

- Make engagement a priority.
- Develop strong facilitation skills.
- Build your network and seek partnerships, on and off campus.
- Be ever mindful of opportunities to create linkages.
- Establish a reputation as a connector.

25

- Convene stakeholders around shared issues.
- Provide the unbiased space and leadership for different voices to be heard.
- Seek overarching goals to build collaboration and encourage action.
- Share your initiatives in internal and external publications (p. 111).

These steps, while not insurance against unsuccessful partnerships, provide direction and the elements of an overall strategic plan, which can be shared with stakeholders within the university, who play a vital role in the success of the CE unit.

Continuing Education and the University

Indeed the literature suggests that continuing education has a solid history of engaging the local, national, and international community beyond the university. Nevertheless, one of the most significant partnerships for the CE unit is its relationship with the parent college or university. Unfortunately, this relationship has often been tenuous (National University Continuing Education Association, 1990; Rohfeld, 1996). Pearce (1992) found in a survey administered to directors of continuing education that these leaders perceived the university itself as the primary threat to their survival, over and above threats from the external environment. These threats from the parent institution were found to have two root causes: a lack of understanding on the part of senior university administrators of continuing education and its purposes; and an organizational culture mismatch between the CE unit and the larger university. The first root cause, i.e., the lack of understanding of continuing education, was attributed to the fact that senior university administrators, trained in the academic tradition, questioned the academic credibility of the continuing education enterprise. The second root cause relates to the incongruity of organizational cultures. Pearce identifies three specific areas contributing to this lack of congruity: differing attitudes toward change, the tension between creating quality programs versus generating revenue, and the scholarly expectations of the parent organization

versus the program/revenue function ascribed to the CE units (pp. 4-5). To address the disconnect between the CE unit and the parent institution, Pearce concludes that continuing educators need to spend time building and maintaining support within the university.

Maintaining university support is critical because of the perceived disconnect between the mission of the university and the mission of the CE unit (Petersen, 2001; Sissel, Hansman, & Kasworm, 2001). Teaching, research, and public service factor prominently in the missions of modern universities (Scott, 2006). Two of the largest public university systems in America, the University of California and the University of Texas, list these pursuits as their primary function. Similar mission statements exist for the University of Wisconsin, the University of North Carolina, the University of Massachusetts, the State University of Florida System, and the University of Illinois. While one could argue that continuing education is aligned with the university in its teaching and public service roles, those who have worked in a university setting can attest that these functions do not typically garner as much acclaim or reward as the research function. As a result, divisions of continuing education often find themselves marginalized within their own institutions (Donaldson, 1991; Petersen, 2001; Vicere, 1985).

Donaldson (1991) characterizes this marginalization in four ways: organizationally, at the boundaries of the institution; geographically, with respect to physical location and programming; functionally, with respect to its alignment with the service mission of the university; and professionally, *vis a vis* other professions within the university. In response to this marginalized status, Donaldson argues that "we need to cast off the yoke of marginality and search for new images that more positively define our roles and reestablish our bearings" (p. 123). To replace this image of marginalization, Donaldson proposes three new images for conceptualizing the role of continuing education: learning network, intellectual front parlor of the institution, and

27

missionary vision (p. 126). Finally, Donaldson acknowledges that one of the most important

barriers to moving beyond marginalized status, lies "…not only out there in our institutions or in

society. Rather, they also reside in our minds and in the images we bring individually and

collectively to our work" (p. 126).

CE units have employed various methods to avoid marginalization and satisfy their critics

within the parent organization. Rohfeld (1996) categorizes these efforts to establish quality and

respectability into two primary approaches: "campus equivalence" and adult development and

learning (p. 55). The campus equivalence argument is predicated on the supposition that

programs within the CE unit are equal in quality to comparable programs on the campus.

Throughout the history of university continuing education, continuing educators have employed

the campus equivalence approach to affirm the academic integrity and rigor of their

programming, both to potential students and the university community. As evidence of program

quality, continuing educators employed traditional academic standards: "student preparation and

achievement; faculty commitment and expertise; and course levels and standards" (Rohfeld,

1996, p. 57).

Seeking to turn the organizational distinctiveness of continuing education into a strength

rather than a liability, researchers within the field have offered alternative conceptions of the role

of continuing education. Petersen (2001) maintains that "Continuing education's location at the

organizational boundaries is necessary, as a significant role for CEUs is providing a bridge

between the institution and the community" (p. 32). Similarly, King and Lerner's (1987)

conception of the CE unit as "front parlor" or "intellectual salon" of the university illustrates the

important role continuing education can play at the boundaries of the university by convening

both the university community and the public to exchange ideas (p. 34). Drawing on Roman

mythology, Donaldson (1991) suggests that CE units should, like the Roman god Janus, have two faces one looking to the external environment and one looking internally, thereby serving "…the important bridging function between the protected core of our institutions and the needs of society which lie beyond their walls" (p. 125). In this bridging role, CE units can become "agents of institutional self-reflection," thereby helping the institution better understand how it is perceived by the stakeholders outside its walls, the same stakeholders it is dependent upon for ongoing support.

Defining Success in Continuing Education

Before I explore the practices of the CE unit chosen for this study, I believe it is important to examine how success has been defined in previous research. Snider (1987) provides a framework for examining continuing education divisions by exploring six components that define successful programs. The components are: academic environment; student services; communications and technology; facilities and support services; diplomatic relationships; and leadership and advocacy (1987, p. 51). I will briefly define these components as each one provides insight into the successful or unsuccessful functioning of the CE unit. Moreover, since these components are often referenced within the continuing education literature, a brief discussion will help to contextualize their meaning. By academic environment, Snider means the delicate coordination and cultivation of partnerships with the academic units within the institution. The strength of a CE unit's relationships with the various departments and colleges on campus often dictates the unit's success. Without these partnerships new programs are very difficult to develop and existing ones are challenging to maintain.

Student services within continuing education, Snider (1987) argues, must take into account and be responsive to the unique needs of adult learners. While the services adult learners need (advising, career counseling, financial aid, tutoring, etc.) are essentially the same as those required by more traditional students, the strategies for their delivery should take into account the unique needs and characteristics of adult learners, e.g., work schedules, prior subject matter experience, and possible family considerations, to name only a few (Kasworm et al., 2000; Knowles, 1980).

Communications and technology, like student services, are important for the CE unit they have the potential for meeting an integral need of adult learners, i.e., convenience (Snider, 1987). Effective use of communications and technology can enable a division to serve new populations of students while improving services to existing students.

Facilities and support services merit consideration, according to Snider, in light of the fact that "[s]erving nontraditional students in nonconventional ways requires the availability and management of a variety of special facilities and services" (1987, p. 58). These facilities include both on- and off-campus locations, thus adding to the potential complexities.

The term diplomatic relationships, like Snider's articulation of academic environment, speaks to the need for continuing education administrators to maintain a dynamic network of personal and professional relationships. Whereas academic environment referred to relationships within the university, diplomatic relationships relates to the importance of linkages with other universities, community colleges, professional associations, local, state, and federal agencies, and private industry (Snider, 1987).

Lastly, Snider (1987) emphasizes the need for leadership and advocacy within continuing education. Since the function of the CE unit is often misunderstood or unknown within the larger institution, continuing educators must articulate their division's role, values, and contributions to key stakeholders on campus, e.g., the provost, academic deans, vice presidents, and support service managers. By serving as an advocate for the CE unit on campus and nurturing key relationships, continuing educators can help to ensure that their division's mission and interests are well represented throughout the institution.

While Snider provides a descriptive framework for program success, empirical studies have provided more detailed findings. In their exploratory study of 118 adult education programs, Lewis and Dunlop (1991) interviewed practitioners and asked them to reflect upon successful and unsuccessful programs that they had planned. The researchers elicited from the participants a list of indicators related to program success. After compiling the catalog of indicators, the researchers then ranked the list by the frequency of participant response, shown below:

1. High demand for the program
2. Participants were satisfied
3. Increased visibility/credibility/goodwill in community
4. Significant participant learning occurred
5. High level of participant involvement/interest
6. Stakeholders were satisfied
7. Financial objectives were met
8. Produced important spin-off benefits for sponsor
9. Produced delayed/secondary benefits for participants
10. Planners/instructors were satisfied
11. High participant completion rate (Lewis & Dunlop, 1991, p. 19).

While this list is based solely on participant perceptions of success and failure, it provides a useful inventory of what success can look like in various contexts. Moreover, these findings

indicate that success is broadly defined and not limited to discussions of enrollments and revenues.

Researchers have also examined success as a function of organizational structure. A great deal of attention has been paid to determining the appropriate organizational structure for CE units (Edelson, 1995; Gessner, 1987; B. K. King & Lerner, 1987; Loch, 2003; Prisk, 1987). These studies have examined whether continuing education should be carried out by a dedicated division within the institution or whether the development and delivery of continuing education programs should be managed by the department or college that offers the program. Another topic of debate has been whether CE units should be entrepreneurial, academic, or some hybrid of the two (Garrison, 2001; B. K. King & Lerner, 1987; Pearce, 1992). This tension reflects the often competing claims placed on CE units by university leadership. It also reflects the general ambivalence that exists when it comes to the role continuing education should play at the university.

Expanding on the work of previous researchers, Dufour and Queeney (2004) contributed to our understanding of the role of continuing education by identifying the tasks, practices, and responsibilities of continuing higher education administrators. Through surveys of continuing education chief administrators and functional managers (marketing, technology, program development, etc.) the researchers compiled a list of 12 areas of practice and 79 discrete responsibilities associated with the administration of continuing education programs. The areas of practice, listed below, reveal a remarkable breadth of responsibilities for professionals in the field: budget planning and development; institutional, community and professional service; conference/program/course delivery; continuing education administration; external marketing;

faculty recruitment, retention, and development; individual career/personal development; internal marketing; leadership; program development; research; and technology management.

Opposition to Continuing Higher Education

While history indicates that CE units have done much in the way of public good, they are not without their critics. A recent report by the California Faculty Association (2012) cites the "Expansion of Extended Education Operations" as one of four ways in which the California State University system is moving toward a private, for-profit model of higher education. According to the report, the CSU, by offering more courses and programs through Extended Education, threatens to undermine affordability and educational equity.

Similar concerns exist within the UC system. Since its original policy on self-supporting graduate degree programs was adopted in 1996, the UC system has added 40 programs generating over $100 million in revenue (University of California, Office of the President, n.d.). Advocates of such programs contend that they provide the freedom to innovate without the restrictions imposed by public funding while also generating resources desperately needed by core academic departments. Critics argue that self-support programs undermine the very notion of public education, providing access to only those individuals with the means to cover the higher price tag of the degree. The recent conversion of UCLA's MBA program to self-support has generated controversy along similar lines and could potentially clear the way for additional programs in the UC system to move to a self-support model (Kiley, 2013).

The Role of the Continuing Education Unit Within the University: Responding to

Disruptive Forces in the External Environment

In January 2013, the credit rating agency Moody's downgraded its outlook on the higher

education sector from stable to negative (Bogaty, 2013). Moody's role within the financial

markets is to evaluate the creditworthiness of institutions seeking to raise capital. Lenders then

use these ratings, much like credit card companies use an applicant's credit score, to determine a

borrower's risk profile and, ultimately, the interest rate, or the cost of borrowing. In their

analysis, Moody's provides the following insights into both the internal and external challenges

facing higher education:

> Nearly two decades of extraordinary annual revenue growth allowed universities to grow
> without focusing on productivity and efficiency. The negative economic and political
> pressure built up during the post 2009 financial crisis period is finally proving to be the
> catalyst for universities to focus more aggressively on operating efficiency and cost
> containment. However, deeper and more structural changes will be necessary to adjust to
> the long-term muted prospect for revenue growth (Bogaty, 2013, p. 15).

Although this news went largely unnoticed by most within academia, Moody's decision to

downgrade the entire sector will make access to credit more difficult and more expensive for

American colleges and universities. While the financial implications of Moody's action are

indeed significant, what Moody's action symbolizes is the erosion of public confidence in higher

education.

Recognizing the growing public concern over the state of higher education, this summer

President Obama unveiled his ambitious agenda to "shake up" higher education.

> Just tinkering around the edges won't be enough: To create a better bargain for the middle
> class, we have to fundamentally rethink how higher education is paid for in this country.
> We've got to shake up the current system (Slack, 2013).

At the center of the plan is the creation of a rating system by which colleges will be evaluated on

various outcomes, including affordability, access, graduation rates, and earnings upon graduation

(The White House, Office of the Press Secretary, 2013). While many in higher education may

shrug off the President's efforts as a misguided attempt to regulate higher education, the

President's attention to this issue highlights the mounting public concern over college costs, low

college completion rates, and increased student loan debt.

How can these two seemingly disconnected events inform this study? First, they are both

reminders that higher education does not exist within a protective bubble that buffers it from the

uncertainties of the external environment. Public dissatisfaction harnessed by governmental

agencies represents a powerful force of external pressure and change. Higher education need

only look down the educational pipeline to the K-12 system to observe the effects of

governmental regulation via No Child Left Behind. Indeed, President Obama's recently

announced plan suggests that similar federal oversight could be on the horizon for higher

education. Second, the alarms sounded by Moody's illustrate that market forces exercise

significant pressure on institutions of higher education. If threats of governmental involvement

were not enough, economic forces have the power to destabilize higher education. Richard

DeMillo (2011), a former executive and Hewlett-Packard and currently Director of the Center for

21st Century Universities at Georgia Institute of Technology, explains the economic forces

confronting the majority of institutions of higher education:

> A key economic lesson of the last decade – that compelling value is needed in order to
> prosper when there are abundant inexpensive choices – has not been internalized by
> American institutions, which for the most part continue making investments to climb
> academic hierarchies in a costly rigged game that they cannot win. In the name of
> excellence, they become more isolated from the needs and expectations of the
> communities they depend upon for support. Inward-looking, they focus on their own

needs and rewards and try to defend the status quo by erecting impenetrable barriers and exclusionary standards (p. 271).

How can institutions of higher education learn from and adapt to the external forces that threaten their existence, be they social, governmental, or economic?

In his book, *The Innovator's Dilemma*, Clayton Christensen argues that the downfall of many large, profitable companies, and indeed entire sectors of the economy, stems from the fact that the very practices that make them successful also make them susceptible to upheavals in the market caused by changes in technology. To quote Christensen, "An organization's capabilities define its disabilities" (Christensen, 2011, p. xxvi). To explain this phenomenon, Christensen introduces the concepts of sustaining technologies and disruptive technologies. Sustaining technologies improve the performance of existing products or services. Disruptive technologies, ironically, result in worse performance at the beginning but are typically "cheaper, simpler, smaller, and frequently, more convenient to use" (Christensen, 2011, p. xviii). Disruptive technologies share the following characteristics:

They are simpler and cheaper and lower performing;
They generally promise lower margins, not higher profits;
Leading firms' most profitable customers generally can't use and don't want them;
They are first commercialized in emerging or insignificant markets
(Christensen, 2011, p. 267).

Examples of established technologies and the disruptive technologies that threaten their dominance include: silver halide photographic film and digital photography; brick and mortar retailing and on-line retailing; classroom-based instruction and distance/online education; full-service stock brokerage and on-line stock brokerage; and offset printing and digital printing (Christensen, 2011, p. xxix). In examining sustaining vs. disruptive technologies, Christensen found that market leaders often fall into the trap of simply making their existing products bigger and better:

> In their efforts to provide better products than their competitors and earn higher prices and margins, suppliers often 'overshoot' their market: They give customers more than they need or ultimately are willing to pay for. And, more importantly, it means that disruptive technologies that may underperform today relative to what users in the market demand, may be fully performance-competitive in that same market tomorrow (2011, p. xix).

This is the innovator's dilemma. This approach limits the organization's ability to scan the horizon for technological changes that could create entirely new markets and, ultimately, render their industry-leading product irrelevant. While these firms are busy improving upon their existing products, new entrants to the market leverage the characteristics of disruptive technologies to reach customers overlooked by the market leaders. These new audiences, drawn by the convenience and affordability of the seemingly inferior product, eventually gather in sufficient numbers to threaten the dominance of the established firms.

Higher education is in no way immune to this condition. Driven by the pursuit of greater academic prestige, improved national rankings, and larger endowments, institutions of higher education engage in a race to become bigger and better than the competition (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; DeMillo, 2011). The sustaining technologies that propel this pursuit include: successful athletics programs, ambitious research agendas, and state of the art campus facilities. However, these innovations come at a cost, and as the zeros on the tuition bill increase, the value proposition of public higher education diminishes, making these institutions vulnerable to disruptions. DeMillo (2011), building on Christensen's work, discusses the disruptive forces threatening institutions of higher education in what he refers to as "the Middle" – the roughly two thousand accredited colleges and universities that look up with envy at the seventy or so Elite institutions and look down with disdain at the For-Profits:

> Every institution in the Middle has to face disruption from above and below. Adding new programs and services increases costs. Cost increases make the most attractive students

37

vulnerable, either to a more compelling value proposition from an Elite or a lower-cost alternative. Cutting costs without fundamental change is not the answer (p. 121).

