1-1-2008

Intra -institutional collaborations: Academic and continuing education departments on campus

Amy Lynn Hyams
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI®

INTRA-INSTITUTIONAL COLLABORATIONS:

ACADEMIC AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

DEPARTMENTS ON CAMPUS

by

Amy L. Hyams

Bachelor of Arts
University of California at Santa Barbara
1990

Masters of Science
University of Nevada Las Vegas
1994

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education
Department of Education Leadership
College of Education

Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas
December 2000

UNLV

Dissertation Approval

The Graduate College
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

November 2, , 2000

The Dissertation prepared by

Amy L. Hyams

Entitled

Intra-Institutional Collaborations: Academic and Continuing Education Departments on Campus

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

Dale L. Andersen
Examination Committee Chair

Dean of the Graduate College

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Examination Committee Member

Graduate College Faculty Representative

PR/1017-52/1-00

ABSTRACT

Intra-institutional Collaborations: Academic and Continuing Education Departments on Campus

by

Amy L. Hyams

Dr. Dale Andersen, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Educational Leadership
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status and nature of intra-institutional collaborations between continuing education and academic departments at four-year, degree-granting institutions of higher education, and to identify factors that support or inhibit intra-institutional collaborations. A survey instrument was designed and distributed to 355 representatives of four-year, degree-granting institutions of the University Continuing Education Association (UCEA). Qualitative and quantitative data were collected. One hundred surveys were returned for a return rate of approximately 30%. Overall, the respondents described a relatively positive collaborative relationship with the academic departments on their respective campuses. The respondents recognized the benefits to collaborations including those to the institution, to the program, and to the field of continuing higher education. A variety of successful collaborations were identified, as well as the factors that contributed to their success. Factors that contributed to the success of intra-institutional collaborations

included faculty and staff involvement, organization policies, campus leadership, and the general level of awareness and value for the continuing education function. Recommendations for professionals included working within the field of continuing higher education to develop standards for practice and professional preparation; to work with the campus leaders, administrators, and faculty to communicate the benefits of intra-institutional collaboration; and to encourage participation and support. The report concluded with recommendations for future research to expand the knowledge of intra-institutional collaboration on university campuses.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Emerging Changes and Collaboration in Higher Education

Higher education is becoming increasingly diverse and complex, calling for innovations, creativity, and increased efficiency. This diversity extends not only to the demographics of the students and faculty but also to the dramatic increase in the variety of structures, configurations of curricula, delivery of institutional courses, programs, and institutional missions. Demographic reports reveal that students are from increasingly diverse cultural, generational, and socio-economic backgrounds (Levine and Cureton, 1998; Sorensen and Robinson, 1992; Twigg, 1992). These students arrive with a wide range of interests, motivations, responsibilities, education, and life experiences. In addition to the student population, there are changes in the compositions of faculties, staff, and leadership (Karabell, 1998). Challenges and opportunities accompany the changes and require professionals in higher education to rethink traditions and operations if they are to serve their communities and flourish.

The changing nature of higher education has generated a demand for new designs, approaches, and content in planning and delivering educational programs. Students are bringing with them a wide array of educational needs and expectations. Institutions of

higher education must respond to these emerging changes by developing new programs, services, and relationships to better assist and support students. Public dissatisfaction with the rising costs of higher education (Levine and Cureton, 1998) is compounding these pressures. The internal and external fiscal constraints and fluctuating economic factors result in the demand to do more for less and support the need for more efficiency and accountability. To compete for the decreasing public funds available for higher education, academic and service programs must rely on the exchange of resources (Sarason and Lorentz, 1998). This may further increase productivity and therefore the value of individual and organizational assets.

Educational institutions are familiar with the strategies of sharing resources and cooperative programming. Partnerships and consortia with external organizations are common approaches to expanding programs and improving efficiency in operations (Fingeret, 1984; Nowlen, 1988). Innovations in technology and distance education call for greater cooperation between departments and groups both on and off campus. Shared resources and cooperative endeavors have helped to facilitate interdisciplinary efforts and expand programs beyond traditional academic boundaries (Wiswell, 1990).

Continuing Higher Education and Collaboration

Continuing higher education units are often the institution's source of collaborative programs and partnerships with external organizations and industry. In fact, the mission of continuing higher education departments traditionally has been to provide various outreach programs to the campus and local community. Inherent in this mission is the need to work with various groups while remaining loyal and responsible to

the host organization as well as the connected residential and business community. Consequently, successful continuing education units often must engage in various inter- and intra-institutional collaborative activities.

McGaughey (1992) suggested that the continuing higher education unit may be better prepared than the host organization and academic departments for collaboration and innovation because its structures are often more flexible. This may include fewer rules for admissions, flexibility in finance and payment arrangements, and options for alternative scheduling and delivery. Continuing higher education departments are often self-supporting and revenue-generating; they are in a position to develop new programs quickly and efficiently, and can generate funding in times of cutbacks or recession (McGaughey, 1992). Most importantly, continuing higher education units support non-traditional students and programs, promoting the values and beliefs which foster lifelong learning, including "belief in the educational potential of learners, value in diversity, flexibility and respect for a variety of student goals and achievements, and a commitment to lifelong learning" (McGaughey, 1992, p. 42).

Statement of the Problem

Walshok (1999) suggested that in our information-based society, there is a need for more access to multidisciplinary and integrative knowledge. This poses a challenge to institutions of higher education, given the boundaries that traditionally separate the disciplines. Hence, there is a need to assess the level of intra-institutional collaborations, to identify approaches to permeating if not eliminating boundaries, and to foster more intra-institutional collaborations. This study responded to such a need and investigated

the collaborations between continuing education departments and academic units on university campuses. It also sought to identify the elements that contribute to successful collaborations on university campuses.

This study investigated the collaborative activities between continuing higher education departments and academic units at post-secondary institutions. Specifically, this exploratory investigation: 1) identified existing intra-institutional collaborations involving continuing higher education departments and academic units at degree-granting, higher education, organizational members of the University Continuing Education Association; 2) explored the nature and characteristics of these collaborations; 3) assessed continuing education professionals' satisfaction with the level of collaboration on their campus; and 4) identified factors essential to the success of the collaborations.

Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework that provided the foundation for this study was developed from theories, concepts, and principles pertaining to organizational behavior and collaborations. A cultural perspective provides further focus on the issues that may be unique to higher education organizations. Kuh and Whitt (1988) suggested studying an organization from a cultural perspective, which allows for consideration of the beliefs, assumptions, attitudes, and behaviors of individuals and groups in that organization. This is particularly relevant for this study, given that "large public, multi-purpose universities are comprised of many different groups that may or may not share or abide by all the institutional norms, values, beliefs, and meanings" (Kuh and Whit, 1988, p. 11).

Furthermore, the organization's cultures and relationships are influenced by a variety of internal and external dynamic forces, including social and economic factors, the organization's structure and history, individual department subculture, and individual factors, including leaders, administrators, and faculty members.