Cuts in the University System of Georgia (USG) are a prime example of the power of these disruptive forces. In January 2013 USG approved a campus consolidation plan for its system of 35 colleges (Diamond, 2013). The plan will reduce the number of colleges to 31 through the merger of eight institutions into four new consolidated institutions. Citing state budget reductions of over $1 billion between 2009-2013, the USG is not ruling out additional consolidations. This move by the USG comes on the heels of a similar consolidation plan in the Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG), which has merged 15 institutions into seven since 2009 (Light, 2011). Choices, which seemed unthinkable in the past, seem inevitable in the aftermath of the Great Recession. However, as DeMillo suggests, change, not simply cutting costs or weathering the storm, is critical for institutions to respond to disruptions.

In addition to disruptions caused by the economy, institutions of higher education face disruptions from within the education marketplace in the form of for-profit education providers. According to the National Center for Education (NCES) (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, & Ginder, 2008) roughly 11% of students in fall 2011 were enrolled in for-profit institutions compared to only 3% a decade ago. In addition, NCES data (Aud et al., 2011) on degree completion reveal that the number of degrees conferred by private for-profit institutions increased by a larger percentage than the number conferred by public institutions and private not-for profit institutions. Harnessing the power of online education, for-profit institutions, like the University of Phoenix and DeVry University, are deploying disruptive technologies in education according to the formula Christensen chronicles in the corporate world.

For-profit institutions, utilizing online learning, capitalize on the fact that, for some, convenience is more highly valued than perceived quality. While the debate continues over the quality of online education, the rapid ascendancy of Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) and the sudden emergence of a new sector of content providers (namely edX, Udacity, and Coursera) along with the considerable press coverage MOOCs have received suggest that online learning has turned the corner (Pappano, 2012). However, faculty opinions of online education remain low. In a survey of over 10,700 faculty at 69 public colleges and universities, Seaman (2009) found that 70% of faculty respondents believe that the learning outcomes for online education are either "inferior" or "somewhat inferior" to face-to-face instruction. In spite of these negative perceptions of online education, students are voting with their feet. According to a Babson Survey Research Group study, the percentage of all students taking at least one course online reached an all-time high of 32% in 2011 (Allen & Seaman, 2013). For-profit providers have capitalized on this trend. By offering a convenient way for post-traditional learners to access higher education, for-profit providers appeal to what students, not faculty, value and demand.

For-profit providers have also capitalized on changing student demands driven by shifting demographics. If Soares' (2013) estimates are correct, the size of the post-traditional market (roughly 80 million individuals) along with the new demands and expectations this population brings to the educational context signal a change in the very nature of higher education. No longer an exception to the norm, post-traditional learners share a number of characteristics that are at odds with the accepted notion of the "traditional" college student:

1. Are needed wage earners for themselves or their families;
2. Combine work and learning at the same time or move between them frequently;

3. Pursue knowledge, skills, and credentials that employers will recognize and compensate;
4. Require developmental education to be successful in college-level courses; and
5. Seek academic/career advising to navigate their complex path to a degree (Soares, 2013, p. 2).

These commonalities differentiate this population from the smaller cohort of "traditional" students who matriculate in college immediately after high school, attend full-time, and depend on family for financial support (Choy, 2002). Unfortunately, this ideal of the traditional student persists and impacts the way that institutions of higher education organize and deliver their curricula and services.

As non-profit public and private institutions have been slow to recognize these changes, for-profit providers have taken another page from Christensen's book, targeting an emerging market overlooked or underserved by the industry incumbents. According to the College Board's *Trends in For-Profit Postsecondary Education* report, the majority of students who attend for-profit institutions are age 24 or older, financially independent of their parents, married or have dependents (Baum & Payea, 2011). These characteristics place these students squarely in the post-traditional category. By targeting this population, for-profit providers are reaching individuals at the margins of the higher education market, who otherwise might not have enrolled. However, given the potential size of this market and the workforce demand for post-secondary education, for-profit providers threaten to disrupt the dominant position of traditional higher education.

Adapting to the various disruptive forces buffeting higher education represents a daunting task. Deeply rooted processes and values make deviation from the norm a challenging prospect even when market disruptions pose a real threat. Furthermore, shared academic governance and the diffusion of power and decision making that come with it, make institutions of higher

education difficult environments in which to institute change. Nevertheless, Christensen's work on disruptive innovation provides a possible solution. He recommends that organizations deploy an independent organization with the processes and values required to solve the emerging problem. Rather than attempting to overhaul the entire organization, leadership can create a "spin-out organization" where the processes and values, necessary to respond to disruption, can thrive.

CE units, because of their market-driven orientation, are well-suited to fill this role. Their unique processes and values position them to provide their university partners with industry intelligence on what students are looking for and what the competition is doing to provide it. In this role, CE units can serve as a sensing mechanism within the external environment, alerting campus leadership to changes and trends in the higher education marketplace. As the literature suggests, CE units, like their for-profit colleagues, have a history of responding to the needs of students and changes in the market. The knowledge gained through these experiences position CE units as essential partners for institutions attempting to respond to the economic, technological, social, and political forces disrupting higher education.

Recognizing the role of CE units in championing innovation, Archer, Anderson, and Garrison (1999) discuss how universities can apply the principles of disruptive technology by leveraging the campus CE unit as an "incubator for innovation." The authors contend that CE units are well-suited for this role for the following reasons:

> These units generally have a cost structure that can achieve profitability with small markets and low margins and a decision-making process that supports rapid prototyping and development of courses and learning products. This is the ideal context in which to incubate disruptive technologies such as distance education (Archer et al., 1999, p. 23).

41

Through a case study of one CE unit at a Canadian university, Archer et al. (1999) discuss four

techniques, developed by Christensen, that universities can apply to respond to the disruptive

forces confronting higher education:

1. They embedded projects to develop and commercialize disruptive technologies within an organization whose customers needed them.
2. They placed projects to develop disruptive technologies in organizations small enough to get excited about small opportunities and small wins.
3. They planned to fail early and inexpensively in the search for the market for a disruptive technology. They found that their markets generally coalesced through an iterative process of trial, learning, and trial again.
4. When commercializing disruptive technologies, they found or developed new markets that valued the attributes of the disruptive products, rather than search for a technological breakthrough so that the disruptive product could compete as a sustaining technology in mainstream markets (p. 22).

These strategies provide a potential template for CE units and their parent institutions to forsee

and adapt to external forces of change. While these tools cannot provide insurance against

disruption, they enable leaders to actively engage with the forces that threaten to undo them, and

thereby, learn from them.

CHAPTER 3: RESEARCH DESIGN

Drastic reductions in state spending for higher education in California have left public institutions like the California State University System with few options for ensuring access to education outside of enrollment cuts, tuition increases, and occasional administrative efficiency gains. Unfortunately, these measures alone could ultimately limit access for many students. While public institutions of higher education have faced state budget cuts in the past, many see the current budget environment brought on by the recent recession as the "new normal." Accordingly, these challenging times, call for a fundamentally different response to these external forces of change. Rather than seeking to buffer the academic core from the world outside their gates, universities will need to be responsive to changes in the external environment if they are to remain vital (Christensen & Eyring, 2011).

CE units provide a possible template for navigating these turbulent times (McGaughey, 1992). Four characteristics, in particular, make this model worth examining: a history of working with adult learners; experience harnessing innovation to adapt to the needs of students and the demands of the market; a focus on workforce development; a track record of working with external partners, responding to market needs, and operating with tight budgets.

To examine the utility of the continuing education model, I have conducted a case study of one CE unit. I have engaged staff within the CE unit as well as other campus stakeholders in investigating the extent to which the practices of the CE unit can be leveraged throughout the campus. The following research questions provided the overarching framework for the investigation.

1. How do directors of CE units and their staff define success for their organization?

2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?
4. Do they think that practices employed in the CE unit could be adapted to work for them? If so, how?

To answer these research questions, I employed a qualitative design, incorporating a case study of a CE unit within the California State University system. The literature supports the use of case studies as a method for investigating a phenomenon in depth as it plays out in a particular site (Creswell, 2009; Yin, 2009). Moreover, this approach is well-suited for exploring "processes, activities, and events" (Creswell, 2009, p. 177). Yin's (2009) definition of a case study provides a thorough orientation to the method:

> A case study is an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon in depth and within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident (p. 18).

For this study, I conducted an in-depth investigation of a real-life context in order to obtain an "intensive, holistic description and analysis of a single, bounded unit" (Merriam, 2009, p. 203). Stake (1995) reminds us that case study research should not be confused with sampling research: "We do not study a case primarily to understand other cases. Our first obligation is to understand this one case" (p. 4). Accordingly, I have limited the scope of the study to one CE unit within the CSU. As my goal is to identify the practices of CE units in order to facilitate their diffusion, the case study method allowed me to understand one unit's practices in depth while also examining the extent to which these practices are diffused throughout the rest of the university. Ultimately, I employed a case study design for the reasons laid out by Merriam (1998), that is "insight, discovery, and interpretation" (pp. 28-29).

Maxwell (2005) sheds light on the role of qualitative inquiry by drawing a distinction between what he calls "variance theory," i.e., quantitative methods and "process theory," i.e., qualitative methods. The former is concerned with demonstrating a relationship or correlation while the latter is concerned with how or why things happen. Similarly, Creswell asserts that "the value of qualitative research lies in the particular description and themes developed *in context* of a specific site" (Creswell, 2009, p. 193).

In this study I explore the *how* and *why* of continuing education in the context of one unit's experience. To answer my research questions I will employ document analysis and person-to-person interviews. Triangulating the findings from these data will enable me to substantiate participants' perceptions and beliefs with multiple sources of evidence.

Research Methods

Site

The population for the study consists of one CE unit within the California State University (CSU) System. As the largest four-year university system in the nation, the CSU boasts roughly 427,000 students and 44,000 faculty. The 23 campuses that comprise the CSU are responsible for awarding nearly half of all bachelor's degrees and a third of all master's degrees in the state of California. An institution of this size presents unique opportunities for multiple perspectives and diverse voices. My rationale for selecting a site within a system that possesses the size and diversity of the CSU was to maximize the potential transferability of the study's findings from the one site under investigation to the system as a whole. In what follows I describe the site and discuss the rationale for its selection.

To protect the site's anonymity I have chosen the pseudonym, California State University, San Marino (CSUSM), Extension. By way of background, CSUSM is a masters-level comprehensive university located in an urban setting. The university as a whole enrolls roughly 15,000 [figure adjusted for anonymity] full-time equivalent students each year. Extension processes over 16,000 [figure adjusted for anonymity] enrollments each year in a mix of continuing education, professional development, and university credit courses.

Using data published by the CSU Chancellor's Office, I was able to compare each of the 23 CSU Extended Education units on a variety of measures to identify selection criteria. Comparative data across the 23 campuses were available for the following two variables: enrollments and revenues. The unit I have selected has the distinction of placing in the top ten within the CSU System in each of these categories, based on the most recently published data. While the institution selected boasts impressive statistics, I do not feel that these measures alone provide sufficient rationale for selection, for they only tell part of the story. To understand the rest of the story I called on colleagues familiar with the institution's history, and it was through these accounts that a compelling rationale emerged. In the course of my investigation I learned that the CE unit had been operating without permanent leadership for a number of years. This lack of stability within the unit led to a perception among campus faculty and deans that the unit was out of touch with the needs, goals, and direction of the university. Consequently, a team of interim administrators was sent from the university's central administration to examine the unit's academic and fiscal operations and implement changes where necessary. Furthermore, the team's findings would be used to determine the unit's future on the campus, that is, would the unit continue to function as an independent college, or would its various operations be folded into other divisions of the university, or simply shuttered entirely.

After a little less than a year of interim leadership, the decision was made to keep the unit intact and a search was conducted to recruit a new leader. The university's investigation of Extension on campus and their research into the role of continuing education on other CSU campuses led them to the conclusion that a refocused and reinvigorated CE unit would be beneficial to the university. After a national search, a candidate with experience in continuing education within the CSU was selected. In addition to experience within continuing education, the new leader possessed extensive experience as a CSU faculty member and researcher. In fact, it was her track record in her previous post of reestablishing ties between the CE unit and the academic side of the university that helped make her a compelling candidate for the position. With the arrival of a new leader in 2013 and a renewed commitment from the institution to Extension, a unique opportunity presents itself to investigate this specific case and ascertain how the practices of the CE unit can be leveraged throughout the university while it is taking place in real time. Given this opportunity, I believe that the selection of this institution will yield rich, meaningful data as it pertains to the research questions.

An examination of the literature on site selection yields a body of research (Creswell, 2009; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Maxwell, 2005; Merriam, 2009) supporting the use of purposeful selection for its utility in yielding data that are the most relevant and meaningful to the study's line of inquiry. Drawing a contrast to survey research, Merriam (2009) argues that "…in this type of research the crucial factor is not the number of respondents but the potential of each person to contribute to the development of insight and understanding of the phenomenon" (p. 105). Similarly, Stake (1995) asserts that what the researcher should be concerned with in selecting the case or cases is not ensuring statistical generalization but maximizing the opportunity to learn.

Gaining Access to the Site

Having identified a prospective campus for the study, I reached out to the dean of the CE unit at CSUSM to express my interest in conducting research at her site. After discussing the feasibility of my research plan, she provided her approval to proceed with the study within her unit and later obtained approval from the university provost. Next, I followed the procedures outlined by the Institutional Review Board at both UCLA and CSUSM and, subsequently, obtained approval from each institution to conduct the study.

Data Collection Methods

Documents

Yin (2009) supports the use of document analysis in case study research, noting its important role in corroborating and supplementing evidence from other data sources. Sources for document analysis in this study will include: websites, promotional brochures, handbooks, internal reports, and minutes. While these data will provide useful insight into the organization's activities, they will be analyzed critically, keeping in mind that they were "…written for some specific purpose and some specific audience *other than* [emphasis in original] those of the case study being done" (Yin, 2009, p. 105).

According to Merriam (1998), the fact that a document was produced for a purpose other than the case study at hand can be a strength rather than a limitation. Comparing document analysis to other data collection strategies, Merriam contends that documents do not disturb the research setting as is sometimes the case with direct observation. Similarly, documents do not share the limitations of interviews in that they do not rely on the cooperation and participation of

human participants. Rather, documentary data can be of particular use in qualitative case studies "because they can ground an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated" (Merriam, 1998, p. 126).

I began the data collection process with a thorough analysis of documents pertaining to the 23 CSU Extended Education units, published by the CSU Chancellor's Office (The California State University, 2012b). These data enabled me to compare the 23 units and identify those that might be appropriate for the study. Equipped with a list of potential sites, I then contacted the State University Dean for Extended Education at the CSU Chancellor's Office to discuss my research plans. The State University Dean, among other things, serves as the liaison between each of the 23 CSU Extended Education units and the Chancellor's Office for the System. As such, the State University Dean is uniquely aware of developments at each of the CSU campuses and is in an ideal position to offer insight into site selection process. In this meeting I solicited the dean's feedback regarding the campuses on my list, and she provided useful background information as well as insight into campus climate.

Having identified the site for the study, I conducted a second round of document analysis, wherein I examined their internet resources. These included mission statements, strategic plans, staff directories, program brochures, and catalogs. A third round of document analysis occurred after I obtained approval from the site and involved an examination of internal documents provided by the dean of the CE unit, including organization charts, budget figures, long-range planning documents, and university committee reports. The information that I gathered in this stage informed the in-person interviews I conducted in the second phase of the study.

Interviews

In order to develop a robust understanding of the case site, I conducted interviews on site at CSUSM, employing open-ended questions to elicit rich, meaningful responses. Appendix A provides a complete roster of interview participants along with their corresponding positions. In some cases, position descriptions were disguised to protect the anonymity of the participant. The literature (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009; Patton, 2002; Seidman, 2006; Yin, 2009) supports the use of interviews for situations that preclude an observer's presence, for events that occurred in the past, for intensive case studies, and for uncovering a participant's thoughts, feelings, and intentions. At a more fundamental level, Creswell (1998) reminds us "Knowledge is within the meanings people make of it; knowledge is gained through people talking about their meanings" (p. 19). Highlighting the importance of interviews for case studies, Yin (2009) asserts "…interviews are an essential source of case study evidence because most case studies are about human affairs or behavioral events" (p. 108). Accordingly, I conducted structured interviews of roughly one hour with key informants within the CE unit and with campus stakeholders. This approach afforded me the opportunity to obtain each stakeholder's unique perspective on their organization. This trove of data enabled me to provide a rich depiction of the practices of the CSUSM CE unit and its relationship to campus stakeholders.

Seidman (2006) contends that the primary way to investigate an organization is through the experiences of the people within that organization. As the purpose of this study is to explore a CE unit's practices, interviewing the individuals who contribute to and participate in the unit's operations seemed the most direct way to elicit the necessary data. I utilized the division's organization chart to identify potential participants. To obtain multiple perspectives on the site, I selected two individuals, one manager and one front-line staff, from each of the division's

subunits. I then presented my request for interviews to the dean. Next, the dean contacted the staff on my behalf to request their participation in the study. In the limited instances where the staff in question were unavailable or unwilling to participate, I consulted with the dean to identify staff with comparable responsibilities within the organization.

I identified interview participants from the academic core by one of two methods. The first method consisted of discussing with the Dean of Extension which faculty and administrators had experience working with her division. From this discussion we concluded that the deans of the academic colleges should be invited to participate in the study. The second method for identifying participants from the academic core involved asking participants in the initial round of interviews to identify other individuals within the university who would be able to provide insight into Extension's practices. This technique, referred to as snowball or chain sampling, is a form of purposeful sampling, which proves useful in identifying interview participants and gathering additional data (Merriam, 2009; Stringer, 2007). While random selection is often employed in quantitative research, purposeful sampling is employed in action research, according to Stringer (2007), to determine "the extent to which a group or individual is affected by or has an effect on the problem or issue of interest" (p. 43). Of course, the downside to this strategy is that the initial informants may simply direct me to individuals who share their own perspective. Cognizant of this tendency, I asked the initial informants to supply me with contacts who represented a diversity of perspectives on the organization.

To gain access to the prospective participants from the academic core, I relied on the Dean of Extension who contacted these individuals via email soliciting their participation in the study. The dean's assistant or I then followed up with those who expressed an interest in order to schedule a meeting.

Before the interview session I provided the participants with the UCLA IRB Consent to Participate in Research information sheet and explained their rights as a research participant, including their right not to participate. After providing them with this information, I asked their permission to audio record the interview session. Permission to record was granted in all but one session. In this instance, the participant allowed me to take notes of our conversation. Interview sessions were later transcribed by me or a paid transcriptionist. Appendix B details the interview protocols employed during the sessions.

Throughout the interview process, I reviewed the data to determine if I needed to make any mid-course corrections in the interview protocol or other elements of the research design. Taking care to identify these necessary adjustments early on in the process helped to mitigate the negative effect of any weaknesses in the overall study design.

Data Analysis

A thorough content analysis provided the initial body of evidence from which I developed my understanding of the site. Merriam (1998) defines content analysis as "a systematic procedure for describing the content of communications" (p. 123). I employed Miles and Huberman's (1994) three part process to analyze the data:

1. Data reduction
2. Data display
3. Conclusion drawing and verification.

At the heart of the process is the understanding that data collection and analysis occur simultaneously, thereby enabling the researcher to recognize patterns and integrate them into a working hypothesis.

Seidman (2006) discusses the role of previous literature when analyzing interview transcripts. "No prior reading is likely to match the individual stories of participants' experience, but reading before and after the interviews can help make those stories more understandable by providing a context for them" (p. 38). Accordingly, my review of the literature informed the initial development of categories by which to analyze document and interview data. The Interview Protocol Matrix in Appendix C expresses this connection between the literature and the development of categories. While this initial development of categories provided the foundation for data analysis, additional themes emerged as new themes presented themselves.

The data reduction phase involved a systematic identification of patterns using the lens of the predetermined and emergent categories. As I analyzed the data, I labeled individual passages with codes (Appendix D) based on the previously mentioned categories. These data were stored in a database where I was able to sort and filter them based on the codes I had assigned. This system allowed me to regularly audit the data to ensure that I was maintaining consistency in the coding process.

Leveraging the database, I was able to display the abundance of data in manageable chunks by sorting according to themes and sub-themes. This process enabled me to identify regularly recurring themes within the data. Additionally, I combined or revised codes as I compared data across categories. In this way, an iterative process of data display and data reduction emerged. Another useful feature of my data display tool was the ability to sort and filter information by participant and/or constituent group – Extension or academic core. This provided me with the ability to perform inter- and intragroup checks for consensus on topics as well as identify group outliers. Filtering the data by participant, enabled me to readily compare

one participant's perceptions with another's. In sum, these analysis strategies prepared me to engage in the next phase of the process.

Having organized the information, I was then able to draw conclusions from the data. The patterns and themes identified in the previous stages of the process informed my carefully drawn inferences from the data. Moreover, the systematic nature of the data reduction and data display processes mitigated the influence of researcher-imposed assumptions and expectations. Consequently, the conclusions that emerged from this final phase of analysis were supported by a strong body of evidence.

Ethical Issues

Although the 23 CE units within the CSU are part of the same system, there still exists a level of competition among them. Consequently, I took care to define my role and intentions as a researcher very clearly with stakeholders at the site. Given the public setting of the CSU CE units, I have taken precautions to keep the identity of the site and the informants confidential. I have disguised any identifying characteristics that could be traced back to a particular person. Moreover, research only commenced when informed consent was communicated by the researcher and granted by the participant.

During the data collection phase of the study I interviewed various stakeholders at the institution. Given their positions of leadership within their organizations, the deans, associate deans, and the provost could be inclined to give the socially acceptable or institutionally appropriate response to interview questions. To account for this behavior I interviewed staff at various levels within the organization. This strategy enabled me to obtain multiple perspectives on the operation rather than just the "party line."

To protect the study from validity threats, I triangulated multiple sources of evidence with multiple stakeholder groups at the site to corroborate and augment findings. Lastly, findings and themes were corroborated with the literature to mitigate the influence of my own biases in the interpretation of the findings drawn from documents and interviews.

CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

The current climate of decreased state funding for higher education and growing political pressure to implement accountability measures within higher education, provides new opportunities for core academic departments to partner with market driven CE units to reach new audiences, create relevant programs that students demand, and generate new revenue to offset reduced state funding. This study investigated the relationship between one CE unit and its parent institution to determine whether the CE unit could serve as a model for how an academic organization can be responsive to the needs of students and the changing external environment.

Over a period of three months during the spring of 2013, I interviewed faculty, staff, and administrators at California State University, San Marino. The following section provides a description of the site with a brief background of Extension and its relationship with the main campus. These elements provide the setting for my discussion of the results of the study, which I have organized into two broad themes or questions:

1. What are the practices employed by Extension that enable the organization to be responsive to the needs of the community and changes in the external environment?
2. What barriers exist that limit the transfer of these practices to the university?

The Site

Although CSUSM is considered an urban university, the main campus is located on the outskirts of the city, giving it more of a residential feeling. Total enrollment at the university is around 15,000 students [figure adjusted for anonymity], and over 50% of the students identify themselves as members of a minority group (Asian, Mexican American, other Latino, African American, etc.). During the course of my data collection at the main campus, I was struck each

time with the diversity of the student body. This diversity extends beyond ethnic diversity to the diversity of cultures and countries represented in the student body. CSUSM attracts students from all over the world to its campus, which was evident in my visits as I encountered a euphony of different languages.

During my visits I travelled the winding walkways from the library to the student center to the various college buildings to get a sense for the campus and elements of its culture that I could observe. As you approach the campus, you are joined by a multitude of others who are arriving from off campus. Consequently, I was not surprised to learn that the majority of students commute to the university. In fact, less than 15% of the student body resides on campus. Nevertheless, the campus still had a certain vitality to it, due perhaps to its vibrant student center and its inviting library, which serve as hubs of activity for the campus.

The Extension campus is located less than 10 miles away from the main campus in an industrial park, close to the city center. Its central location makes it a convenient destination for working adults attending classes after work. In contrast to the pastoral, main campus, the city center campus resides in a single multi-story office building. The offices and classroom spaces of the facility are modern and well-maintained, lending it more of a professional, corporate feel.

Surveys conducted by Extension on its students seeking certificates reveal that it is serving a distinctly different population than its main campus counterpart. First, 75% of the students in certificate programs are over 30 years old. Second, over 80% hold at least a bachelor's degree. Commenting on the demographics of Extension students, Karen Elliott, a program director, took issue with the conventional wisdom that Extension students are less 'academic' than their counterparts on the main campus:

Most of [our students] have academic degrees; many of whom have graduated from [CSUSM]. There's sometimes a split between this idea that [Extension] doesn't serve the academic population. We actually serve a more academic population, one who has graduated from universities, often with advanced degrees.

With over 16,000 registrations [figure adjusted for anonymity] each year, Extension's enrollment figures place it among the top 10 CE units within the CSU system. Similarly, Extension's annual revenues of over $15 million [figure adjusted for anonymity], compared with an average of $8.25 million, make it a leader in the system. However, these statistics do not tell Extension's full story. While I was aware before my study began that the division had experienced a high level of turnover in its leadership, my interviews revealed that a lack of consistent leadership had isolated Extension from the main campus.

Ellen Weiss, the dean of Extension, indicated that "…there has not been a permanent full-time dean in place here for the last 11 years. And so staff was not used to responding to management in a regular, consistent way and had developed their own little silos." Henry Wada, a program coordinator at Extension, amplified the dean's comments: "And because we haven't had consistent leadership for like eleven years our relationship with campus has kind of become weak and weird and not so healthy." Robert Montoya, a department chair on the main campus, called the leadership turnover in Extension "a rollercoaster!" He elaborated, "It's been uneven, some of it very exciting. There have been a lot of changes. We've gone through several directors now and it's always hard to maintain a consistency when there's new leadership. You have to train them and they have to train you."

Making matters more difficult, the former university president is said to have held beliefs that pushed Extension even further to the margins of the university. One high-ranking administrator in Academic Affairs, Richard Brindle, elaborated, "…the previous

president…came up through the faculty ranks. He went to an Ivy League school. He is an old-time academic, and his sense of what extended learning should do, is wedding planning. And so he's always held [Extension] in disregard." Tim Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, confirmed Brindle's observation saying, "Under the former president, there was very much kind of a, 'let's downplay, let's even close [Extension]." Though the president charged a university task force with investigating Extension to determine the unit's future, the task force members found value in Extension's contribution. Though the report was critical of Extension in many ways, it concluded that overall Extension "…provides a useful, flexible way for the university to offer programs that benefit the campus and members of the community."

The next four years saw more leadership changes in Extension. Brindle was appointed by the provost to evaluate Extension and, in the end, recommended that it be more closely tied to the university. Like the earlier university task force, Brindle concluded that Extension serves an essential role in extending the resources of the university to the community, and should be better supported by the campus.

About six months ago, a new dean of Extension was appointed and was charged with reintegrating the division with the campus and increasing the division's revenue. The new dean, Ellen Weiss, was a seasoned administrator with a record of turning around underperforming units. In an interview she said that one of her immediate challenges was rebuilding the division's organizational structure and employee morale, which had suffered with the changes in leadership.

Market-Driven But Campus Based: The Practices of Extension

Results from my interviews with staff in Extension point to a tension between Extension

and the main campus. To survive, Extension must respond to market developments as well as the

needs of external constituents. Karen Elliott, a program director in Extension, speaks to what

drives Extension and its practices:

> When you have people paying tuition out of pocket, or their companies are paying for it, they're not coming here because it means them getting a degree. So if it's not good, we hear about it immediately. There's a much faster return time. If something works, we hear about it, if something doesn't work, we hear about it very quickly and we have to act.

On the other hand, to maintain its credibility, Extension must abide by the university's standards

for academic quality and oversight. Tony Cardenas, an Extension program director, explained

the conflict:

> I would say it's the best and worst of both worlds because we have the umbrella of [CSUSM]; as successful as [CSUSM] is, then we get to ride on those coattails. We have to abide by all the regulations and all of that, but we also have to operate as a business. We don't have the state funding so we have to operate as a business and be aware of all of that. How do you balance good academics with fitting into the sales or getting it sold so that you can accomplish the academic goals and the financial goals, and feed back to the university?

This balancing act translates into a set of practices employed by Extension to survive in these

two very different environments. The following statements summarize the views of Extension

staff on these practices: partnerships with industry organizations keep the organization abreast of

changes in the market and ensure that programs address a need within the community;

employing instructors who are active professionals in their fields helps ensure the relevance of

the curriculum; adapting to the needs of external organizations and main campus departments

provides these partners with flexibility in program development and delivery. The goal of

investigating these practices is to answer the question: What do CE units actually do that make them worth emulating? What I present is in no way an exhaustive list of best practices. Rather, these findings capture what participants found most meaningful in their experience. These data provide an indication of what strategies Extension has utilized to respond to market forces as well as the needs of its external stakeholders.

Partnerships with Industry: An Essential Feedback Mechanism

According to individuals I interviewed, partnerships with industry organizations provide an essential sensing mechanism for CE units. These relationships appear to create a feedback loop from the external environment through which program directors can evaluate whether their curricula are in line with both employer and student needs. The dean of Extension expressed this challenge:

> And I think that's always a challenge is how do you, how do you maintain a program's currency? How do you maximize the potential benefits of the students that enroll in the programs in terms of future career choices? So that's something we're always cognizant of.

Extension staff explained that the need for this connection is important in those industries where the subject matter or the industry regulations are rapidly changing. Without this vital feedback from the frontlines, programs run the risk of being relevant at their inception only to gradually drift out of currency.

Partnerships with outside organizations protect the organization from this threat by providing a means for maintaining a program's relevancy. Cliff Simpson, a program coordinator, communicated this dynamic:

> There's a convergence between what we do, the training that we provide and industry…What's the relationship like? The partnership? It's partnership between

61

industry and education in the training program. There's overlap there. There's a continual sharing of ideas. I think that's what underpins the professional development programs.

Simpson's colleague, Terry Lee, the director of one of Extension's most successful programs, also reflected on the importance of these connections: "[W]e partner up with our professional association...So partnering with the professional associations that match closely to your area that you're working with, works really well." Similarly, Tony Cardenas, the director of several successful Extension programs, shared how industry partnerships were one of the keys to his success:

> I go to industry events for different industries and start to get known in that way…There's two of us for four programs. There's not a lot of us to go around. It's really important. Partnerships are huge, and we get a lot from the industries around here.

Not only do industry partnerships enable CE units to receive vital feedback from the professional world, they also provide a pathway for students to move from education to employment. Staff in Extension explained how by cultivating ties with industry they were able to secure internships as well as employment opportunities for their students. The added value for the external partner is that they are gaining access to a well-trained hiring pool. Pat Walker, a program director with strong ties to industry organizations, appreciated this dynamic:

> For me that's what it's all about, and it helps my partners too. They know I'm not gonna just send them any student or any graduate. It helps industry because they don't want to do all of the weeding out process. I think it benefits the university in many, many ways.

Simpson made a similar observation about the benefit of these arrangements for the industry partner:

> I mean a lot of our faculty decide to teach here because they know it's an opportunity to cherry pick. Like, 'Oh, this is where I could find somebody to come and work for me or for us.'

From the student's perspective, they recognize the value of enrolling in a program with connections to a potential employer, thereby easing the transition from the classroom to the workplace. Regarding the added value these relationships provide for the student, not to mention the CE unit, the dean of Extension explained:

> Well several of the programs that you mentioned, I think are attractive to our clients and therefore successful because of our connection with the relevant industry in this area…We have involvement from companies in this area that our clients are really interested in, in learning about and working with and working in, you know? So that makes those particular programs very attractive.

Henry Wada corroborated the dean's comments on this issue:

> Particularly with the ones that do well, the leadership in that program is involved in that industry somehow. Either they are in it, or were in it, still have ties and connections to it, and that's where students find opportunities, internships, and jobs – that director or coordinator having a tie into that industry.

Clearly, strong ties to external partners play a vital role in meeting the workforce needs of the respective partner while also providing a tangible benefit to students drawn by the possibility to secure employment opportunities as a result of their participation in one of Extension's programs.

The Benefit of Instructor-Practitioners

While partnerships with industry provide much needed feedback to Extension from the external environment, employing instructors who are active professionals in their respective fields helps to maintain the relevance of the curriculum while also enhancing the classroom experience. Because Extension does not have its own full-time faculty, as is the case with most CE units, it relies on part-time instructors whose day jobs are in the field of their expertise. This arrangement affords Extension with the advantage of hiring subject matter experts who are active in their field, thereby infusing the curriculum with current perspectives and practices from the

professional community. Henry Wada spoke to this practice within Extension: "Starting with one

of the instructors who come in and give them real world information, all of the instructors are

doing what it is that they are teaching so students learning from them are learning current best

practices." Although the increasing utilization of part-time instructors has raised concerns about

quality in higher education (Eagan & Jaeger, 2008; Finder, 2007), staff from Extension believed

this practice was actually beneficial for students:

> Part of it is it's easier when you're only hiring adjunct faculty because that gives you
> more opportunity to hire people who work in the industry they represent full-time, and
> they can bring to the student the latest. You don't always have the same feeling of
> competition with your own students because you're pretty secure and doing well in your
> industry and not being kept away from your industry because what you do full-time for
> the university is one of the things that keeps you away from doing it.