Kuh and Whitt (1988) argued that institutions of higher education have an overarching organizational culture as well as several separate sub-cultures. These sub-cultures usually reflect distinct academic disciplines and departments that coexist with others on most campuses. But if "the culture of the discipline is the primary source of faculty identity and expertise" (Kuh and Whitt, 1988, p. 77), conflict may result if inconsistencies arise between that sub-culture and the organizational culture, and if their goals are not compatible. Furthermore, the separate departments and disciplines may have sub-cultures that are conflicting rather than complementary.

While it may not be possible to develop a perfect model of collaboration, the literature identifies variables that appear to be related to collaborative relationships and integrated organizations. Specifically, this investigation explored the role of institutional leadership, organizational structure, and academic faculty in supporting or inhibiting collaborative intra-institutional relationships on university campuses. These variables are covered extensively in Chapter Two and contribute to the conceptual and theoretical framework that was used for this study.

Significance of the Study

This study explored and identified individual and organizational factors that may support and/or inhibit intra-institutional collaboration on university campuses. Particular

focus was given to the institutional leadership, organizational structure, and faculty and staff. This study may serve a theoretical purpose in the conceptual understanding of collaboration and practical purpose in the development of policies and procedures that contribute to successful intra-institutional collaboration on university campuses.

The continuing higher education department's relationship with its host organization has a significant effect on the department's and institution's mission, programs, resources, performance, and success in serving the internal and external community. McGaughey (1992) suggested that linkages established by continuing higher education departments can instigate and enhance collaborative relationships between the university academic units and the professionals and residents in the community it seeks to serve. Further, a well-functioning and responsive continuing higher education unit can enhance the reputation of the university. Conversely, a poorly functioning continuing education unit can be a detriment to the reputation, efforts, and financial status of the institution. Therefore, attending to the relationships between continuing higher education departments and academic units is especially important, since individual academic departments and faculty typically enjoy a considerable amount of autonomy and control, identifying and engaging in collaborative relationship and programs.

Long's (1990) delphi study investigated trends and developments affecting continuing higher education as identified by chief administrators in the field, and confirmed concerns of program quality, a diverse and rapidly changing student population, increased competition from outside corporate education providers, and a lack of research and development related to continuing higher education. Technological

advances are rapidly altering curriculum, program content, research, and costs associated with service to students. While the costs are increasing, institutions of higher education are receiving less financial assistance from federal and state government sources. The costs are likely to be shifted to the students at a time when more non-traditional students are returning to school, may have families to support, and are less likely to be eligible for traditional sources of financial aid. A more heterogeneous student population will undoubtedly have a more diverse educational history as well as more diverse needs and interests. Integrated, interdisciplinary programs may replace specialized, more liberal education, and will require more cooperation and collaborative relationships and programs.

These new methods of developing and delivering programs require a critical look at how current programs are run, and how individuals and groups work together to fulfill organizational goals and missions. Sarason and Lorentz (1998) suggested that a major source of organizational inefficiency is "flawed coordination and collaboration" (p. x). Therefore, fostering a positive and productive collaborative relationship is imperative, given the importance and the potential impact of the relationship between university academic departments and continuing higher education. This study provides a new perspective on organizational behavior by considering the current status of intra-institutional collaborations as well as variables that may contribute to their success. This information will be of use to researchers studying organizational behavior and higher education administration; administrators and leaders seeking innovative methods for improving organizational culture, efficiency, and quality; and faculty members who

desire to improve collegial relations, expand their personal and professional networks, and enhance the content and communication of their research and curriculum.

Finally, this investigation and its findings will provide the greatest benefit to the diverse student populations of today and tomorrow. More efficiency in fiscal operations could reduce the costs of education to the student. Collaborative and interdisciplinary studies will expand the students' conceptual and practical knowledge and understanding of the disciplines. Ultimately, the student will enjoy a more comprehensive and fulfilling educational experience that will encourage and enhance lifelong learning for personal and professional development.

Research Design

This exploratory, descriptive study utilized a survey design. The survey was distributed to professionals identified as organizational representatives of four-year, degree-granting, institutional members of the University and Continuing Education Association (UCEA). The responses were analyzed using both quantitative and qualitative approaches. A more detailed description of the research design and methodology is presented in Chapter Three.

Delimitations

This study's population was confined to professionals identified as representatives of organizational members of UCEA. Rather than include all organizational members, this study included representatives of four-year, degree-granting institutions of higher education.

Limitations

The study design, methodology, and analysis have several limitations that must be recognized. First, the study population was limited to professionals identified as representatives for organizational members of UCEA. Second, the study limited its exploration to the perceptions and responses of continuing education professionals. These professionals may have been assigned to both continuing education and academic departments, and all held primarily administrative rather than faculty positions. While professionals working exclusively in academic departments were consulted during the development of this study and instrumentation, the data collection did not extend to include those positioned solely in academic departments.

Potential limitations inherent to survey research that may affect the responses and data collected for the study include respondent memory changes or lapses over time, potential biases and inaccuracies due to personal beliefs and perceptions, and non-responses to specific questions. However, every attempt was made to minimize factors that may negatively affect the data and validity.

An additional limitation to this study is the researcher's personal biases in favor of intra-institutional collaborations, since the researcher is employed as a professional in continuing higher education. A variety of strategies suggested by Miles and Huberman (1984) were employed to help control for such bias. Specifically, the researcher remained open and aware of the potential for bias by assuming a "state of mind" and method of triangulation, whereby data is collected, double-checked, verified, shared with outsiders, and reported. These procedures are discussed more thoroughly in Chapter Three.

Assumptions

The following assumptions contributed to the foundation and direction of this study: 1) The survey instrument developed specifically for this investigation accurately solicited perceptions of continuing education professionals; 2) Individual perceptions influenced involvement in collaborative campus activities; 3) The professionals included in this study possessed the information needed to complete the survey instrument; 4) The professionals who completed the survey instrument had direct experience and/or accurate knowledge of campus collaborations as defined by the investigator.

Definition of Terms

The following terms included in this report and study are defined as follows:

Academic Departments: The academic department is the central link between the university and the discipline, between an organized body of knowledge and the institution (Trow, 1977). Academic disciplines refer to the different branches in academia that deal with the acquisition of knowledge such as the "study of English, math, science, art, music, and history" (Spafford, Pesce & Grosser, 1998, p. 2).

Collaboration and collaborative programs: These terms refer to an interdependent relationship and activities and efforts that result from the cooperative work with an individual or group. Spafford et al. (1998) defined "collaborate" more operationally as working together cooperatively toward a common objective or goal. A more comprehensive discussion and explanation of collaboration is presented in Chapter Two.

Continuing Higher Education: Continuing Higher Education refers to the unit so designated within a university which offers a variety of credit and non-credit classes and

activities outside of the regular programs and studies of the academic departments. Continuing higher education has also been referred to as "extended education" and "extension services" (Cabell, 1985, p. 16). These terms are used interchangeably in this study. While continuing education units may be present in various post-secondary academic institutions, this study distinguishes continuing higher education from other similar education and training activities offered through corporate or other non-educational institutions.

Host or Parent Organization: These two terms will be used interchangeably to refer to the university institution with which the continuing higher education department is affiliated.

Credit Classes, Non-Credit classes: This study refers to credit classes as those recognized by a traditional degree program or course of study and thus those that carry duly authorized credit upon completion. Non-credit classes will include courses, workshops, and other activities that are not recognized by a traditional academic degree program and thus do not carry duly authorized university credit upon completion. It is also important to note that while non-credit classes do not carry traditional academic credit, students can receive continuing education units (CEUs) recognized by various professional associations.