Terry Lee, a program director, articulated a similar conviction regarding the value of employing

full-time professionals who teach part-time:

> And the other part of the success paragon here, is I have 3 graduates of our program who
> are now teachers here. That makes it even better because they graduated as paralegals,
> they're working as paralegals, and now they're teaching. And so I have paralegals
> actually teaching courses in the program...What they're doing when they're coming into
> class is they're saying, 'This is what I do every day. This is what came up at work, and I
> used this software and here's how it works.' So the tie-in is definitely hands-on.

Hiring instructors who bring industry experience to the classroom is an example of how

Extension is responsive to developments in the external environment. The next section explores

this notion of responsiveness in greater detail by examining how Extension adapts to the needs of

external organizations and the main campus departments in the development of programs.

Responding to the Needs of Stakeholders

Offering a perspective on how Extension adds value through its responsiveness to the

needs of its partners, Tim Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, explained: "It's

the fact that [Extension] is more flexible, and I think that the opportunities that the programs of

[Extension] can offer to the community are very beneficial." Karen Elliott, from Extension, made

a similar observation: "I think it has to do with being highly responsive. I think [Extension's]

really capable of doing that in a way that the university at large hasn't responded quickly,

appropriately, and personally." Unlike the university's traditional degree offerings that follow

the standard academic calendar and require attendance on-campus, programs offered through

Extension offer a degree of flexibility to accommodate the unique needs of the respective

partner. A comment by Richard Brindle, from Academic Affairs, expresses this flexibility in

more detail:

> One of the advantages of [Extension] is you customize things in very specific ways…So
> you can customize curriculum for exactly what a group of people need. There's a degree
> completion program they're working on right now…They worked really carefully with
> the department here and the people in the police force, in customizing curriculum and
> time. You know when people can come. So the flexibility and the specificity that you can
> get with [Extension] programs, is an advantage I think for departments - makes it easy to
> fulfill the specific needs that other people have. So that's a huge advantage…So the
> ability to customize what you're doing to make it really specific, be really flexible. All of
> those things are assets for [Extension].

Specific examples of how Extension adapts to its partner's needs include: offering programs at

the job site, accelerating a program so that students complete the course requirements in a

fraction of the time that it would normally take, and tailoring the curriculum so that the learning

outcomes are closely aligned with the needs of a specific cohort of students (for example, police

officers pursuing a degree in public administration). In my interview with Karen Elliott, she

discussed more of the specifics of how she approaches these partnerships with external groups:

> I think successful partnerships have to do with, if we're the provider bringing services to
> organizations off site, it's our job to serve them. It's our job to understand their needs, to
> assess what the needs are, to design a program that's going to speak to those needs,
> communicate those needs successfully, to assess them at the end, and make sure that
> they're satisfied with what they've gotten. To make sure the participants have gotten

what they've needed. I mean the way I would talk about creating contracts, is I would talk about we need to serve the organizations. we need to serve the participants, and we need to understand the organizational needs, the participant, the employee needs, and we need to infuse our understanding of the needs from our perspective.

Elliott describes an approach that involves Extension and the external partner in the co-creation of the curriculum, thereby aligning the academic content with workplace activities.

Through this interaction between the academic and the applied, Extension serves as a broker between the external partner and the university. In this role, Extension must respond not only to the requirements of the outside agency but also the needs of the academic department. In my interviews with staff from Extension and faculty and administrators from the academic core, participants identified the following ways in which Extension responds to the needs of the academic core: providing a degree of flexibility in the delivery of programs, providing a mechanism for experimenting with new programs or new audiences, and providing an additional source of revenue.

Faculty and administrators from the academic core explained how Extension was able to operate with a greater degree of flexibility because it is exempt from some of the rules governing university operations. A comment made by Robin Cooper, a college dean, illustrates how Extension benefits the academic core in this way:

Well there are a couple reasons [Extension] can be more flexible. Let me say that flexibility is often quite appreciated. They are more flexible. One thing is our faculty are in unions. So that gives us certain constraints. If we have lecturers, who are non-tenured track faculty, and a new course opens up, we need to give priority to existing lecturers. There may be somebody better. But if that person is competent, then we don't really have a choice in the same way. Whereas for [Extension], it's not covered by the contract in the same way that we have total flexibility in who we hire. That is often a very desirable feature of [Extension], having that kind of flexibility, being able to tailor things. That can work well sometimes. Probably we need to take more advantage of it, in fact.

66

Similarly, Tim Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, addressed this notion of flexibility, "It really is because university, by definition, is pretty rigid. And the kind of, sort of flexibility that [Extension] often is able to offer, is much harder for the university to adapt that approach."

In addition to providing greater flexibility, faculty and administrators in the academic core indicated that working with Extension affords them with the opportunity to explore new programs and new audiences. Reflecting on this issue, Robert Montoya, a department chair, indicates "There are opportunities to experiment, to create, launch, develop, and earn some share of the profit on working with an organization like [Extension]. I'm very glad we have it. We benefit from it." Kim Tran, also a department chair, found great benefit in how Extension enabled her department to explore new audiences for their programs:

> The potential is great actually. If [Extension] helps us reach these other audiences, these other bodies of students that want to learn, we have a responsibility as academics to teach people to be critical and literate about media. So the more people that are critical and literate about media, the better media becomes.

One of the college deans, Robin Cooper, recounted a specific experience where he was able to work with Extension to leverage his college's resources to serve a previously unreached group:

> For a company who wants a group of employees to have this particular body of knowledge, can we do that for them? I remember before I was dean… And I got called by a federal agency…They wanted basically a business calculus course, which we offer, but for enough of their employees; something like 25 of their employees, good sized class. And they were willing to pay for it, and they wanted it at their site and they wanted certain topics in it, and it was fun. And I said, 'Great! We can do that. I'll find a good instructor and everybody wins. You'll get a good course and we'll make some money.' I don't know why they needed that for 25 employees, but they decided they did. So I think we need to do more of that, and that's one that came to us. We aren't out advertising we could do this. It came to us. There are probably lots of sizable companies where we could do more of custom courses for them and do a good job, feel comfortable we're doing something educationally sound, and make some money.

Cooper's example also highlights an additional form of flexibility Extension offers the academic

core, which is the ability to generate new sources of revenue.

Through partnership with Extension, academic units from the main campus have the

ability to generate additional revenue to supplement declining state funding. Participants from

the academic core expressed an appreciation for the flexibility this provides them. Kelly Masters,

an associate college dean expressed this notion succinctly:

> I would say on this campus, especially in the budget crisis, [Extension] is being regarded
> as, by administrators, as a way to save our skins…It brings money to the college for stuff
> that otherwise we would not be able to do.

Another associate dean, Jamie Matthews, elaborated on this point:

> We have more students enrolling in Open University in this college, than any other of the
> colleges in the university. So makes a fair amount of money. It's good money, because
> we can use it in what we want. So that's very important to us in tight budget times.
> That's one way we interact with [Extension]…Ultimately, because we don't have enough
> money, we need for [Extension] to make money for us.

Cooper, a college dean, provided one of the most detailed explanations of the flexibility

Extension revenue affords to colleges and departments:

> They can help us make more money. And I've said, it's very good money. When we
> make money from [Extension], it's not general fund money. So we can spend it on pretty
> much anything we want. It rolls over from one year to the next. That's a super advantage.
> Because the amount of discretionary money we have, I mean most of our money goes to
> paying salaries. And yeah, we got a big budget, but it's almost all gone from salaries. So
> creating more discretionary money for the departments, for which they could do good
> things, is great. So I think we can really benefit from this.

Finally, the university's provost commented on what he believed to be one of the benefits of

partnering with Extension: "The major benefit. I think we have touched on a lot of them. First of

all, a source of revenue that we really need at these times that the general fund is being cut

back." In summation, Extension helps departments generate new revenues, which provide the academic core with the flexibility to respond to reductions in state funding.

These data provide an indication of the strategies Extension has utilized to respond to market forces as well as the needs of stakeholders both on and off campus. What I have described is in no way an exhaustive list of best practices. Rather, these findings capture what participants found most meaningful in their experience. While these data suggest that Extension is engaging with the community and university partners in significant ways as a model of how an academic organization can be responsive to the needs of students and the changing external environment, I feel it is important to make clear that this narrative is only half of the story. Participants from the main campus and even those within Extension made it clear that they did not view Extension as a model organization. This should come as no surprise given the various challenges the division has experienced over the years, particularly the lack of consistent leadership at the helm of the organization and the lack of support from the university's previous president. In the section that follows I will discuss those issues that surfaced with regularity in the interviews and internal documents.

Barriers to Effectiveness

This study revealed a number of barriers, which undermine the effectiveness of Extension and limit the transfer of its practices to the university's academic core. In the section that follows, I detail the findings related to these barriers. Rather than go through a laundry list of every problem within the organization, my intent with this section is to provide a balanced picture of the unit, exploring those challenges which participants from Extension and the main campus believed were legitimate barriers to the organization's effectiveness.

69

Faculty, staff, and administrators were in agreement that the lack of consistent leadership

in Extension had negatively impacted both the organization itself and its relationships with the

main campus. Cycling through a series of deans and interim deans over the course of the last 15

years has taken a toll on the organization. Internally, the staff has had to endure a period of

prolonged uncertainty with regard to the division's overall direction and priorities. Externally,

this lack of leadership has meant that the division has been unable to establish strong ties with

and secure support from stakeholders on the main campus. Tony Cardenas, a program director in

Extension, expresses both aspects of this challenge:

> Lack of communication is huge – lack of leadership. We just haven't had any real
> communications with the university…And opening up the lines of communication,
> communication, communication. Understanding what the strategy is so that we can all get
> on board. People don't necessarily need to have things their way, as long as they know
> what direction they're going in. That would be really important.

As Cardenas's comments indicate, communication, or the lack thereof, has been a contributing

factor to the division's strained internal and external relationships. Insights shared by Henry

Wada, a program coordinator, and Karen Elliott, a program director, speak to the internal impact

of poor communication from leadership. First, Wada shares his analysis of the problem:

> A lack of leadership and if leadership is going to be here then communicating with the
> people who work here on a regular basis so that they feel heard and they feel incentivized
> to do their job. The potential here is crazy, and we're losing people. All the young people
> are quitting, and the older people will be retiring soon. So then there's another learning
> curve.

Second, Elliott identifies the communication competencies she believes are necessary for the

environment to change:

> I mean we've had a leadership gap for a long time. I think it's important to have
> leadership that's able to talk up, across, and downwards in an organization. Historically,

people have tended to be strong in one area but not others and it's a barrier to not have someone who has the capacity to relate in multiple areas of communication.

Elliott's analysis highlights the role that open communication plays in maintaining strong internal and external relationships.

The staff in Extension also shared their perspectives on how the leadership vacuum has affected Extension's relationships externally with the main campus. Richard Brindle, from Academic Affairs, explains just how essential it is for the leader of Extension to have strong ties to leadership on the main campus:

> I think the leadership is key. The leadership at [Extension] is key, and the leadership in the university is key. Because a lot of the possibilities can only happen if somebody has a vision and if somebody is clear about the vision, and also if you have the ear or the opportunity from the dean of [Extension] with the academic community. It's really key.

Leslie Clark and Karen Elliott from Extension expressed very similar views on the importance of solid working relationships between Extension and campus leadership.

> Well the leadership here has to be respected and liked by the leadership on the main campus. Trusted, respected and liked, for us to succeed. And that's what we're trying to build, a better bridge. Because as I've said, there's a lot of misunderstanding or a lack of understanding in what actually goes on here.

> If the leadership of [Extension] is valued and held in esteem by the leadership in the campus then [Extension] has a much better chance of being valued by the campus at large and being more successful and not seen as only a cash cow or for what it doesn't do well as opposed to being ignored for what it does do well.

Clark and Elliott contend that effective leadership is critical to Extension's overall effectiveness within the university.

Internal Barriers: Understaffing

In the absence of effective leadership, Extension staff often had to fend for themselves to obtain the resources they needed to succeed. The one resource that participants indicated was

71

most lacking was staff. For an organization to be effective, it has to have sufficient staff to handle the workload. Interviews with Extension staff along with internal documents shed light on the problem of understaffing within the division. While I heard from many participants that the division was understaffed, I looked to the employee directory to quantify the problem. According to the listing provided to me, 15 of the existing positions were vacant, which represents nearly 20% of Extension's entire staff. Henry Wada, a program coordinator, corroborated this figure and contributed additional perspective by indicating that much of the turnover had been recent:

> We lost 14 people between December and January, who either quit or retired, and maybe 3 people asked to leave or go to campus. The morale here is so low so that even now that we have new leadership people are so disillusioned and so tired of not being communicated with that the morale is just awful.

This figure does not include another 3-4 positions that the dean of Extension was in the process of creating in order to address what she saw as an absence of management-level positions within the organization. Whatever the actual level of understaffing, statements made by Extension staff revealed that the turnover and subsequent vacancies were having a negative effect on the remaining staff. The following section documents the impact from the perspective of those affected.

In the absence of sufficient resources, namely human resources, Extension staff had to make difficult decision about their own personal response to the situation. They could choose to shoulder the additional work left by their departing colleagues; they could simply leave the organization themselves either before or after feeling overworked; or they could stay and watch from the sidelines, refusing to take on any additional responsibilities. In my interview with Wada he recounts the choice he made:

> The key for the majority of the coordinators here, they could do so much more work in terms of development and even just administering if we knew somebody cared. It just

feels like no one cares at all. No one listens. We have some of the same problems. I've trained two bosses now, and it just gets old and tiring, and you stop having that buy-in. That's when students don't get phone calls back and all those things start to happen. In my situation since my previous boss was asked to leave, the one program that I have to myself, our enrollments have gone up 220% so I do more work, and I do better work, but at the same time I haven't had any communication from anyone to say good job or we see that you have the ability to help with development, maybe you should help us.

Tony Cardenas, a program director, shared Wada's response to the circumstances, choosing to find creative ways to manage the difficult situation:

[Extension] has a history of 'if you don't know how to do it, figure it out,' without any resources. There's a real scarcity mentality that exists. On one hand, we're being asked to always generate new revenue, but there's infrequent input of revenue into projects. If we want to start something new, we have to raid our other programs. So it's just been a very thin environment. There's always a push to create new things but there's not the support in terms of financial resources or staff to do it. With all that said, I think a lot of people who work here have done some creative things, myself included. You know I'm just used to working with so very little.

The approach taken by Cardenas and Wada was not uncommon among those I interviewed. Nevertheless, comments made by some revealed that they were struggling to reconcile this decision with the reality they were facing each day. Regan O'Connor, director of Human Resources, articulated this dilemma:

You need to have the resources you need. Otherwise we're talking about 3 staff handling about 90 programs. If you're adding more, fine, all these ideas are great, but with limited resources, nothing you can do. You can't do much. So you end up having to drop some, depending upon the priority. So, in order to be successful in growth, you need to make sure you have a reasonable amount of resources to handle. And make sure you have the staff knowledgeable in what they're doing, of course.

Dana Cruz, a coordinator in Extension's enrollment services unit, communicated this struggle to keep up as it was playing out in the division.

We're so understaffed. And we don't have leadership coming down and saying, 'This is what we're gonna do.' Maybe it has to be day to day to day... I don't even know what I expect in communications anymore, because it's been so long since we've had communications. We're very fragile right now, enrollment services, and it feels like that

in other areas, from talking to my comrades. Before the dean arrived, we were run into the ground…

Cruz also provided insight into how the director of the enrollment services unit had dealt with the problem of understaffing by working harder until the work got to be too much:

> My boss ended up leaving because the enrollment services director became the Special Sessions director, the Winter Sessions director. The Special Sessions director was unfortunately incompetent, and rather than try to keep him up to speed, well he'd been here for years. There was just no working with his weaknesses. So rather than have him be in that position and fail to do things that needed to be done, she just took over.

When Cruz's supervisor eventually left, the workload was passed on to Cruz, who found herself in the same precarious position: "I'm not even a director and they're asking all of us to step up. They don't ask us, it just happens…Then I realize I'm doing what my boss did, who left because her job became so overwhelming. " Cruz's comments underscore the impact that understaffing, in addition to the underperformance of some staff, had on the rest of the division.

External Barriers: Limited Faculty Understanding of Extension

In addition to the internal challenges confronting Extension, this study also found that very little is known by the faculty within the academic core about Extension or about how partnering with Extension could benefit them. Further, many faculty and administrators in the academic core hold negative perceptions of Extension, which limit the likelihood that strong partnerships between Extension and the main campus will emerge.

For collaborations between faculty and Extension to occur, faculty need to have a clear understanding of how working with Extension could be advantageous to them. This study found that there was consensus among participants from both Extension and the main campus that faculty have very limited contact with or understanding of Extension. Providing insight into this dynamic, Cary Stevenson, director of Extension's Facilities unit, provides the following

explanation, "I would say it's seventy-percent lack of understanding, thirty-percent of just negative. Why are they out there? They're just drawing money. They're drawing resources. I think it's like a 70/30 split. Seventy-percent is a lack of understanding." Whether or not Stevenson's breakdown of the percentages accurately reflects reality, his belief, that faculty perceptions of Extension range from lack of understanding to negativity, is corroborated by the experiences of participants in Extension and within the academic core.

When I asked the question "To what extent do you believe the faculty understand/value the role and contributions of Extension," staff from Extension spoke primarily about the lack of knowledge that faculty had about Extension. The general feeling was that Extension was not within the average faculty member's frame of reference. Stevenson, who worked for Extension then transferred to the main campus and then returned to Extension, has observed this phenomenon from both angles. He recalls hearing faculty and administrators express their opinions about Extension:

> 'Why do they exist. Why not just close them. We don't understand.' Having worked on the same floor with the provost, with a lot of people, when I say I used to work for [Extension], they're like 'I don't even know why that place is still around. What do they do out there?' I think the main problem is that there's a lack of understanding of what [Extension] does, what its mission is. It's just seen as this group that is in the [city center campus], and that's it. What do they do? They don't even understand what it is that we teach, what it is that we do. I think that's perhaps the biggest thing. They just don't understand. They have no clue as to what [Extension] does.

He also indicated that when he was planning to leave his position in the academic core to come back to Extension he encountered incredulity from faculty who couldn't understand why he was leaving the main campus:

> I used to work with many, many faculty in all of these different colleges for compliance. When I was telling them I was leaving, 'Oh yeah I'm going to the [city center] campus...'
>
> 'We have a campus [in city center]?'

75

[U]nless they teach on campus and teach here, there's very little understanding. Some of them don't even know there's a campus here. Numerous ones were like, 'We do?' Yes, there's a campus [in the city center]. I'm not making it up.

Karen Elliott expressed sentiments similar to Stevenson's:

I think that a lot of faculty don't even know we're here. They don't know what [Extension] is, or they know about it in some remote fashion. I think there are people in the main campus who have worked with [Extension], some have had great experiences, some have tried to wring whatever they can from [Extension]. Others have had bad experiences. I think that's the gamut, that by and large, it's not on their radar.

The dean of Extension provides some helpful insight into why Extension is not on faculty

"radar" by recounting her own experiences as a faculty member:

Well the faculty don't understand what we do at all. And that doesn't surprise me. When I was a faculty member, I remember students coming to see me for advice, because maybe they had a problem with the admissions process. I remember I had no idea what students went through when they applied to the university. Faculty don't involve themselves in processes like that. And I didn't learn how the university budget [works] until much, much later when I was an administrator, you know. I began to understand how money comes in, how revenue is used on the campus. So I don't expect that the faculty have a real understanding of how we operate.

Leslie Clark, director of operations in Extension, corroborates the experiences of Stevenson and

Elliott regarding faculty understanding of Extension:

A lack of understanding. And I think that there's a fair amount of academic snobbery. That is real. As a matter of fact, I'm sure that our previous president held professional development in great disdain… I just think that if you're a faculty member, a tenured faculty member, you're not really thinking about the other world of continuing education. Even though you should be; you should be learning your whole life. Just my opinion.

However, later in the interview, Clark identifies an important counterpoint in this discussion:

Now there are a few that we're working with, department chairs who are very entrepreneurial, and they're getting it. They want to work with us, and of course they want the best deal they can get. But they seem to get it a lot more. That's because they've also been connected in outside activities. They haven't been completely tunnel-visioned academic their whole life. And let's face it, if you've been a professor your whole life, you probably see things a certain way.

Clark makes it clear that there are some faculty who value the role of Extension. What then

distinguishes those faculty who don't understand or value Extension from those that do? Cliff

Simpson, a program coordinator who works frequently with faculty on the main campus,

indicated that one reason might be the different dynamic that exists between student and

instructor in the Extension classroom:

> I think it's just a more valuable experience for everybody. To me, it's more alive, it's more immediate. There is a certain immediate need. Everybody in the room is an adult. They know why they are there. No time is wasted, you just cut to the chase. I think the faculty feel more vital. I think they are challenged more because the students are more engaged, and they have higher expectations. It's not like that astronomy class has been taught for 20 years. In some ways what happens in [Extension], there's more change that is possible. Adjusting, constantly adjusting. That means the material is new. I think the faculty really like that; it keeps them on their game. They know they can't just show up and bluff through the course.

Simpson suggests that the typical student in an Extension class can bring a diversity of personal

and professional experiences to the discussion, which the typical undergraduate often cannot. As

a result, some faculty feel more engaged in the educational experience. Nevertheless, this

opinion about Extension programming, as the following section makes clear, is not widely held

among faculty.

In an attempt to better understand faculty perceptions of Extension, I turn to the

reflections of faculty and administrators in the academic core. One of the associate academic

deans, Kelly Masters explains faculty behavior using her own experience as a faculty member:

> I'll start with when I was a faculty member. I did not understand how it worked. And many faculty members don't understand that. I mean I think that's important to know right then and there. I didn't understand the rules governing the payments…there are many many aspects...So [Extension] works well, if people understand how it works. But if you're just a schlub faculty member, and you're trying to do something and people can't explain that to you, it was difficult to work.

As was indicated already, a lack of knowledge regarding Extension and its procedures is a

common barrier to faculty involvement with Extension. Francis Aziz, one of the college deans

confirms this assessment:

Oh boy, I would say they're not that aware, frankly. In fact, faculty often will come to me and say, 'Look, well we can just do this through [Extension], raise a lot of money.' And first of all, you can't do this because of rules and then, secondly, you just can't make a lot of money. You need to have a pretty well thought out plan. So I'm not sure that the faculty have a clear idea of what [Extension] really is all about. I think department chairs in our college at least do, so the chairs are pretty on top of it. But I think general faculty, do not.

These insights provided by members of the academic core, added to the observations made by staff from Extension, reveal the limited understanding that faculty possess regarding the work of Extension.

External Barriers: Negative Faculty Perceptions of Extension

Not only did faculty members on the main campus evince a lack of understanding about Extension practices, many held negative perceptions of Extension that together present a substantial challenge to faculty involvement. My interviews with faculty and administrators in the academic core, bolstered by internal university reports, revealed a list of reservations about Extension: the cost of operating a satellite campus was viewed as a financial drain on the rest of the university; program agreements and budgets have not been developed in a transparent and uniform manner; services provided by Extension in support of programs have not justified their cost; Extension offerings lack the academic rigor found on the main campus; and, finally, the mission of Extension is not well-aligned with the mission of the university. Without going into the veracity of these claims, I will now discuss these concerns in greater detail.

Extension Is a Financial Drain

An issue raised by faculty and administrators in the academic core was that Extension represented a financial drain on the rest of the university due to the costs involved with operating its satellite location. The university task force report recognized the impact of the satellite

location on the future of Extension, indicating that "The financial success or failure of [Extension] is driven by the on-going cost of rent." Negotiated around the height of the real estate bubble in 2006-2007, the lease that moved Extension to its present location in the city center locked the division into a long-term lease. Although the task force acknowledged that the city center campus was part of a broader strategic commitment by the university to have a presence closer to the commercial center of the city, the acquisition of the site was, nevertheless, perceived as primarily an Extension initiative. The provost provided some additional background:

> Then a second situation that contributed quite a bit, was that [Extension] and its operations were moved to our [city center] campus…The university lent them money to build out the space and they took out a 15 year lease. This was at the height of the bubble, as you know. Then in 2008, things really crashed, and so the university ended up picking up much of the tab and still does for the rent for [Extension]. So that has exacerbated, I would say, the relationships between [Extension] and the main campus.

Robert Montoya, a department chair, provided a similar perspective: "The move was perceived at the time, as a great opportunity, and now it's viewed as a huge cost for the university." Tim Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, concurred:

> [City center] campus, again, I think is very valuable for the university as a whole, to have a presence down there. But I know that it's been, again, when you read the report from the task force, there's no question that it's been a drain on the finances.

As a result of this strategic decision, Extension was in the unfortunate position of being viewed not as a resource to the main campus but as a financial liability.

Extension Is Not Consistent and Transparent in Its Program Agreements

Additional concerns about financial management surfaced in the course of the study. A sentiment expressed by faculty and administrators from the academic core was that program agreements and budgets have not been developed in a transparent and uniform manner. More

specifically, these stakeholders felt that the agreements and the favorability of the terms seemed

to vary from one program to another, based either on a prior personal relationship or the

negotiator's skill in striking a deal. This issue was of sufficient concern to be identified by the in

the university task force report:

> [T]he Task Force believes that a 'rate sheet' should be developed to specify levels of
> service provided to campus programs and the percentage of revenue retained by
> [Extension] associated with each service level. Creating a rate sheet would reduce the
> number and potential inequity of variable negotiated rates that are currently offered to
> different programs.

When colleges and departments make the decision to partner with Extension, they are effectively

entering into a business agreement, which is formalized through a memorandum of

understanding (MOU) and a program budget. These documents stipulate, among other things, the

scope of services each party is committing to provide and, just as important, the percentage of

revenue and/or surplus each party will receive for their efforts. Each agreement also specifies the

amount of Extension's administrative overhead expense. This expense is a percentage of the

gross revenue that Extension receives in exchange for the various services they agree to provide

in the scope of services section of the MOU. Typical services include: student registration,

payment and refund processing, budget administration, faculty hiring and payroll, curriculum

development, and marketing. Robert Montoya, a department chair, relates his perspective on the

issue from his own experience:

> The whole process of MOUs of [Extension] has generated some complaints in two ways.
> In the first way is that, it's uneven. You don't get the same contract. You talk to your
> colleagues and they're getting a better percentage. And you try to find out how they just
> negotiated it, in the hallway or something, and you wonder why you can't negotiate it.
> You try, and sometimes you're successful and sometimes not and there's some griping
> about the unevenness of the arrangements.

Kelley, an associate dean from one of the colleges, recounts a similar experience with this

process:

There was no standardization. There's no standardization of the MOUs, of the relationship between the units and [Extension]. It was all pretty much interpersonal. It was not institutionalized. I think that's changing now, with [Ellen Weiss] actually. But at that time, it was really on a personal basis.

The university's provost also expressed his concern over this issue as one who has had to deal with the complaints from faculty, chairs, and deans over the lack of transparency and uniformity:

Indeed one of the problems with [Extension] here was that there had been different arrangements made with different faculty and some perceived correctly that it was uneven, and we've tried to make that more fair. Before it was kind of, I guess, whatever kind of deal could be made, and this is a legacy again from the past from before my time. So we've tried to straighten some of that out. So some faculty definitely have the feeling that they do all the work and [Extension] just scoops some of the money. And so they don't like that.

That this issue made it all the way up to the level of the provost is an indication of the extent of the problem.

To be fair, participants from Extension also communicated their awareness of this problem. Karen Elliott correctly identifies the impact of this issue on the division's reputation:

I know that a lot of the past controversy and negativity that has come from the campus, towards [Extension], has been tied to the way a lot of the academic programs have been set up or special deals that have been made and that sort of thing.

In the same fashion, Leslie Clark conveys her understanding of the matter:

[Ellen Weiss], I think, is going to make a big difference in terms of our success with campus, because the complaints that you will hear and probably have heard are being addressed in terms of not being transparent enough. [Ellen's] making standardizing the rates that colleges are going to be asked to pay for our overhead services. So that everybody can talk to your neighbor and you're both paying the same thing for the services that we provide so people are not wondering, 'Well how come you get 10% when I'm paying 30%?'

As Clark indicates, the arrival of a new leader in Extension provides the division with the opportunity to assess its practices and make changes to address the concerns raised by its campus partners.

Quality of Extension Services Do Not Justify Their Cost

According to these partners, another area that Extension must address is the quality of the services it provides. As I discussed in the previous section, participants from the academic core felt that the calculation of Extension's administrative overhead lacked a clearly articulated rationale and seemed to be based more on personal relationships and deal making. Consequently, some programs were able to negotiate better deals than others and receive back a larger percentage of the gross revenues, while receiving the same level of service from Extension. With regard to this level of service, participants expressed their frustration that the quality of the services they ultimately received from Extension was not commensurate with the amount of money the program was paying. By and large, the complaints about Extension services focused on the lack of service provided. However, some participants also communicated their dissatisfaction with the performance of some of the Extension staff tasked with administering their programs. The net result was that academic partners felt they were being wronged on two levels. On one level, they believed that Extension was collecting more than they should for their role in the partnership, and on another level, they felt that the services Extension eventually provided were not always high quality. You get a sense of this frustration from Robert Montoya, a department chair:

> The second thing is, the unevenness in the service that is provided. So, you may have an MOU with [Extension] on a program… And it might say [Extension] is responsible for outreach/marketing. [Extension] has to put the signs on the buses and the ads on the radio and do the outreach. Then you find that they really don't do very much. How come I'm paying a percentage for this outreach, and all I see on the buses are the MBA programs?

The complaint here is that the academic partner is not getting what it paid for. Extension agreed to take on certain responsibilities in exchange for a percentage of the revenues, but from the

academic partner's perspective the service was not delivered. Robin Cooper, one of the college

deans, provides a similar perspective on this issue:

> Probably the main complaint I get from faculty involved with programs like this through [Extension], is they, [Extension], is taking a larger share than they feel comfortable with…[Extension] is collecting all the money and charging 30% for taking somebody's credit card. And it doesn't feel good to some faculty sometimes. So that I would say would be the main problem. It's the same, I think, with Open University. We're getting, I think it's now 40 or 45%, and it's our faculty that are doing all the work. They're grading the extra papers and everything like that. So it seems to me, you might think, 'Well, why aren't we getting 80%, right?' And sure, [Extension] should get something. They have collected the money, but that is literally, for the Open University, the only thing they're doing...So those would probably be the main source of dissatisfaction is for the high percentages that are taken. There's somewhat of a feeling that maybe the services aren't worth that high a percentage.

Morgan Armstrong, also a college dean, expressed almost identical concerns:

> You know this other thing we do with [Extension]…is that we get this thing called Open University, which is non-matriculated students take some of our classes, and they pay a certain amount of money, and it adds up. We get about, at the moment, about $180,000 a year in Open University money, which we use for supplies and equipment, travel, things like that, but they take 45% of the cut. We take 45% of the cut, and the central CSU takes 10% of the cut, and we do all the work. Our faculty do all the work. They take the students in the classes. All [Extension] does is process the payments. Now if that's worth 45%, come on. I mean it should be 25%, not 45%. So we should be getting 70%...But we should be getting much more out of that…And the faculty are grading the papers. The faculty are admitting the students into the classes, which is sometimes too large already…And probably, ultimately, [Extension], even if they took a smaller cut, would make as much money because the faculty would be more into it because they knew that the money was coming back to the college.

A final comment, made by Francis Aziz, a college dean, indicates that perhaps part of the

problem is faculty perception of the work of Extension:

> I think probably the biggest complaint that I heard from our people was, 'Why do we have to pay them so much when they don't do anything for us?' And I think that's still a bit of a perception. Just recently, some folks are trying to run a program through [Extension], and said, 'Well we're going to recruit the students and we're going to do all the [work]…so why do we have to pay them for all that kind of stuff?' And I've talked to [Ellen Weiss] a little bit about that so I know that at some level we're going to have to, at some point we're going to have to figure that out. I'm not sure what that figuring out is, whether that means they do more in those areas, or change the perception of our folks about what's going on, but that's clearly a perception that many of our folks have.

Aziz's observations provide some nuance to the discussion, while also recognizing the role of perceptions and expectations in the success of any partnership.

As I mentioned earlier, some participants from the academic core communicated their dissatisfaction with the competency of the staff they interacted with in the administration of their programs. While I do not believe it is fair to pass judgment on all Extension staff because of the behavior of a subset of the group, I feel that I need to discuss the issue of staff performance because it was mentioned on a number of occasions during interviews with participants from the main campus. A point made by Richard Brindle, from Academic Affairs, is that some of the turnover Extension experienced over the last year was necessary, that is, a concerted effort was made by the administration to address the issue of underperforming staff: "Actually, a bunch of people quit who were incompetent. And that had to happen in order to start over again." That being said, the comments that follow indicate that some reputation repair work is necessary to regain the confidence of faculty and administrators. A high level administrator in academic affairs paints the following picture of the problem:

> Some of the people who were in [Extension] were not seen as the most competent individuals. And so sometimes that was considered a problem. So if we're going to ramp up, are there going to be competent people there? Is this really going to work? Or is it going to make my course a mess?

Francis Aziz, a college dean, whose college runs multiple programs in partnership with Extension, articulated her perspective, "So I think the big issues, the two big things were going on, really still continue to be personnel. Making sure you got the right people doing the right thing." Aziz goes on to provide specifics about some of the challenges her college has encountered in the past:

> But I also know then that there were some legitimate concerns and complaints from people who worked with them regularly and about inconsistent responses, and no

responses, and balls that got dropped, and payments that were inaccurate, and all that kind of stuff.

Nevertheless, Aziz provides some hope that things are changing, "It feels like they've really turned a corner. I hope that's true." Indeed, some evidence exists that Extension's reputation on the main campus is improving. Kelly Masters, an associate academic dean, provides some support for this claim:

> But [Ellen Weiss] is turning out to be very knowledgeable about the rules that you have to follow, and I want to say this, [her] support staff is also very good, and that matters! To have support staff that know what the rules are too.