Intra-institutional Collaborations: Intra-institutional collaborations will refer to activities between different groups within the same institution. This differs from inter-institutional collaboration, which refers to activities between different groups associated with different institutions.

Summary

Colleges and universities must respond to the changing demands and needs of today's and tomorrow's learners. The static organization of the past must be replaced by a more dynamic and flexible institution. "The real issue lies in the capacity of individual campuses to recognize the fundamental changes required in the information age, to design effective roles for themselves within those change opportunities, and to innovate how they reach out to new and lifelong learners" (Rowley, Lujan, and Dolence, 1998, p. 25).

This study investigated the extent and nature of intra-institutional collaborations on university campuses. Specifically, this study was designed to assess the extent and nature of intra-institutional collaborations and explore the variables perceived to be essential to collaborations between continuing education and academic departments. It is intended that an increased awareness and understanding of the salient organizational variables will assist administrators in promoting and supporting collaboration. Ultimately, such collaborative efforts will improve the quality of campus and community relations and educational experiences for the students and faculty.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The changing nature of higher education has generated the need for new designs, approaches, and content in the planning and delivery of programs. Such innovations include not only technological advances in content and delivery, but extend to partnerships with various groups, including business and industry (Fingeret, 1984; Nowlen, 1988; Wiswell, 1990), libraries (Sisco and Whitson, 1990), museums (Chobot and Chobot, 1990), religious institutions (Beatty and Robbins, 1990), fraternal associations (Ferro, 1990), local community groups (Courtnay, 1990; Donaldson and Kozoll, 1999; Galbraith, 1990), and collaborations with other higher education institutions as well as K-12 organizations (Sarason and Lorentz, 1998). While it is evident that inter-organizational collaboration has become an increasingly effective and popular approach to doing business in higher education, there is less discussion and/or evidence of intra-institutional collaborative efforts.

This paucity of research on the status of intra-institutional collaboration is particularly evident with regard to institutions of higher education. Given that institutions of higher education are typically organized by discipline-based departments, intra-institutional collaboration would appear to be essential to achieve the organization's mission and goals. Unfortunately, little is known about the prevalence and nature of such

intra-institutional collaborations, and even less information is available to help guide professionals in such endeavors.

The review of the literature begins with a discussion of collaboration in general terms, including the benefits of such arrangements as well as salient organizational variables found to support or inhibit collaborative efforts. The review then narrowed its focus to discuss specific issues related to intra-institutional collaboration in higher education, with specific emphasis on the relationships between traditional academic credit units and continuing education units on university campuses.

Collaboration

Donaldson and Kozoll (1999) attempted to define collaboration and identify principles and strategies for success. One of their first guiding principles was that collaborations themselves are "organizations formed by boundary-spanning persons, or individuals who cross the boundaries of two or more organizations to create these new organizations" (p. 8). Consequently, these organizations have all of the elements of regular open social systems, including inputs, transformation processes, and outputs, as well as norms, values, roles, and boundaries (Katz and Kahn, 1966). In addition, collaboration as a type of organization is characterized by a dynamic environment influenced by its individuals, interpersonal relationships, and processes (Donaldson and Kozoll, 1999).

Collaborations have also been distinguished from other types of organizations and orientations. Donaldson and Kozoll (1999) claimed that collaboration organizations

"differ from conventional organizations because they have shorter life spans, employ unconventional kinds of governance, and rely on more informal mechanisms" (p. 3).

The vast amounts of literature on inter-organizational collaboration suggest that collaboration can take on many forms, vary in intensity, and be classified on a continuum based upon the extent of interdependence and formality (Cervero, 1984; Sarason and Lorentz, 1998). Cervero (1988) compared six different variations of inter-agency relationships including: monopoly, single provider; parallelism, whereby different providers offer the same program; competition, with different organizations not necessarily working together but pursuing a similar goal; cooperation, whereby providers assist each other as needed; coordination, when the activities of one organization consider the activities of another; and collaboration, incorporating interdependent strategies and working together toward a common goal.

Apps (1990) identified three forms of inter-organizational relationships as cooperation, coordination, and collaboration, and argued that collaboration involved the highest level of intensity and interdependence. Donaldson and Kozoll (1999) agreed with this distinction and added that collaboration extends beyond the specific program or activity and includes the planning and evaluation processes. Furthermore, the participants and their organizations assume joint responsibility over decisions, and the strength of the collaboration is in the differences between the individuals and organizations participating in the collaboration (Gray, 1985).

Collaboration has also been defined operationally as an activity. A collaborative activity or the act of collaborating implies crossing organizational boundaries to work with others toward a common objective or goal (Spafford et al., 1998). Hohmann (1985)

suggested that two or more groups decide to collaborate "to combine their resources to meet specific educational goals over a period of time" (p. 75). Furthermore, collaboration is not a rational process with sequential and clearly defined steps, but more of a complex political process (Hohmann, 1985). As previously suggested, the group formed to engage in collaboration jointly determines the direction, actions, and status of the collaborative activity. Each is equally invested and responsible for the actions, decisions, and consequences (Donaldson and Kozoll, 1999).

Steward (1997) used metaphors to describe collaborations and affirmed that collaboration was not a final product but an ongoing, self-generating, self-organizing process. The collaboration process values individual differences and requires time for participants to evolve, change, and build trust and commitment. She metaphorically described a collaboration as a "troupe of travelers" suggesting a journey and adventure; a "sea anemone" indicating an adaptive organism that changes and is changed by its environment; the "round table" whereby every participant has an equal voice; a "web" symbolizing interconnectedness; a "quilt" or "jazz ensemble" in which each individual segment has its own part and importance but together make an integrated and harmonious whole; and a "catalyst" suggesting the relationship of collaboration to transformation and change (p. 33).

Robertson (1998) provided a comprehensive discussion of collaboration, incorporating many of these different perspectives. In general terms, he defined collaboration as "the process through which two or more actors intentionally work together to accomplish a specified objective" (Robertson, 1998, p. 68). Robertson (1998) also suggested that collaboration is "not a dichotomous phenomenon" (p. 69) but is,

instead, one in which an organization and/or individual can choose to collaborate on specific programs with particular individuals at varying levels of intensity.

Benefits of Collaboration

A review of the literature reveals many examples of the essential functions and benefits of collaborative relationships for individuals and organizations both within and outside of the field of higher education.

The 1972 Carnegie Report identified some of the benefits of collaborations to support its recommendations for program review and innovations. The authors claimed that "significant economies can be achieved through consortium agreements and other forms of inter-institutional cooperation" (p 127). According to Briar-Lawson (1998), collaboration is a way to "conserve energy and resources" (p. 156) and is a means to help empower individuals and groups to be more efficient and effective.

Steward (1997) purported that the primary benefit of collaboration lies in its inherent focus of seeking out better ways of doing things. Bringing together different individuals with varying perspectives and experiences leads to constant questioning, negotiation, and the channeling of energies to reach a shared vision and fulfill a shared purpose. Walshok (1999) supported this notion further and stated that in our new knowledge-based society, creativity and innovation are not individual qualities but come from group processes and "webs of talent" (p. 77). Furthermore, Walshok (1999) argued that the changing society has increased the need for access to knowledge that is integrative and multi-disciplinary, calling for more collaborative programs and processes.