Nevertheless, a challenge Extension faces in changing its reputation is that most faculty and administrators on the main campus do not have regular dealings with Extension. As those I interviewed from the main campus explained, faculty and administrators have limited interactions with or understanding of Extension. Consequently, campus perspectives may continue to be shaped by prior experiences and negative perceptions.

Extension Programs Lack Academic Rigor

One of the perceptions held by faculty and administrators in the academic core was that Extension offerings lacked the academic rigor found on the main campus. Morgan Armstrong, a college dean, explained:

> Well it seems a lot of the courses are frivolous and they could be much higher quality. Both in terms of the kinds of courses there are and the attractiveness of the courses and the quality of the teacher. You know, just silly courses.

Armstrong elaborated on this point further:

> And I don't appreciate the quality in general of what they're producing, and I want it to be at the same level of quality of what we're trying to achieve on this campus. It could be different, but it has to be good-different, and I'm not sure it's good-different.

Armstrong's perspective was shared by Jamie Matthews, an associate college dean:

85

One of my objections when I was talking about my experience is there's a tendency for [Extension] to give a course credit or certificate credit, other kinds of credit, that don't meet the same standards of the campus.

Pat Walker, a program director from Extension, contributed an interesting perspective on why some faculty and administrators in the academic core viewed Extension's programming as inferior:

What it boils down to is that both sides think they're better than the other. Campus - we're better than the other because they're very vocational, and they don't understand these lofty goals, and they understand these deep thoughts. We think we're better because we don't buy into that ivory tower attitude, and that's just as bad. We're all the same university. Maybe that's a dialectic that has to take place, and it always has to be that way, and that's what makes it work. I don't know.

Walker's comments capture a key area of conflict between Extension and the academic core, that is, this issue of mission and the subsequent valuing of the purely academic mission above the professional or vocational orientation of Extension. This conflict is not a new one within the academy. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that it spills over into the relationship between the academic core and Extension. As Walker explains, the tension between the academic and the professional goals of education often puts the main campus and Extension on opposing sides of a dispute, in which each participant claims the higher ground.

Extension Is Not Well-Aligned with the Mission of the University

Expressing their views on this issue, faculty and administrators at the main campus revealed that they do not believe that the mission of Extension is aligned with the mission of the university. While its physical distance from the main campus no doubt contributes to perceptions that Extension's work is at the margins of the university's core mission, Extension has its work cut out for it as it seeks to convince faculty, staff, and administrators on the main campus that its

86

work is aligned with the institution's strategic plan. Kim Tran, a department chair, frames this

debate perfectly:

> My problem with [Extension] is they lack a clear understanding of who they are. They're in an existential dilemma of biblical proportions – extremely exaggerating. I mean they really are...But the existential dilemma I think [Extension] is in, and therefore it's a part of the university's – What are you? Before, you were extended ed., so you were the vehicle for the university to do community service. You were teaching, non-credited courses, using the stature of the university and the resources to the community, and then you sort of grew into, well, you're going to provide some for-credit opportunities and some vocational training because there's demand for it in the community, in the city, right? So you got languages and you got computer skills, stuff like that. Then it became sort of, well, it's the only way to create opportunities to generate revenue outside the Registrar, right?

If Tran's comments are any indication, the problem for Extension is not simply aligning its

mission with that of the university but also determining exactly what its mission should be. Tim

Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, echoes Tran's assessment of Extension's

challenge:

> It's the fact that [Extension] is more flexible and I think that the opportunities that the programs of [Extension] can offer to the community are very beneficial. What I think we as a campus need to decide, as we're sort of developing a future model for [Extension] is, do we really want [Extension] to be primarily just an extension of what we do in our normal operations? For example, should the content of [Extension] programs be limited by the degrees that we currently offer or the programs that we currently offer through the regular programs or through the general fund? Or do you want [Extension] to be sort of this entity that creates its own curriculum?

As both Extension and the university grapple with the role Extension should play on

campus, the insights that follow provide possible approaches to how Extension can contribute to

the university's mission. Again, Tran provides a keen analysis of the situation:

> And that whole climate, you know the [Extension], the president, that culture, the fact we are social justice, but not always, but there's a skepticism about anything with money, but give me my money. All that makes any partnership with [Extension], I think, except for really open-minded or new people, extremely difficult. If you go into a partnership already skeptical, thinking they're the enemy, what are you going to get? So I think there needs to be repair done to [Extension's] narrative and image on campus, and to do that

we really have to segregate money from the mission. If [Extension] is anything, it shouldn't be just a vehicle to raise revenue. If it is, it's always at this institution going to be considered problematic. Always. It's got to have a unique purposeful, meaningful, integrated mission that also can in some ways, specific ways, generate revenue for the institution and the constituencies in that institution department. So it needs a vision that way.

Tran's insights bring to the surface a disconnect between what Extension believes its purpose is and what the university wants Extension's mission to be. Tim Singh, the university's director of enrollment services, provides some insight into how Extension can better align itself with the goals of the institution:

And that essentially, was my thesis, that [Extension], extended learning, continuing education, are more successful when they sort of model the mission of the campus. So that's a reason why at a [UCLA], the mission might be, learn more about literature or learn more kind of things you want to do after you retire; that you didn't get a chance to do when you were an undergraduate. Whereas at [CSUSM], if our mission is really training the work force and the citizens of our region and whoever else wants to come, then probably [Extension] should more closely model that, to be successful and to be integrated and accepted and valued on the campus. In other words, if you get too far from the mission of the main campus, you run the risk of them saying, 'Well, we could just cut that tie,' and you're gone. You're on your own, and, of course, you can't exist without the main campus. So that's kind of the debate.

Richard Brindle, from Academic Affairs, offers additional advice on how Extension can position itself to contribute to the university's mission:

I think also that the more that the professional development programs are mirroring or look more like the academic campus, the better it is for [Extension], because I can't tell you how many times people have brought up this wedding planning thing. 'They only do just wedding planning down there. They just do this stuff that's superfluous and doesn't matter and is not academic whatsoever.' That gives [Extension] a bad reputation with faculty.

Building on Brindle's point, Robert Montoya suggests one avenue where Extension's work lines up nicely with the university's mission.

One of the things I've liked, and this is what we've done, [my division] does special kinds of programs with community organizations, with community members, and we've partnered with [Extension] to bring those in. As the university has a mission for

engagement, [Extension] can contribute to that mission. As long as it's seen as being a part of that, and not contrary to that, I think it's a good thing. I think consistency with general mission goals of the university, not just fiscal goals, but the programmatic goals are great things to foresee.

Montoya suggests here that community engagement could serve as an avenue for aligning the work of Extension with the university's mission. Brindle shared Montoya's perspective:

I think that something that would be a selling point on this campus is finding ways, to make the faculty understand that we can fulfill our mission through [Extension]. So social justice; everybody gets that here. That is at the top of people's agenda. But doing things that fulfill the social justice mission or the civic engagement mission, but particularly social justice, is a big selling point on this campus. The more that an [Extension] operation can show that it's an important player in whatever the university's mission is, is I think a big selling point.

Alex Silberman, one of the academic deans, provides still another angle on how Extension can align itself with the broader campus mission:

Well first of all, I don't know if I agree with your premise, that it is to be integrated. So there's a huge assumption in that about integration. Now I agree that it should be part of the mission, but maybe it's a different target market, and that's how I kind of look at it. If I look at the programs they do, it's not our target market. It really isn't, or it could be the appetizer to people who are thinking about getting some education, and they have an experience with [Extension] and they decide to get a degree.

If these comments are any indication, this issue of aligning Extension's mission within the university's priorities and goals is on the mind of faculty members and administrators at CSUSM.

However, within this discussion of mission and how Extension can align itself with the university's strategic plan there lies an unresolved tension: How does a public institution reconcile its teaching, research, and public service imperatives with the increasing need to generate revenue to fund these enterprises? Kim Tran alludes to this tension in a previous remark when she refers to segregating "money from the mission." Likewise, Robert Montoya articulates

how he is grappling with the seemingly irreconcilable approaches of Extension and the academic

core:

> I suppose it would be possible to structure practices within university or on the same lines of that sort of entrepreneurial version. But it's a little frightening. I think of trying to understand the consequences of doing that. A bit too complicated for me. I like the idea that Extension's a separate unit. That they can partner with us as opposed to moving it into our structure. I mean, you would start to really be changed, undermined maybe. Structures that have been in existence hundreds of years, it would impact faculty governance. It would impact RTP processes. It might impact curricular development. It would change the whole nature of the higher ed. To have a state university operating with an entrepreneurial structure, there would be decisions that would be made not because they are necessarily the best curricularly, pedagogically, or mission driven, but they might be good financially, and I think that makes people fairly nervous.

Kelly Masters, an associate college dean, shared similar concerns raised by faculty members in

her college about the money-mission debate:

> I was told this point blank last week, 'Getting money is your job. It's not mine.' But faculty don't see making money as their business...I'm just thinking of all the trouble we've had lately with faculty who…actually this is a big issue. [Extension] is a huge issue right now, and it always has been, but I'm noticing it more because faculty don't want to treat education as a business. They really don't. I don't know where they think they are. Who pays their salary? Just because they're good people?

These statements made by Montoya and Masters reveal the deeply held values that inform

faculty notions of the role of higher education and, ultimately, their perceptions of Extension.

However, changes in the external environment might be causing a shift in thinking, if later

comments made by Masters are any indication:

> Because if you have a public university, I do think public funds should pay for more than they're paying for right now. I mean, I think we're in the time when we're never going to get those public funds back, but [Extension] could help us with the entrepreneurial model for education. Not as an end in itself. Not as a way to privatize, but as a fair way to exchange… the university for me, has always been business, and I'm not a business person, believe me. But it's always an exchange of money for credits and a grade. An entrepreneurial model that doesn't offend faculty, and that makes it clear that this is not just about money. It's money in exchange for something.

Whether Masters' sentiments place her in the mainstream is unknown, but what her comments, along with Montoya's, reveal is an existing debate within the academic core about its role in generating revenue and its level of comfort with Extension's entrepreneurial approach.

Statements made by faculty, staff, and administrators at CSUSM reveal the complexity of the challenge that Extension faces as it determines how it fits within the greater university mission. Their insights also point to potential solutions for addressing this challenge. The recommendations that follow were born out of these insights.

CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

This study investigated how staff and administrators in one CE unit describe the best practices of their division. Several findings emerged. First, partnerships with industry organizations keep Extension abreast of changes in the market and ensure that programs address a need within the community. Second, employing instructors who are active professional in their fields helps ensure the relevance of the curriculum while also enhancing the classroom experience. Third, Extension adapts to the needs of external organizations and the main campus departments in the development of programs. Through this interaction between the academic and the applied, Extension serves as a broker between the external partner and the university. These findings corroborate what is well known within the field of continuing education. Their real significance is that they lay the groundwork for the discussion that follows.

This study also found that significant barriers exist both within Extension and within the academic core that limit the effectiveness of these practices. Within Extension, the absence of consistent leadership has resulted in a lack of direction for the division and has undermined the division's relationships with partners in the academic core. Within the academic core very little is known about Extension or about how partnering with Extension could benefit them. Further, many faculty members and administrators in the academic core hold negative perceptions of Extension. Participants identified the following negative perceptions held by the faculty on the main campus: the cost of operating a satellite campus was viewed as a financial drain on the rest of the university; program agreements and budgets have not been developed in a transparent and uniform manner; services provided by Extension in support of programs have not justified their

92

cost; Extension offerings lack the academic rigor found on the main campus; and, finally, the mission of Extension is not well-aligned with the mission of the university.

The study findings understood within the context of the extant literature, lead to several recommendations. These recommendations are grounded in both findings and the literature and are intended for leaders in both Extension and the academic core in the hope that they will recognize that their destinies are inextricably linked and, therefore, endeavor to identify ways to leverage their collective strength. Time, however, is of the essence. Disruptive social, economic, and technological forces threaten the academic core. Changes that twenty years ago seemed unimaginable now appear inevitable. A report, commissioned by then Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings, expresses the gravity of the present situation:

> History is littered with examples of industries that, at their peril, failed to respond to—or even to notice—changes in the world around them, from railroads to steel manufacturers. Without serious self-examination and reform, institutions of higher education risk falling into the same trap, seeing their market share substantially reduced and their services increasingly characterized by obsolescence (Spellings, 2006, p. xii).

The recommendations that follow take into consideration the threats posed by the current environment while also recognizing the opportunity for change afforded by these external pressures.

Recommendations

Recommendation #1: Be Consistent and Transparent in Agreements with Campus Partners.

The findings indicate that mistrust and resentment have accumulated over the years surrounding the terms of the agreements between Extension and its campus partners. To build trust and support, procedures for partnering with Extension should be documented and disseminated with transparency. The roles and responsibilities of all parties should be discussed

and agreed upon early on to limit any misunderstandings. Moreover, the terms of the agreements should be consistent from one program to another based on the work being done and not on personal relationships or the deal-making skills of those involved. Agreements with appropriate incentives for each party are more likely to summon the best efforts of those involved and endure through the inevitable ups and downs.

Recommendation #2: Articulate a Clear Vision of the CE Unit's Role Within the University.

As the literature (Pearce, 1992; Petersen, 2001) and the findings of this study suggest the connection between the university's mission and the mission of the CE unit is not always clear. Consequently, CE leadership must first contextualize the unit's mission within the existing strategic plan for the university. It cannot be a peripheral, marginal effort detached from the "real" work of the university. Petersen (2001) provides useful direction on this issue:

> Continuing education professionals have experience in developing alliances and networks, both within the university and externally in developing programs. By aligning themselves with the university's mission, [CE units] are more likely to strengthen their internal alliances. At the same time that [CE units] try to bring continuing education closer to the core of the institution, they must identify the critical skills and expertise that continuing education professionals add to the activity and the value that a centralized function provides. In short, [CE units] need to do a better job of informing the university community of their role in delivering continuing education and their contributions to the university's mission. (Petersen, 2001, p. 35).

The literature and the opinions of those interviewed in this study suggest that the way CE units can align themselves with the university's mission is through community engagement (Dufour & Queeney, 2004; Fletcher, 2008; Shannon & Wang, 2010). Specifically, the CE unit can act as the face of the university as it reaches out into the community to meet the needs of prospective students as well as public and private agencies. In this capacity, CE units can extend the reach of the university and build bridges to new constituent groups. This strategy benefits the CE unit,

which stands to gain new partnerships and enrollments, and the university, which strengthens its connection to and influence in the local community.

Recommendation #3: Consistent Outreach to Faculty and Administrators Is Necessary to Inform the University Community about the Role and Value of the CE Unit on Campus.

Once the CE unit has aligned its mission with the university's, it must engage in the equally important work of communicating this mission to the university community. This study found that faculty members have very little interaction with or knowledge of the role of the CE unit. Rather than lament this fact, CE leadership should instead see it as their unit's responsibility to educate the campus about the important role they play in helping the university achieve its strategic goals. This recommendation is consistent with previous findings that suggest that the quality of the interactions between leadership in the academic core and leadership within the CE unit has an influence on the division's overall success (Pearce, 1992; Snider, 1987). In fact, Pearce makes the following recommendation:

> Perhaps the most important implication drawn from this for practice is the need for deans to focus time and attention within their own institutions. They need to lobby internally to build support for the concept of continuing education, and just as importantly, to build support for the continuing education unit itself (1992, p. 6).

While I agree with Pearce on this point, I believe that the dean/director of the CE unit should start by educating his or her own staff on the history, relevance, and mission of the division. Since the majority of the campus's interactions with the CE unit will be with someone other than the dean/director, developing a sense of purpose among the staff and educating them on the work of the organization is an important first step in informing the university community about the role and value of the CE unit on campus.

Ensuring that everyone within the CE unit is committed to the division's mission is a prerequisite for influencing what is, perhaps, the most difficult group to win over – the faculty. As this study demonstrated, negative faculty perceptions about continuing education are hard to displace because faculty members have such limited interaction with the CE unit. While a few well-positioned professors can negatively influence the effectiveness of the CE unit, it is also true that the passion and creativity of the faculty fuel new program development. Consequently, the CE unit should endeavor to activate these characteristics and engage faculty members in their respective areas of inquiry.

While comments made by participants in the academic core reveal an unresolved tension over the core's role or responsibility in generating revenue, funding cuts for higher education have forced this discussion out into the open, as this quote by Kelly Masters suggests:

> I would say on this campus, especially in the budget crisis, [Extension] is being regarded by administrators as a way to save our skins.

This environment affords both the academic core and Extension with an opportunity to reexamine deeply held values about higher education and determine whether entrepreneurship and education can be reconciled.

Recommendation #4: Maintain Qualified, Consistent Leadership of the CE Unit.