Turning to studies that were found to be particularly relevant to the present study, Knox (1989) claimed that our changing and diverse society prompted the need for more comprehensive program planning in education. He identified a shift from individual courses to more comprehensive programs that address the complex issues in contemporary society. Developing such comprehensive programs requires working with multiple parties and collaborative relationships (Knox, 1989).

Gabor and Yerkes (1999) agreed that the keys to success in this contemporary, dynamic information society and "knowledge age" is "seeing the university as a single, not sole, driver in the educational marketplace that seeks strategic partnerships" (p. 63) to meet institutional goals.

Cervero (1988) explored collaborations specific to institutions of higher education and identified benefits such as an increased awareness of universities' capabilities, increased collegiality, and the enhanced quality of programs and services. He further suggested that collaboration was a successful strategy in times of resource scarcity.

Factors that Support or Inhibit Collaboration

The literature revealed various individual and organizational factors that may support or inhibit collaborative relationships. While most research and discussions were found to focus primarily on inter-institutional collaborations, the variables may prove to be relevant and equally essential for intra-institutional collaborations.

In a case study on collaboration, Hohmann (1985) identified many of the key issues and essential ingredients for success. This study found that there must be a clear understanding of the form and depth of the collaborative relationship and level of

commitment. The organization's climate must foster openness and interdependence. Formal agreements must be in place, and formal and informal linkages must be established. This requires a high level of professional maturity and interpersonal skills (Hohmann, 1985).

Steward (1997) identified various features of collaboration, suggesting factors that must be present for successful collaboration to occur. Specifically, she stated that successful collaborative activities require interdependence and on-going give and take, solutions emerging from dealing with individual and group differences, partners working beyond stereotypes, joint ownership in decision-making and collective responsibility, and an emerging process of negotiations and interactions.

Walshok (1999) investigated essential features of collaboration and added that successful collaboration requires all team members to work together at all stages of the planning process, a sincere value for and belief in dialogue and synergy, and a "belief in the notion that unexpected ideas and solutions grow out of genuine conversations between groups of otherwise distinct and highly specialized individuals" (p. 84).

By investigating a variety of collaborative relationships, Robertson (1998) identified and explored the key antecedents that affect the likelihood that individuals and organizations will collaborate. Specific "pre-requisites" include the incentive to collaborate, which is guided by individual and organizational self-interest; willingness to collaborate, which requires a level of mutual interest, trust, and desire; ability to collaborate, which requires a specific level of knowledge and skill; and the capacity to collaborate, with respect to the level of power and authority to engage in collaborative agreement. Robertson (1998) suggested that these four antecedents to collaboration

should guide organizational policies and procedures to support rather than inhibit collaborative arrangements.

Apps (1988) argued that "many barriers prevent multidisciplinary efforts on university campuses" (p. 159). Specific challenges arise from the fact that most universities are structured along a "one-dimensional department base" with regard to finances, programs, and resource distribution. This discipline-based structure often segregates rather than unites faculty, and innovation and changes "are typically perceived as threats to them" (p. 186). This separation is further emphasized by the lack of administrative and faculty leadership that supports and encourages collaborative efforts and the failure to reward and recognize such contributions (Apps, 1988).

While there is little research to guide the development and process of intra-organizational collaboration, the literature does reveal various factors that are quite likely to be essential. While no one factor seems to be solely responsible for successful collaboration, it is clear that the leadership, organizational structure, and individual faculty have significance. Therefore, attention was directed at these factors in the review of the literature. Presented next is a summary of the literature related to these factors.

Leadership

The impact of leadership on intra-institutional collaborations between academic departments and continuing higher education in institutions of higher education is complex. While this review focused primarily on the behaviors of the institutional leader, discussions of leadership activities and attitudes that support or inhibit

collaboration must also consider the leader of the specific academic department and the continuing education unit.

The concept of leadership has produced hundreds of definitions and has been the focus of countless research studies and books. According to Owens (1998), the many definitions of leadership have two common themes: "1) Leadership is a group function; it occurs only in the processes of two or more people interacting; and 2) Leaders intentionally seek to influence the behavior of other people" (Owens, 1998, p. 200). Ultimately, the goals of leadership include not only enhancing human resources in the organization but also energizing and motivating organization members with a common vision and purpose (Ashkenas, Ulrich, Jick, and Kerr, 1995; Bennis, 1989; Chance, 1992; Conger, 1992; Owens, 1998). This requires the ongoing process of creating and transforming an environment to one that is "motivating, inclusionary, caring, and empowering" (Owens, 1998, p. 224).

In a similar vein, Schein (1992) also discussed the influence of the leader on the organization's culture. He argued that "organizational cultures are created in part by leaders, and one of the most decisive functions of leadership is the creation, the management, and sometimes even the destruction of culture" (p.5). Schein (1999) later expanded on these ideas, suggesting that the leader's roles and behaviors must adjust to the various stages of organizational development with the overall purpose of creating and promoting the vision that helps direct the behaviors and attitudes of organizational members.

The role and impact of leadership on organizational culture and behaviors have evolved to meet the demands of the new knowledge organization and the information

society. Helgesen (1996) argued that the technology has distributed power to all levels of the organization, therefore increasing the role and importance of teams. Consequently, effective leadership will come from the "grass roots," must respect individual competence, protect team autonomy, and provide ongoing support (Helgesen, 1996, p. 21).

Hershey, Blanchard, and Johnson (1996) supported this new role and the need for the transformational leader. Transformational leadership requires the leader to demonstrate personal commitment; communicate need for change; establish and communicate the vision; generate support for the vision; acknowledge, honor, and deal with any resistance; define and set up an organization that can achieve the vision; and provide regular communication and feedback on the organization's progress. These theorists support the "situational leadership model" (p. 525) to guide the transformation, whereby each leader's style and behavior are adapted to accommodate the specific individuals and circumstances. This model recognizes that leadership goes beyond administration and management, is more than traits and behaviors, incorporates transactions and interactions, and promotes transformation (Rose, 1992).

While leadership does have an impact on the organizational culture, Schein (1992) stated, "culture is the result of a complex group learning process that is only partially influenced by leader behavior" (p.5). Thus, the orientation of individuals in key leadership positions impacts the way individuals understand and approach tasks as well as the way individuals interact with each other (Schein, 1992). Ultimately, the leadership will have an impact on the existence and success of collaborative activities and efforts.

Implying that collaboration may require a unique type of leadership, Steward (1997) suggested that collaboration requires a "shift from vertical patterns of leadership and power to horizontal patterns of shared leadership and symbiotic supportive relationships" (p. 48). Castle (1997) supported this notion of shared leadership and suggested that "all engaged in collaboration need to be prepared to change how they exercise power and to negotiate its use in the different roles of the collaborators so that power is used in a way that empowers all and is conducive to the collaborative process" (p. 62).

As previously suggested, discussions of leadership activities and attitudes that support or deter collaboration must consider not only the institutional leader, but also the leader of the specific academic department and the continuing education unit. The review of the literature revealed several sources that spoke to that issue.

Mason (1989) suggested that leaders of continuing education units have relatively little formal power compared to the "more traditional administrators" (p. 82) elsewhere in the university. Mason attributed this inferiority to the marginal status that continuing education units often occupy on their campuses. It was further suggested that assuming a proactive approach and strategic planning process would assist continuing education leaders in developing new programs, improving quality, and enhancing the position and esteem of adult and continuing education programs. This would in turn improve the image of the continuing education's functions on campus and most likely positively impact collaborative relationships with other academic units. In other words, the effective continuing education leader will have the "diplomatic skills necessary to

develop and maintain an intricate network of professional relationships" (Snider, 1987, p. 60) and will serve as an advocate for continuing education on the campus.

Somewhat akin to this, Edelson (1992) argued that the situational context of continuing education within its parent organization calls for a specific leadership style that incorporates program leadership, political leadership, leadership of the people, and leadership within the profession. He suggested that the fragility and uncertainty of the future supported the need for visionary leaders who are futurists and on the cutting edge of the present and future with regard to change, technology, program delivery, and content.

Taking a somewhat different tact, McGaughey (1992) indicated that perhaps the most important role of the continuing education leader is to model, support, and communicate the values of continuing education to the unit as well as to the parent organization. Specifically, he stated that continuing education leaders must have a strong belief in the educational potential of adult learners and a dedication to the goals of adult and continuing education. They must be hard working, consistent, and professional; demonstrate utmost integrity; value diversity; and be committed to lifelong learning for him- or herself, staff, and students. Most importantly, they must contribute to the institutional culture by sharing these values and enhancing the reputation of continuing education on campus. McGaughey (1992) added that "although the larger institution may not have a specific understanding of the needs of the adult learner or of the importance of lifelong learning, the adult and continuing education leader can share information and outcomes in order to enhance the knowledge base of leaders in the larger institutional setting" (p. 48). He suggested further that "the need for dynamic leadership

in adult and continuing education may also be more critical than exists in other areas because of the heavy reliance on shifting fiscal resources, large numbers of part-time faculty, and fragile and complex relations with external agencies" (p. 43).

Taking the topic to a higher level, Knox (1989) conducted a comparative analysis of continuing education programs in a study focusing on world perspectives on adult education. The analysis provided a global perspective of issues and challenges facing adult and continuing education. In spite of the differences in programs and services offered, the investigation identified common themes and challenges. Specific issues included making continuing education goals congruent and central with the parent institution; becoming part of the strategic plan of the institution; reducing barriers to participation in adult and continuing education programs; obtaining strong and consistent support from the parent organization, ensuring that the continuing education unit remains sensitive to economic and political fluctuations; and fostering collaboration within and between the university and with non-educational agencies for more efficient use of resources. The key to meeting these challenges and successfully addressing these issues, according to Knox (1993), is a strong leader and a strategic leadership process, which clarifies the goals and mission, strengthens the relationship with the parent institutions, attracts new participants, and facilitates collaboration.

Organizational Structure

The structure of an organization is another core component that seemed likely to impact the behaviors and interactions of organizational members and thus, intra-institutional collaborations. Once again, a review of the literature was conducted on this

topic. While the literature was found to contain relatively little research and data on intra-institutional collaborations occurring in higher education, it was clear that organizational structures and administrative policies do little to encourage or reward such efforts.

Katz and Kahn (1966) argued that an organization, being an open social system, must adapt to environmental demands and incorporate adaptive structures to "generate appropriate responses to external conditions" (p. 39). Schein (1992) argued for a balance between centralization and decentralization, suggesting that function should dictate form rather than vice versa. Furthermore, in his discussion on promoting a vision that supports collaboration, Schein (1992) stated, "I don't think that you have to change the attitudes of people, because the people are really willing to work together—you just have to create more of a structure for it to happen" (p. 165).

Structural components of the organization can actually inhibit collaborative efforts. Katz and Kahn (1966) purported that universities had traditionally enjoyed considerable autonomy which prevented them from having to develop many adaptive mechanisms to respond to external conditions. Consequently, when problems or issues arose, the organization responded by trying to change the external environment rather than adjusting the internal environment. While this approach may have worked at one time, the rapidly changing nature and the increased diversity of higher education have made it ineffective. As suggested by Toffler (1984), increased innovation and a climate of high novelty requires a daily challenge of assumptions and bureaucratic structures that lead to inefficiency. While bureaucracy was appropriate during the industrial age when there was a more predictable environment, the information and knowledge age requires

more of an "ad-hocracy" with flexible work units that can engage in rapid learning and respond to change (p. 93). Similarly, according to Schmuck and Runkel (1985), the formal structures of the schools are typically the result of rational planning and traditions and can limit the "capacity to deal with unpredictable contingencies" (p.18). As a result, informal structures emerge to accommodate the "needs and feelings that cannot be encompassed by the formal structure" (Schmuck and Runkel, 1985, p. 18).

Weick (1986) recognized that the efficiency of an organization depended greatly on the complementary nature of its individual components. "Loosely coupled" organizations are characterized by horizontal, vertical, internal, and external boundaries (Ashkenas et al., 1995) and experience increased conflict and decreased cooperation (Schmuck and Runkel, 1985). Individuals and groups within a loosely coupled organization have a good deal of autonomy, which may reduce the interaction and interdependence among subsystems, increasing the division of labor, conflict, and the avoidance of collaboration (Schmuck and Runkel, 1985). Ashkenas et al. (1995) acknowledged that, while some distinction in roles and authority may be appropriate, boundaries must become more flexible and permeable to facilitate collaboration and cooperation.

In spite of the potential conflicts that may arise, loosely coupled organizations can also be adaptive and efficient. Weick (1986) found that loose coupling allows the organization to persist because a breakdown in one part may not necessarily cause a breakdown in another. Furthermore, it increases the organization's members' ability to generate innovation and novel solutions, and provides more opportunities and room for autonomy. Lerner (1992) indicated, "multi-organizational systems with loosely linked

sub-components can be considered reliable because if one part fails, another can step in to help" (p.14).

In a study of continuing education organizational models, Higgins (1997) identified and examined the patterns of coupling and integration, and sought to establish various degrees of coupling. A survey instrument was sent to continuing education professionals, and findings confirmed the varying degrees of coupling between continuing education and academic departments. Different classifications of coupling were identified with variations based on faculty relationships and administrative structures. Furthermore, the nature and extent of the organization's coupling appeared to impact its efficiency and effectiveness.

The organization's boundaries also impact the direction and effectiveness of communication channels. Thus, Schmuck and Runkel (1985) suggested that formal and informal channels of communication are needed to instill trust and cooperation, and must be integrated into the organization structure. Challenges arise in the loosely coupled organization because subsystems may have their own norms that influence the openness and flow of communication. Consequently, one of the goals of organizational development is to improve the effectiveness of the formal and informal communication channels in organizations. Rigid boundaries must be made more fluid to allow for the dissemination of information needed to communicate vision, goals, and trust between and within subsystems (Ashkenas et al., 1995). True dialogue, not just words, will help generate the trust and exchange. Dialogue is more than conversation but involves "seeking to build deeper understanding, new perceptions, new models, new openings, new paths to effective action, and deeper and more enduring, even sustainable, truths"

(Brown, 1995, p. 157). Ultimately, collaboration requires organization and communication channels that promote information sharing and true dialogue.