A concern voiced consistently throughout my interviews with main campus and Extension stakeholders was the lack of consistent leadership in Extension. The revolving door of deans and directors within the unit undermined the development of strong main campus partnerships. Without these partnerships, Extension programming can lose its connection to the university's mission and become a marginalized operation on campus. As the literature suggests (Pearce, 1992; Snider, 1987), the relationship between the leadership in the CE unit and the

leadership in the academic core is critical to the CE unit's effectiveness. Consequently, it is imperative for central university leadership to hire a qualified leader, who is skilled at establishing alliances within the university. Alliances take time to develop and time to maintain. Consistent leadership at the helm of the CE unit is essential to the formation of meaningful partnerships.

Nevertheless, the literature suggests that finding and retaining experienced higher education administrators can be a daunting task, due in large part to the mass exodus of baby-boomer retirees and the dearth of aspiring faculty and administrators to replace them (Clark & Hammond, 2001; J. E. King, 2008; Shults, 2001; Watts & Hammons, 2002; Weisman & Vaughn, 2007). This problem is exacerbated in CE units because the leadership pipeline is even smaller than it is in traditional academic units. Consequently, campus leadership may find it necessary to tap faculty members and administrators from traditional academic divisions to lead the CE unit. This approach has its advantages. For one, an established faculty member or academic administrator will have existing relationships with the departments and colleges with which (s)he will need to partner. These relationships could then be leveraged to develop new programs and generate buy-in for future CE initiatives. In addition, tapping a well-respected academic to lead the CE unit lends the division a degree of credibility and potentially mitigates some of the concerns, as detailed in this study, voiced by members of the academic core about CE programming. One downside to this approach is the significant learning curve someone without experience in the field of continuing education will face upon entering the position.

While hiring an established campus leader is a viable option, campus leadership should not rule out the option of recruiting a candidate who possesses experience within the field of continuing education. Given the need to interface effectively with constituents within the

97

university setting in addition to partners and industries in the external environment, the leader of

a CE unit must develop a wide range of competencies (Dufour & Queeney, 2004; Garrison,

2001; Wisniewski, 1999). In their study of continuing education administrators, Dufour and

Queeney (2004) identified the following areas of practice for professionals in the field: budget

planning and development; institutional, community and professional service;

conference/program/course delivery; continuing education administration; external marketing;

faculty recruitment, retention, and development; individual career/personal development; internal

marketing; leadership; program development; research; and technology management. A seasoned

continuing education administrator will have had opportunities to hone these necessary skills

through prior experience. This prior knowledge and experience enables the continuing education

practitioner to hit the ground running, thus relieving campus administration of the need to train

and micromanage the new hire.

Regardless of their approach to recruitment, campus leadership must have an

understanding of the type of leader required for the position. As this study has attempted to

demonstrate, the CE unit possesses characteristics that make it unique from traditional academic

divisions on campus. Accordingly, the individual chosen for this position must possess the

competencies and characteristics required for this role. Moroney's (2007) Continuing Education

Leadership Matrix provides a useful model for conceptualizing the requirements of CE

leadership. The model defines four archetypes that detail the areas of expertise involved:

- **The Academic** is characterized by an interest and expertise in the subject matter, undertakes research and writing, provides instruction, develops program content, oversees the curriculum and academic standards, and offers academic counseling.
- **The Entrepreneur** is characterized by an interest and expertise in developing and promoting products for the marketplace, proposes program concepts, determines market suitability, generates revenue, develops communications strategies, and runs promotional campaigns.

98

- **The Administrator** is characterized by an interest and expertise in developing and maintaining systems and workflow processes to support the delivery of programs, implements policies and procedures, streamlines information flow, and maintains cost controls.
- **The Adult Educator** is characterized by an interest and expertise in the process of teaching and learning for adults, structures the curriculum to optimize learning, works with instructors to improve teaching, builds linkages with external communities, and focuses on the quality of the learning experience (pp. 69-70).

The strength of this conceptual framework lies in its explication of the diversity of skills necessary for effective leadership in continuing education. While these archetypes do not cover every capacity required of the leader, they can provide campus leadership with an essential orientation to the enterprise of continuing education and a blueprint for selecting a qualified leader for the CE unit.

Recommendation #5: Leverage the Unique Processes and Values of the Campus CE Unit to Anticipate and Respond to Disruptive Forces.

As previously discussed, higher education is facing unprecedented disruptive forces that threaten its future. According to Christensen (2011), one way to anticipate and respond to disruptive forces is by creating a spin off organization with its own processes and values. The findings of this study suggest that CE units can function in this capacity.

CE units provide an example of how an academic organization can be responsive to the needs of students and the changing external environment. Because they rely on student enrollments rather than state funding for their survival, CE units must develop and deliver educational programming that participants within the community value. Consequently, CE units find it necessary to anticipate and respond to changes in the external environment, be it labor market trends or changing technology. In addition, those CE units that operate within an institution of higher education must also abide by the curricular and academic governance

structures of their parent organization. CE units are a distinctive hybrid of a market-driven business and an academic institution. The organization that results from this dialectic presents a unique opportunity for the academic core to gain intelligence on developments in the higher education marketplace and, thereby, identify and respond to disruptive forces. In this framework, the parent university can leverage not just the revenue but also the knowledge and experience generated by the CE unit. To navigate disruptive innovation within higher education, the university can deploy Extension as a spin-off organization, chartered with responsibility for exploring new audiences, gathering intelligence on trends and the practices of competitors within the market, not just peers from similar institutions but also the for-profits, which are attractive alternatives for potential students. As costs rise these institutions, according to DeMillo (2011) and Christensen and Eyring (2011), present a compelling value proposition: convenience, accelerated programs, attentive student services, more practical, professional curriculum.

Nevertheless, the university cannot simply spin-off the CE unit and believe that its job is done. Rather, it must be willing to learn from the CE unit's successes and failures. As state budgets fail to keep up with enrollments, public universities find themselves scrambling to find new sources of revenue, and CE units provide a convenient target. As a result, the CE unit has to contend with the campus perception that its role is primarily one of revenue generation in support of the main campus. The parent organization must look to the CE unit not only as a source for additional revenue but also as a source of learning.

Higher education is experiencing a time of unprecedented disruption. Growing public dissatisfaction, declining state and federal funding, increased state and federal regulation, and technological innovations threaten the academic core. Up until now many within higher education have considered the academy immune to external forces of change. No doubt Sears

Roebuck and Eastman Kodak felt this same sense of invincibility. Sadly, history is replete with examples of once thriving organizations that failed to respond to changes in their environment. The academic core has a choice to make. Continue along its present course and let external forces shape its future. Or engage these external forces, leveraging the university's intellectual vibrancy and internal capacities for innovation. This study found that CE units play an important role in assisting the university in this effort.

Directions for Further Research

Limitations of the Study

This work provides a rich case study of the practices of one CE unit within a university setting. Certain factors, however, limit the generalizability of the findings. First, the research design called for a single site case study. By focusing the research at one site, I was able to obtain a rich body of data. Nevertheless, these data are best understood within the context in which they were generated. The relationship that exists between Extension and the main campus at CSUSM is a result of the unique history and organizational culture of this specific institution. While certain elements of this relationship will be common across institutions, readers should exercise caution when attempting to generalize these findings to other contexts.

Second, the interview protocol introduced certain limitations into the study. To get a sense of faculty perceptions of Extension, all interviewees were asked the question "To what extent do you believe the faculty understand/value the role and contributions of extended education?" While the responses obtained from this question provided many useful and interesting insights, these data were, in some instances, indirect measurements of faculty perceptions. For example, the individuals I interviewed, who were not members of the faculty,

could only provide their observations or opinions on faculty perceptions of Extension. Even when the respondents were faculty members themselves, their assertions about other faculty were not direct measurements of the phenomenon in question.

Directions for Future Research

Future research could build on the results of this study by utilizing alternate research methods. A multiple site case study employing a cross-case analysis could provide at least two significant benefits. First, this approach might yield an even more robust collection of CE best practices. A study comprised of a diverse sampling of CE units, each responding to the needs of its unique context, has the potential to generate a more complete picture of current practice. Second, a cross-case analysis would contribute to the generalizability of the findings. The exploration of patterns and themes from site to site would define those practices and perceptions that are a function of an organization's particular context and those that are common across settings.

Another approach, which could extend the findings of this study, is a mixed methods design. In addition to the qualitative data generated in the present study, a mixed methods study harnessing survey data could provide a more comprehensive picture. Questions addressed directly to faculty, administrators, staff, students, and even industry partners would not only help quantify the opinions of these constituent groups but would also provide a means for triangulating the data derived from the in-depth interviews.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Interview Roster

Last_name	First_name	Affiliation	Job/Function	Interview Date
Armstrong	Morgan	Academic Core	College Dean	5/16/2013
Aziz	Francis	Academic Core	College Dean	5/16/2013
Brindle	Richard	Academic Core	Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs	4/4/2013
Cardenas	Tony	Extension	Director, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Carter	Jessie	Academic Core	Provost	7/1/2013
Chang	Mark	Academic Core	Director, Academic Program	3/22/2013
Clark	Leslie	Extension	Director, Operations	3/22/2013
Cooper	Robin	Academic Core	College Dean	4/4/2013
Cruz	Dana	Extension	Coordinator, Student Services	3/22/2013
Elliot	Karen	Extension	Director, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Lee	Terry	Extension	Director, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Martinez	Lisa	Extension	Coordinator, Human Resources	3/22/2013
Masters	Kelly	Academic Core	College Associate Dean	5/16/2013
Matthews	Jamie	Academic Core	College Associate Dean	6/5/2013
Michaels	Lee	Academic Core	Director, Academic Program	4/4/2013
Montoya	Robert	Academic Core	Director, Academic Program	4/5/2013
O'Connor	Regan	Extension	Director, Human Resources	3/22/2013
Silberman	Alex	Academic Core	College Dean	5/16/2013
Simpson	Cliff	Extension	Coordinator, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Singh	Tim	Academic Core	Director, Enrollment Services	4/4/2013
Spencer	Shaun	Academic Core	Associate Director, Academic Program	4/4/2013
Stevenson	Cary	Extension	Director, Facilities	3/22/2013
Tran	Kim	Academic Core	Department Chair	4/5/2013
Wada	Henry	Extension	Coordinator, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Walker	Pat	Extension	Director, Extension Program	3/21/2013
Weiss	Ellen	Extension	Dean of Extension	6/14/2013

Appendix B: Interview Protocols

Interview Protocol for Participants from the Academic Core

1. Briefly describe your role at the university
2. Briefly describe your involvement with Extension.
3. Have you ever partnered with Extension? If yes, how was your experience? If no, what prevented you
4. How well-integrated is Extension with the rest of the university?
5. To what extent does the faculty understand/value the role and contributions of Extension?
6. To what extent does the university leadership understand/value the role and contributions of Extension?
7. An attempt is being made on campus to integrate the work of Extension into the work of the university as a whole. What concerns have you heard faculty or others in the university voice about Extension? What specific objections do people on campus have about working with Extension?
8. In my conversations with Extension stakeholders they listed the following practices as instrumental in their success. How could the practices of Extension be adapted to work for you and your division?
9. What benefit, if any, do you see in working with Extension?
10. If you were Dean of Extension what changes, if any, would you make?

Interview Protocol for Participants from Extension

1. Briefly describe your role in the college?
2. Please name some recent successes the college has experienced.
3. In your opinion, what does success look like for the college? What evidence would you point to illustrate that success?
4. Think of a few of the successful programs within the college. What practices have made them successful?
5. What role do the following factors play in the success of the college?
    a. The relationship between Extension leadership and campus leadership
    b. Effective management (effective advertising/marketing, appropriate pricing/budgeting, effective administration/management)
    c. Instructor/instruction-related dynamics (effective instructor skills/personality, appropriate selection of instructors, good instructional design)
    d. Student support services (registration services, advising, financial aid, career services, etc.)
    e. Partnerships with the academic colleges and departments
    f. Partnerships with off-campus public/private organizations
6. What do you see as the chief barriers to your college's growth and success? Consider both campus-related barriers as well as obstacles in the external environment.
7. To what extent do you believe the university leadership understand/value the role and contributions of Extension? What evidence/examples can you point to?
8. To what extent do you believe the faculty understand/value the role and contributions of Extension? What evidence/examples can you point to?
9. Is there anything that came up or occurred to you during this interview that you did not get a chance to share? Any final thoughts that you would like to add?

Appendix C: Interview Protocol Matrix

Research Question	Interview Question	Audience	Reference
1. How do directors of CE units and their staff define success for their organization?	Please name some recent successes the college has experienced.	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991)
1. How do directors of CE units and their staff define success for their organization?	In your opinion, what does success look like for the college? What evidence would you point to illustrate that success?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	Think of a few of the successful programs within the college. What practices have made them successful?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991)
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	How well-integrated is Extension with the rest of the university.	Extension/ Academic Core	Pearce (1992) Snider (1987)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role do partnerships with the academic colleges and departments play in the college's success?	Extension	Pearce (1992) Snider (1987)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role do partnerships with off-campus partners play in the college's success?	Extension	(Shaffer, 1992) (McGaughey, 1992) (Shannon & Wang, 2010)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role does the relationship between Extension leadership and campus leadership play in the college's success?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991) (Snider, 1987)

2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role has effective management played in the college's success (effective advertising/marketing, appropriate pricing/budgeting, effective administration/management)?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991) (Snider, 1987)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role have instructor/instruction-related factors played in the college's success (effective instructor skills/personality, appropriate selection of instructors, good instructional design)?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What role do student support services play in the college's success (registration services, advising, financial aid, career services, etc.)?	Extension	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991) (Snider, 1987)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success?	What do you see as the chief barriers to your college's growth and success? Consider both campus-related barriers as well as barriers in the external environment.	Extension	(Pearce, 1992)
2. What do directors of CE units and their staff identify as key practices to their division's success? As the barriers to their success? 3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	To what extent does the university leadership understand/value the role and contributions of Extension?	Extension	Pearce (1992) Snider (1987)
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	To what extent does the faculty value the role and contributions of Extension?	Extension/ Academic Core	(Pearce, 1992) (Snider, 1987)

3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	Have you ever partnered with Extension? If yes, how was your experience? If no, what prevented you?	Academic Core	(Pearce, 1992) (Snider, 1987)
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	An attempt is being made on campus to integrate Extension into the work of the university as a whole. What concerns have you heard faculty or others in the university voice about Extension?	Academic Core	
4. Do they think that practices employed in the CE unit could be adapted to work for them? If so, how?	In my conversations with Extension stakeholders they listed the following practices as instrumental in their success. How could the practices of Extension be adapted to work for you and your division?	Academic Core	(Lewis & Dunlop, 1991)
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates?	What benefit, if any, do you see in working with Extension?	Academic Core	
3. To what extent do members of the academic core see value for them in how the CE unit operates? 4. Do they think that practices employed in the CE unit could be adapted to work for them? If so, how?	If you were Dean of Extension what changes, if any, would you make?	Academic Core	

Appendix D: Data Analysis Coding Scheme

Integration	Practices	Success	Understand-CE	Value-for-them
academics	barriers-external	community impact	admin	adapt
incentives	barriers-external-university	enrollments	Chancellor's Office	capacity
satellite-campus	barriers-fiscal	financial-support university	faculty	Extension-personnel
partner	barriers-internal	instruction	incentives	CE-services
mission	barriers-internal-communication	leadership	suspicion	community impact
serve-community-not-campus	barriers-internal-leadership	location	Univ-leadership	constraints
negative	barriers-internal-morale	longevity		customize
	barriers-internal-resources	meet-needs		downtown-campus
	barriers-internal-staffing	multimedia		entrepreneurial
	business orientation	parent success		flexibility
	evaluation	placement		hiring-faculty
	faculty	quality		incompetent
	flexibility	recognition		inefficiency
	hands-on skills	referrals		mission
	instruction	relationship-main campus		negative
	location	return-customers		new audiences
	management	revenue		Oakland-campus
	marketing	staff		partner
	partnerships-campus	students		reputation
	partnerships-industry	systems		revenue

Integration	Practices	Success	Understand-CE	Value-for-them
	partnerships-international			student-success
	pricing			task force report
	relationship-main campus			Univ-leadership
	relevant-curriculum			Univ-mission
	responsiveness			
	student services			
	technology			

REFERENCES

Adelman, C. (1998). *Answers in the toolbox*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

Allen, E. I., & Seaman, J. (2013). *Changing course: Ten years of tracking online education in the United States*. Newburyport, MA: Sloan Consortium. Retrieved from http://search.proquest.com/eric/docview/1361827932/13FBD0D5EBD76F010FC/1?acco untid=14512

Archer, W., Anderson, T., & Garrison, R. (1999). Adopting disruptive technologies in traditional universities: Continuing education as an incubator for innovation. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *25*(1), 13–30.

Aud, S., Hussar, W., Kena, G., Bianco, K., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., & Tahan, K. (2011). The condition of education 2011. *National Center for Education Statistics*. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED520001

Bash, L. (2003). What serving adult learners can teach us: The entrepreneurial response. *Change*, *35*(1), 32–37.