The boundaries separating academic disciplines and departments have long been identified as a challenge for interdisciplinary efforts. Of particular concern has been the impact of these boundaries on interdisciplinary work. As stated at a National Conference on Public Service and Extension at Institutions of Higher Education, "We have wrought miracles through specialization, but have we wrought miracles in synthesis?" (Rusk, 1974, p. 6). In his keynote address, Rusk (1974) expressed further that:

> We shall need more fraternity among the academic disciplines and more fraternity among the individual campuses, and if you forgive my saying so, my experience over the last twenty-five years has suggested to me that negotiating cooperation among departments and more particularly among campuses is just a little more difficult than negotiating with the Russians. (p. 8)

Rocco and Murphy (1985) identified emerging issues facing institutions of higher education, which may require collaboration, and called for changes in institutional structures. They focused on the new "non-traditional" student who is older, more self-directed, interested in the practical application of knowledge, and has more and varied work, community, and family experience. They discussed the implications for the institution's policies and procedures for access, admissions, assessment and placement, resources, curriculum, and teaching practices, and stated that:

> We need to develop a range of opportunities for collegial relationships, for collaborative planning, for self-planned and self-paced study so that the student's self-determination can be realized through the practical capacity to set priorities and achieve learning goals (Rocco and Murphy, 1985, p. viii).

Cabell (1985) suggested that changes in the student population call for an increase in extension programs, and "the future of higher education may rest on the success or

failure of such extension units" (p. 16). Furthermore, a unified approach is needed, bringing together faculty, staff, and facilities, to prevent duplication of programs and meet the students' needs (Cabell, 1985). This clearly implies the need for collaboration on an intra-institutional basis.

Matusak and Dowd (1985) also investigated the organizational structure and appropriate administrative procedures appropriate for the changing student population. They identified different administrative structures that may be employed, including a free-standing institution designed entirely for alternative degree programs and non-traditional students; a school, college, or division within a larger organization; and a specific or singular program within a college or division. Further, the authors supported the more common structure of the school, college, or division within a larger organization, but argued that this arrangement required ongoing and total cooperation among administrators and staff. They stated, "it is imperative that the unit have equal status with the other divisions, schools, or colleges in the same institution" (p. 30). Apps (1988) agreed that the campus departments, administration, and extension units must cooperate to support the non-traditional students with services including orientation, counseling, academic support, and administrative services such as child care, financial aid, placement services, and parking.

Nowlen (1987) provided a comparative analysis of the centralized and decentralized approach to continuing higher education and argued for a model that blends the two organizational structures. His investigation found that the decentralized continuing education model, where each academic department conducts its own discipline-related continuing education programs, is often a source of turf and

coordination conflicts. Conversely, the centralized continuing education unit may be better able to coordinate interdisciplinary programs and often benefits from the economies of scale (Nowlen, 1987).

King and Lerner (1992) found that most continuing education units are mixed, incorporating both centralized and decentralized structures. They recommended an "integrated model," (p. 95) which combines the entrepreneurism of continuing education with academic rigor. Furthermore, they suggested, "The integrated continuing education unit should be positioned as a boundary actor representing the university to select external constituencies" (King and Lerner, 1992, p. 95).

Niemi (1989) argued, "If adult and continuing education is to strengthen its impact on institutions of higher education, it has to become more proactive in assisting them to accommodate the new population of adult learners" (p. 59). Policies must be broadened to "reflect a commitment to adult learners as being integral to the institution and as exhibiting unique characteristics and needs" (p. 60). Ultimately, how institutions of higher education will respond to the changing society "will depend largely on an institution's organizational structure and the position of continuing education within that structure" (Escott, Semlak, and Comadena, 1992, p. 56).

Financial structure and economic stability are also organizational factors which may support or inhibit collaborative relationships. King (1992) indicated, "The demographic, social, and economic changes occurring in the university's external environment may require corresponding changes in the traditional bureaucratic structures of higher education, including their financial operation" (p. 104). Marienau (1985) contended that establishing links between the continuing education unit and the

institution requires compatibility and profitability. The goals, norms, values, and programs of the continuing education unit must be perceived as compatible with the parent institutions. Furthermore, profitability or at least solvency is required to avoid being seen as dependent or a burden, which will discourage cooperation and collaboration (Marienau, 1985).

Taking a somewhat different tack, Ratchford (1974) argued that the existing organizational structure would have a negative impact on the public service and extension mission of the university. In particular, he argued that there needs to be a strong institutional commitment to the public service function, a reward system that recognizes public service activities similar to traditional university activities, a continuous and stable presence, and a sufficient support staff (Ratchford, 1974).

Gessner (1987a) purported that continuing higher education units are faced with a dilemma due to the dual roles they assume as part of the academic institution with all of the traditions and bureaucratic processes, while at the same time relating to the private sector. Consequently, continuing education organizations might experience chronic uncertainty due to little security or institutional support, compounded by the need to be self-supporting, if not profitable (Pittman, 1989).

King and Lerner (1992) also argued that continuing education units are often pressured to fulfill two potentially competing expectations: to be a profit center and to be a conventional academic unit. King (1992) addressed this issue further and indicated that in addition to generating new funds and supporting the traditional university agenda, "Continuing education administrators are frequently forced to compete with academic deans for the same, often dwindling, internal resources" (p. 103). Consequently, the

competition can lead to conflict between schools, departments, and deans (King, 1992). King and Lerner (1992) concluded by presenting an integrated model approach combining entreprenuerism and academic rigor, and suggested that the ideal situation involves continuing education in the strategic planning process of the parent institutions and continuous intra-organizational coordination (King and Lerner, 1992).

The potential impact of the institution's funding and distribution of resources should not be minimized. King (1992) stated, "The traditional funding allocation process, which is primarily based on competition among units, has created an atmosphere of mistrust within the university. That mistrust lessens, or even eliminates, the potential for collaborative interdisciplinary programming or administrative planning" (p. 120). Consequently, "universities must create financial planning strategies that reward collaborative efforts, reduce duplication, and enhance interdisciplinary approaches" (p. 122). If university fiscal management structures may actually create disincentives for collaboration, ". . .it should also be possible to use those fiscal management systems to create incentives (for collaboration)" (Picus, 1998, p. 246).

In summary, while the literature contains relatively little research and data specifically on the relationship between intra-institutional collaborations in higher education and the organizational structures that attend them, this literature review shows these organizational structures to be important factors in the view of most experts, and thus worthy of further exploration.

Turning to the third of the core factors of intra-institutional collaboration that were subjected to a review of the literature, faculty involvement and the importance of incentives and motivation were addressed.

Individual Motivation: Faculty and Staff

The evolution from scientific management to the human relations approach of organizational management recognized the significant effect of individuals on organizations. As previously suggested, individual motives and needs influence the direction and effectiveness of organizational development and change (Schmuck and Runkel, 1985). Consequently, any attempt to modify subsystems and interpersonal relations must recognize and attend to the different individuals' motives, needs, and competencies.