Baum, S., & Payea, K. (2011). Trends in for-profit postsecondary education: Enrollment, prices, student aid and outcomes. *Retrieved from College Board Advocacy & Policy Center at http://advocacy. collegeboard. org/sites/default/files/11b_3376_Trends_Brief_4Pass _110414. pdf*. Retrieved from https://trends.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/trends-2011-for-profit-postsecondary-ed-outcomes-brief.pdf

Beder, H. (1984). *Realizing the potential of interorganizational cooperation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Berg, G. A. (2005). *Lessons from the edge: For-profit and nontraditional higher education in America*. Westport, CT: Praeger.

Bogaty, E. (2013). *US higher education outlook negative in 2013*. New York: Moody's Investor

    Service. Retrieved from https://www.moodys.com/research/Moodys-2013-outlook-for-

    entire-US-Higher-Education-sector-changed--PR_263866

Borden, V. M. H. (2004). Accommodating student swirl: When traditional students are no longer

    the tradition. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *36*(2), 10–17.

Bowen, H. R. (1997). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American*

    higher education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Breneman, D. W., Pusser, B., & Turner, S. E. (2006). *Earnings from learning: The rise of for-*

    profit universities. Albany: SUNY Press.

Brown, J. N. (1995). *The knowledge connection: The role of colleges and universities in*

    workforce development. Washington, D.C.: National University Continuing Education

    Association. Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED

    446544

Browning, O. (1887). The University Extension movement at Cambridge. *Science*, *9*, 61–63.

    doi:10.1126/science.ns-9.207S.61

California Faculty Association. (2012). *For-profit higher education and the CSU: A cautionary*

    tale. Sacramento. Retrieved from http://www.calfac.org/forprofitcsu

Carnevale, A. (1991). *America and the new economy*. Alexandria, VA: American Society of

    Training and Development. Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED

    333246

Carnevale, A., & Desrochers, D. (2001). *Help wanted...Credentials required: Community colleges in the knowledge economy*. Annapolis Junction: Community College Press. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED451832

Choy, S. (2002). *Nontraditional undergraduates*. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2002012

Christensen, C. M. (2011). *The innovator's dilemma*. New York: Harper Business.

Christensen, C. M., & Eyring, H. J. (2011). *The innovative university: Changing the DNA of higher education from the inside out*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, R. L., & Hammond, P. B. (2001). *To retire or not? Retirement policy and practice in higher education*. Philadelphia: Univ of Pennsylvania Press. Retrieved from http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=e84xvHekwa4C&oi=fnd&pg=PP13&dq=To+Retire+or+Not+hammond&ots=TdhtI0eNy7&sig=30CDQcazWrA01QYgZtsIMfYuLls

Creswell, J. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

DeMillo, R. A. (2011). *Abelard to Apple: The fate of American colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Diamond, L. (2013, January 8). Historic vote merges eight Georgia colleges into four. *Atlanta Journal Constitution*. Retrieved from http://www.ajc.com/news/news/local/regents-give-final-ok-to-merge-georgia-colleges/nTqH4/

Donaldson, J. F. (1991). New opportunities or a new marginality: Strategic issues in continuing higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *55*(3), 120–28.

Doyle, W. (2010, December 3). *The politics of higher education reform*. Working Paper, Stanford University. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/dept/cepa/DoyleWilliamR.pdf

Dufour, C. P., & Queeney, D. S. (2004). Areas of practice, responsibilities, and tasks of continuing higher education: A practice description for the field. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *52*(2), 2–12. doi:10.1080/07377366.2004.10400280

Eagan, M. K., & Jaeger, A. J. (2008). Closing the gate: Part-time faculty instruction in gatekeeper courses and first-year persistence. *New Directions for Teaching and Learning*, *2008*(115), 39–53. doi:10.1002/tl.324

Edelson, P. J. (1995). Historical and cultural perspectives on centralization/decentralization in continuing education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *59*(3), 143–56.

Elden, M., & Chisholm, R. F. (1993). Emerging varieties of action research: Introduction to the special issue. *Human Relations*, *46*(2), 121–142. doi:10.1177/001872679304600201

Finder, A. (2007, November 20). Decline of the tenure track raises concerns. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2007/11/20/education/20adjunct.html

Fletcher, F. (2008). Community-university partnerships: Community engagement for transformative learning. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *34*(2), 31–45.

Friedman, T. L. (2007). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Macmillan.

Garrison, R. (2001). Leadership in continuing studies: The reflections of a dean. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *27*(1), 79–99.

Gessner, Q. (1987). An overview of continuing higher education. In Q Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on continuing higher education* (pp. 1–11). New York: Macmillan.

Greenwood, D. J. (2007). Teaching/learning action research requires fundamental reforms in public higher education. *Action Research*, *5*(3), 249–264. doi:10.1177/1476750307081016

Gumport, P. J. (2001). Built to serve: The enduring legacy of public higher education. In P. Altbach, P. Gumport, & B. Johnstone (Eds.), *In defense of American higher education* (pp. 85–109). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Hecker, D. E. (2005). Occupational employment projections to 2014. *Monthly Labor Review*, *128*, 70.

Hein, L. I. (1992). *The purposes of university continuing education: The perspectives and learnings of continuing education deans and directors* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. NN78835)

Horn, L., & Lew, S. (2007). *California community college transfer rates: Who is counted makes a difference*. Berkeley, CA: MPR Associates, Inc. Retrieved from http://www.mprinc.com/products/pdf/horn_ccc.pdf

ICF International. (2010). *Working for California: The impact of the California State University System*. San Francisco: ICF International. Retrieved from http://www.calstate.edu/impact/docs/CSUImpactsReport.pdf

Jones, D., & Kelly, P. (2007). *Mounting pressures facing the U.S. workforce and the increasing need for adult education and literacy*. New York: National Commission on Adult Literacy. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED 506595

Kasworm, C., Sandmann, L., & Sissel, P. (2000). Adult learners in higher education. In A. L. Wilson & E. Hayes (Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kazis, R., Callahan, A., Davidson, C., McLeod, A., Bosworth, B., Choitz, V., & Hoops, J. (2007). *Adult learners in higher education: Barriers to success and strategies to improve results*. Washington, D.C.: Department of Labor. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED 497801

Kelly, A. P. (2011, September 6). How for-profit colleges can save themselves—and higher education. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved November 23, 2011, from http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2011/09/how-for-profit-colleges-can-save-themselves-and-higher-education/244595/

Kiley, K. (2013, July 2). UC business schools see different levels of resistance to innovation plans. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved September 11, 2013, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/07/02/uc-business-schools-see-different-levels-resistance-innovation-plans

King, B. K., & Lerner, A. W. (1987). Organizational Structure and Performance Dynamics in

      Continuing Education Administration. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *51*(3), 21–

      38.

King, J. E. (2008). *Too many rungs on the ladder: Faculty demographics and the future*

      leadership of higher education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

      Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/IssueBrief-2008-Too-

      Many-Rungs-On-The-Ladder.pdf

Kirsch, I. S., Braun, H. I., Yamamoto, K., & Sum, A. (2007). *America's perfect storm: Three*

      forces changing our nation's future. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Knapp, L. G., Kelly-Reid, J. E., & Ginder, S. A. (2008). *Enrollment in postsecondary*

      institutions, fall 2011; financial statistics, fiscal year 2011; and graduation rates,

      selected cohorts, 2003-2008. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics.

      U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

      http://eric.ed.gov/?q=Enrollment+in+Postsecondary+Institutions&id=ED537749

Knowles, M. S. (1980). *The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy*.

      Chicago: Follett Publishing Company.

Kohl, K. J. (2010). Coping with change and fostering innovation: An agenda for professional and

      continuing education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *74*, 9–22.

Lazerson, M. (1998). The disappointments of success: Higher education after World War II.

      Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, *559*, 64–76.

Levine, A., & Cureton, J. S. (1998). *When hope and fear collide: A portrait of today's college*

      student. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewis, C. H., & Dunlop, C. C. (1991). Successful and unsuccessful adult education programs: Perceptions, explanations, and implications. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, (49), 15–28.

Light, M. (2011, June 30). Sandersville, Heart of Georgia Technical Colleges become Oconee Fall Line Technical College on July 1. *TCSG Press Releases*. Retrieved August 23, 2013, from https://tcsg.edu/press_detail.php?press_id=211

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Loch, J. R. (2003). In my opinion: Cracks in continuing education's mirror and a fix to correct its distorted internal and external image. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *51*(3), 41–44. doi:10.1080/07377366.2003.10400264

Lohmann, S. (2005). Darwinian medicine for the university. In R. Ehrenberg (Ed.), *Governing Academia*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Maxwell, J. A. (2005). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

McGaughey, J. L. (1992). Symbolic leadership: Redefining relations with the host organization. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *1994*(56), 39–50. doi:10.1002/ace.36719945606

Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Morey, A. I. (2004). Globalization and the emergence of for-profit higher education. *Higher Education*, *48*(1), 131–150.

Moroney, P. (2007). Continuing education leadership matrix: A model for practitioners in higher education. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *33*(1), 61–82.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Non-traditional graduates*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/2002menu_tables.asp

National University Continuing Education Association. (1990). *Expanding access to knowledge: Continuing higher education.* Washington D.C.: National University Continuing Education Association.

Norman, T. L. (2006). *An academic and industry partnership: A case study of the evolving role of continuing education at the University of Minnesota* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses. (Order No. 3235387)

Nunley, C. R. (2007, October 26). Community colleges may be losing their edge in educating adults. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.com/article/Community-Colleges-May-Be/32728

Pappano, L. (2012, November 2). Massive open online courses are multiplying at a rapid pace. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

119

Pearce, S. D. (1992). Survival of continuing higher education: Deans' perceptions of external

    threats. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *40*(2), 2–7.

    doi:10.1080/07377366.1992.10400841

Petersen, N. (2001). Aligning continuing education units and universities: Survival strategies for

    the new millennium. *Canadian Journal of University Continuing Education*, *27*(1), 29–

    60.

Prisk, D. P. (1987). Organizational models and elements of an effective organization. In Q

    Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on continuing higher education* (pp. 67–82). New York:

    Macmillan.

Pusser, B., Breneman, D. W., Gansneder, B. M., Kohl, K. J., Levin, J. S., Milam, J. H., &

    Turner, S. E. (2007). *Returning to learning: Adults' success in college is key to America's*

    future. Indianapolis, IN: Lumina Foundation. Retrieved from

    http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED

    496188

Rachal, J. (1989). The social context of adult and continuing education. In S. Merriam & P.

    Cunningham (Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education* (pp. 3–14). San

    Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Rivera, C. (2012, March 22). Students hurt by disinvestment in higher ed, hancellor says. *Los*

    Angeles Times. Retrieved April 11, 2012, from

    http://latimesblogs.latimes.com/lanow/2012/03/students-hurt-by-states-disinvestment-in-

    higher-ed-chancellor-says.html

Rohfeld, R. W. (1996). Access and the search for academic respectability in continuing higher

    education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, *60*(1), 54–66.

Salner, M. (1988). *Continuing education in the California State University: A history*. Long

      Beach, CA: The California State University System.

Sandeen, C. A., & Hutchinson, S. (2010). Putting creativity and innovation to work: Continuing

      higher education's role in shifting the educational paradigm. *Continuing Higher*

      Education Review, *74*, 81–92.

Scott, J. C. (2006). The mission of the university: Medieval to postmodern transformations. *The*

      Journal of Higher Education, *77*(1), 1–39.

Seaman, J. (2009). *Online learning as a strategic asset. Volume II: The paradox of faculty*

      voices: Views and experiences with online learning. Washington, DC: Association of

      Public and Land-Grant Universities. Retrieved from

      http://search.proquest.com/eric/docview/864942179/13FBCD17893CD98749/1?accounti

      d=14512

Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education*

      and the social sciences. New York: Teachers College Press.

Sengupta, R., & Jepsen, C. (2006). *California's community college students*. San Francisco:

      Public Policy Institute of California.

Shaffer, T. E. (1992). Continuing higher education organizational learning. *The Journal of*

      Continuing Higher Education, *40*(3), 23–40. doi:10.1080/07377366.1992.10400853

Shannon, J., & Schoenfeld, C. A. (1965). Evaluating university general extension. *Adult*

      Education Quarterly, *16*(1), 34 –36. doi:10.1177/074171366501600106

Shannon, J., & Wang, T. (2010). A model for university–community engagement: Continuing

      education's role as convener. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*, *58*, 108–112.

      doi:10.1080/07377361003661499

Shulock, N., & Moore, C. (2007). *Rules of the game: How state policy creates barriers to degree completion and impedes student success in the California community colleges*. Sacramento, CA: California State University Sacramento, Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy.

Shults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. Washington, DC: Community College Press. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED 451833

Sissel, P. A., Hansman, C. A., & Kasworm, C. E. (2001). The politics of neglect: Adult learners in higher education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*, *2001*(91), 17–28. doi:10.1002/ace.27

Slack, M. (2013, August 20). President Obama: A personal mission. *The White House Blog*. Retrieved August 24, 2013, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2013/08/20/president-obama-personal-mission

Snider, J. C. (1987). Components of successful continuing higher education programs. In Q Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on continuing higher education* (pp. 51–65). New York: Macmillan.

Soares, L. (2013). Post-traditional learners and the transformation of postsecondary education: A manifesto for college leaders. *American Council on Education*. Retrieved from http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Soares-Post-Traditional-v5-011813.pdf

Spellings, M. (2006). *A test of leadership: Charting the future of U.S. higher education. A report of the commission appointed by Secretary of Education Margaret Spelling*. Washington,

D.C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from

http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/index.html

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Strawn, J. (2007). *Policies to promote adult education and postsecondary alignment*. New York:

National Commission on Adult Literacy. Retrieved from

http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED

506594

Stringer, E. T. (2007). *Action research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Stubblefield, H. W., & Keane, P. (1989). The history of adult and continuing education. In S.

Merriam & P. Cunningham (Eds.), *Handbook of adult and continuing education* (pp. 26–

36). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

The American Society for the Extension of University Teaching. (1898). *Concerning university*

extension: It significance, method and results. Philadelphia. Retrieved from

http://www.archive.org/details/concerninguniver00amer

The California State University. (2003). Commission on the extended university. Retrieved

January 18, 2012, from http://www.gateway.calstate.edu/ceu/strategic_docs.htm

The California State University. (2010a). Statistical abstracts. *CSU Analytic Studies*. Retrieved

January 28, 2012, from http://www.calstate.edu/as/stat_abstract/stat0910/index.shtml

The California State University. (2010b, May 5). Special Sessions: Executive Order No. 1047.

Executive Orders. Retrieved from http://www.calstate.edu/eo/EO-1047.html

The California State University. (2012a). Measuring the value of a CSU education. *Systemwide*

information: The CSU's value to students. Retrieved September 25, 2012, from

http://www.calstate.edu/value/systemwide/

The California State University. (2012b). Statistical abstracts. *CSU Analytic Studies*. Retrieved

January 28, 2012, from http://www.calstate.edu/AS/

The California State University. (n.d.). Historical fee perspective. *Public Affairs, CSU*. Retrieved

January 28, 2012, from http://www.calstate.edu/PA/info/fees-historical-perspective.shtml

The Morrill Act of 1862. , Pub. L. No. 7 U.S.C. 301 et seq. (1862).

The White House, Office of the Press Secretary. (2013, August 22). Fact sheet on the President's

plan to make college more affordable: A better bargain for the middle class. Retrieved

August 24, 2013, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/08/22/fact-

sheet-president-s-plan-make-college-more-affordable-better-bargain-

University of California, Office of the President. (n.d.). Self-supporting programs. *Academic

Planning, Programs and Coordination*. Retrieved September 10, 2013, from

http://www.ucop.edu/academic-planning-programs-coordination/academic-

planning/planning-policies-and-other-activities/self-supporting-programs.html

Unknown. (1891, April 11). A misapprehension. *Harper's Weekly*, *35*(1790), 259.

Vaughan, G. B. (2006). *The community college story*. Washington, D.C.: American Association

of Community Colleges.

Vicere, A. A. (1985). Creating order from the chaos: Academic integrity in continuing

professional education. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *35*(4), 229 –239.

doi:10.1177/0001848185035004005

Watts, G. E., & Hammons, J. O. (2002). Leadership development for the next generation. *New

Directions for Community Colleges*, *120*, 59–66. doi:10.1002/cc.90

Weisman, I. M., & Vaughn, G. B. (2007). *The community college presidency 2006*. Washington,

DC: Community College Press.

Wilms, W. W., & Zell, D. M. (2002). *Awakening the academy: A time for new leadership.*

    Bolton, MA: Anker Publishing Company, Inc.

Wisniewski, M. A. (1999). Leadership competencies in continuing higher education:

    Implications for leadership education. *The Journal of Continuing Higher Education*,

    47(1), 14–23. doi:10.1080/07377366.1999.10400361

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage

    Publications.