Katz and Kahn (1966) recognized that individuals have a significant impact on the organization. They stated that "social systems are anchored in the attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, motivations, habits, and expectations of human beings" (p. 33).

Schmuck and Runkel (1985) further suggested that even if the organization as a whole is not yet ready for major organizational change, ". . .smaller efforts can begin with subsystems containing individuals who are more ready" (p. 205). The authors offer "signs to look for" to help identify individuals who are ready for the change, and encourage starting collaborative programs and efforts with those persons. Specifically needed are people with the time and energy necessary for the change or development; administrators with long-term visions and perspectives, since change does not happen overnight; individuals who have not adopted a destructive pessimism; individuals who are intrinsically motivated, since the process can be difficult and may not provide immediate external rewards; and persons who recognize and appreciate the true complexities of organizational behavior. According to Schmuck and Runkel (1985),

individuals with these characteristics can generate the momentum needed to help effect change.

A dominant theme in organizational theory has been the interaction between the organizational structure and people. Social system theories and perspectives have acknowledged that not only do people affect the organization, but the organization can also affect its individuals. Consequently, the individual is likely to behave in ways that are learned and enforced throughout the organization's systems (Owens, 1998). Ideally, the organization's leader will identify and acknowledge the individuals' needs, and build in organizational structures to accommodate those needs (Owens, 1998).

The impact of individuals on comprehensive program planning and collaborative efforts and relationships was recognized by Knox (1989). He argued that "continued cooperation depends on the stakeholder's recognition of a favorable cost/benefit ratio, which is helped by their active participation and their receipt of appreciation for the contributions" (p. 51).

Taking this to a functional level, Apps (1988) found that the academic community has not been successful in instilling the cooperation of faculty. In fact, his research led him to conclude that:

> One of the most lamentable records of higher education has been the failure of many multidisciplinary relationships. The political power base of single departments has traditionally been so strong and their hold on faculty evaluations and rewards so tenacious that they have rendered many multidisciplinary efforts feeble and vulnerable (p. 189).

Also emphasizing this core factor, Escott et al. (1992) suggested that academic faculty can be a crucial element in collaborations on campus, but only if administrative and organizational structures support that involvement. They contended that continuing

education programs offer faculty opportunities for innovation, creativity, entrepreneurship, and research, and can ". . .bring together faculty from various disciplines to address social problems and link the university with the external environment" (p. 56). This may require adaptation of course content and teaching style and must be recognized by a reward system that supports this contribution (Escott et al., 1992).

Robertson (1998) provided a unique perspective on collaboration, which supports the need for faculty and staff participation. Robertson (1998) argued that ". . .specific activities comprising effective collaboration are not engaged in by organizations per se but by individual members of those organizations" (p. 69). Furthermore, ". .collaboration at the organizational or system level cannot be achieved in the absence of collaboration at the individual level" (p.70).

Relative to the contemporary situations, Niemi (1989) argued that continuing professional education assumes a marginal status and low priority in the university campus community. As a result, faculty are less motivated to participate because their "efforts are not sufficiently rewarded when decisions are made with respect to salary, promotion, and tenure" (p. 55).

While various organizational and individual factors affect the success of collaborative activities on campus, it is clear that faculty involvement and support also have a significant impact. Foley (1998) found that collaborative efforts often place intense time and energy demands on faculty due to regular meetings, the training and supervision of students, and initiating and maintaining contacts with collaborative partners. Faculty also found collaborative relationships to be the source of interpersonal

stress and thus "faculty viewed the personal costs of collaboration as outweighing the personal benefits" (p. 223), thus decreasing the likelihood that faculty will support such efforts.

This review of the literature underscored the vital importance of leadership, organizational structure, and faculty involvement as necessary ingredients of successful collaboration. The following section will discuss how these factors may interact to affect collaboration, thus offering further insight into the complex process.

Interaction of Key Variables Affecting Collaboration in the University Setting

> Why have opportunities for collaboration and cooperation, when the advantages appear to strongly outweigh the disadvantages, been met with resistance from colleges and universities? There are probably many factors at work, including institutional inertia, strong feelings of turf protection, differences in students and programs, pervasive academic autonomy, and the complicated demands of collaborative efforts (Young, 1987, p. 41).

Discussing separately the leadership, organizational structure, and individual factors that influence organizational behavior does not deny their interrelatedness. The organization's structure and channels of communication influence, and are influenced by, the leadership and involvement of individual faculty members. The behaviors of individual members also influence and are influenced by the organizational structure. Additionally, the leader's behaviors and vision is certain to affect and be affected by the organizational structure and its members. This multi-directional effect and inter-dependence of components has been widely recognized and supported in contemporary

organizational theories (Owens, 1998). Therefore, the organization must have the leadership, structure, and individuals to support and encourage collaborative behavior.

Collaborations on Campus

Although the influence of leadership, organizational structure, and individual motivation on collaboration may not be unique to institutions of higher education, universities do experience particular issues and challenges within these domains, which may be different from other types of organizations. A review of the literature revealed various aspects of this phenomenon.

In their study of university governance and leadership, Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1986) concluded that colleges and universities should be distinguished from other types of organizations because of their goal conflict and ambiguity, fragmented professional staffs, environmental vulnerability, and a model of governance described as "organized anarchy" (p. 12). This organized anarchy was the result of having many people in control, little comprehensive or strategic planning, a variety of missions, clients, and pressures, and decentralized groups with varying perspectives and interests. The authors argued that these conditions warrant a model of governance whereby the university is perceived as a political system with complex subsystems and struggles for power. Furthermore, the political model requires a new model of management and leadership whereas the leader is more of a mediator and "statesman" rather than the "hero at the top" (p. 24), and requires skills in strategic planning rather than directing and supervising. Unfortunately, most universities fail to match the appropriate leadership

style and source of power with the organizational goals, structure, and members (Baldridge et al., 1986; Etzioni, 1986).

In a more focused fashion, Edwards (1999) attributed the uniqueness of higher education institutions to the organization of academic departments. He explained that, while the purpose of the academic department is to represent specific disciplines on campus, there is a growing need for more interdisciplinary work. Instead of radically abolishing the departmental structure, Edwards (1999) argued that "departmental boundaries must become more porous and faculty members must be able to move more flexibly" (p. 26). This also requires a leadership process that encourages, rewards, and supports crossing disciplines and collaborative efforts (Edwards, 1999).

Glowacki-Dudka (1999) conducted a longitudinal case study of the development and productivity of the Alpha Institute, an inter-institutional collaboration formed to produce distance education programs. The study examined both the structural and process challenges and issues associated with inter-institutional collaborations and revealed the complexities of the interactions between the leadership, organizational policies, and individuals on university campuses. Tensions included organizational procedures, funding, commitment, and leadership. Equally significant were the communication, level of trust, expectations, and compatibility of individual and organizational goals. Relationships played a particularly significant role and were seen as the "key to collaboration" (p. 102). In addition, the author found it to be "essential that each partner knows what role he/she has to play and is aware of the perceptions that others hold of them" (p. 102).

Strategies that were essential for the success of the Alpha Institute included having a shared vision, maintaining flexibility, a sharing of the leadership roles as opposed to a single leader, group decision-making, and a negotiation process for the management of conflict. The author recommended that each participant benefits from the collaboration, establishing the roles and expectations, allowing time for developing trust, and implementing an operating agreement and evaluation process.

In spite of the many challenges, the Alpha Institute was deemed a successful inter-organizational collaboration. Specific benefits included increased organizational exposure, increased resources, increased organizational capacity, the sharing of experience and expertise, development of a high quality product, increased access to technology and knowledge, and the personal and professional growth of the individuals involved.

As previously suggested, little was found in the the professional literature specific to the extent and nature of intra-institutional collaboration in higher education. Much more existed on inter-institutional collaborations, including many examples of collaborative efforts between universities and community colleges, universities and K-12 entities, public and private universities, universities and surrounding communities, and universities and business and industry (Sarason and Lorentz, 1998). While there has been discussion of the need for and potential benefits of intra-institutional collaboration, there is a paucity of research describing the development, support, process, and efficacy of such efforts. Following is a discussion of the few examples of intra-institutional collaborations identified in the literature.

Collaborations on Campus: Continuing Education

Apps (1988) discussed in general terms various collaborative activities among continuing education and academic units on university campuses. His discussion focused on alternative degree formats designed to serve the increasing number of older students. Many of the successful programs were housed in continuing education departments, recognized and granted credit for experiential learning, and went beyond simply changing the class schedule to provide services and accommodations for older students. According to Apps (1988), while the continuing education unit offered more flexibility for the alternate degree formats, there were possible disadvantages. He found that the value of the degrees may have been questioned as "degrees earned from programs separate from the mainstream of the college or university are often viewed as having less quality than the traditional ones" (p. 132).

The increased interest in post-baccalaureate certificate programs prompted Patterson (1999) to conduct a study of the policies, procedures, and programs that support graduate certificate programs. Thirty-four universities provided information regarding the development, approval, administration, review, and termination of graduate certificate programs. The findings from this study supported the development of a proposed model of shared governance for the implementation of graduate certificate programs. Specifically, the investigation of current and effective practice found that the most successful programs were collaborative efforts between academic departments, graduate schools, and continuing education. The study's findings indicated that academic departments and graduate schools were best able to develop curriculum, locate faculty, and ensure that the program goes through the standard approval process of the

university. Continuing education departments and staff, on the other hand, were found to be better able to identify market demands and needs, handle the registration functions, and program marketing and promotion. In addition, the continuing education departments best handled fiscal arrangements, since most enjoy more flexibility in setting prices and student fees. Finally, the study found that an essential element of success for these collaborative graduate certificate programs was a "fast-tracking" process in the program approval stage to avoid time consuming and frustrating bureaucratic policies and procedures (Patterson, 1999, p. 74).

The University of Southern California's Inter-Professional Initiative (IPI) provides a comprehensive illustration of the motivations, benefits, challenges, and interactions of key variables of inter- and intra-organizational collaboration. The IPI is a collaboration of academic programs and community institutions oriented toward "effecting change in individuals, organizations, and the service delivery system" and improving conditions for children and families through ". . .better service delivery, education and training" (McCroskey, 1998, p. 12). One of the primary goals of the IPI is to fulfill an extension function by improving the education and training of professionals through a multidisciplinary program of eight academic units including education, social work, nursing, public administration, dentistry, occupational therapy, physical therapy, and medicine.

While the IPI continues to be a "project in process" (p. 13), many salient issues have emerged and lessons have been learned. Preliminary results and outcome assessments have identified positive results for the university, faculty, students,

community professionals, and recipients of the community services delivered through the IPI.

The IPI provided additional insight into the factors that may encourage and/or inhibit the collaboration process. A specific lesson learned was that ". . .the process of bringing together people with different perspectives, experiences, and expectations is very difficult, but the learning curve is predictable" (McCroskey, 1998, p. 13). McCroskey (1998) suggested that the collaboration process begins with a positive enthusiasm, which is usually followed by frustration when barriers and interpersonal conflicts arise. To overcome these frustrations, ". . .people need sharp stimuli to begin and periodic incentives to continue their commitment" (p.14), calling for strong leadership, administrative and institutional support, and intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to initiate and maintain the motivation of the faculty and staff. Specific challenges that arose from coordinating different disciplines on campus included enrolling students in different degree programs, receiving approval from multiple departments and curriculum committees, class and program listing in university catalogues and schedules of classes, and the scheduling and supervision of classes and field experiences. According to McCroskey (1998), overcoming these challenges requires a new paradigm to guide the undergraduate, graduate, and professional education and training, and a "bridge" to connect disciplines (p. 17).

It is clear that individual and organizational variables interact to either support or inhibit collaboration. It is also evident that unique issues arise within the context of institutions of higher education. As suggested by Gatz and O'Hearn (1998), "As hard as

multidisciplinary cooperation may be in the community, multidisciplinary education is even more problematic" (p. 169).

Historical Perspective on the Relationships between Continuing Education and Academic Departments

Some historical perspective is needed to aid in the understanding of the relationship between continuing higher education units and academic departments. A review of this aspect of relevant higher education history provides insight into the current relationships and challenges to collaboration.

In an investigation of adult learners, Cyril O. Houle (1961) observed that there were different types of learners who desire different kinds of education. He identified goal-oriented learners, who have clear goals for attending a class. Specific goals may refer to personal or professional needs. Activity-oriented learners attend classes, not necessarily for the specific instruction or content, but more so for experience of involvement. Houle (1961) suggested that these individuals might be motivated by loneliness and the desire to meet people and socialize. Learning-oriented students were distinguished from the goal- or activity-oriented. According to Houle's investigation, these students were intrinsically motivated, had a strong desire to learn, and considered learning to be a source of fun and enjoyment. The identification of the different motivations and needs of learners supported the development of programs that were appropriately administered. Houle's investigation also identified the many benefits derived from involvement in adult education programs, supporting the importance and need for such program development. Finally, the study argued for more attention and study of the issues that may encourage involvement in adult education programs.

Specifically, Houle suggested that experts of early and formal education collaborate with adult educators to enhance the understanding, research, and practice of adult education. While Houle (1961) recognized that "the University is distinguished from kindergarten chiefly by the maturity of the student, and adult education is distinguished in the same way from the schooling provided to children and youth" (p.81), he called for a more coordinated effort to create a community of lifelong learners.

Knox (1981) applied a social system perspective to understand the relationship among continuing education departments, academic departments, and the host institutions, and suggested the nature and quality of these relationships depend on "mutually beneficial exchanges" (Knox, 1981, p. 3). Examining the relationships from a social systems perspective required consideration of certain program components such as: 1) inputs, including tangibles such as finances and facilities as well as intangibles including support and respect; 2) processes, such as program development and implementation; and 3) outcomes, including the primary outcome of student proficiency as well as secondary outcomes of enhanced organizational public relations and increased organizational effectiveness (Knox, 1981). According to Knox's (1981) investigation and report, understanding the complex relationships requires consideration of all three elements of the social system. In addition, effective administrators must understand the social system and relate to the needs, interests, and perspectives of all members of the individual departments and parent organization.

Research on the historic relationship between continuing higher education, academic departments, and the host organization was conducted by Miller (1981), and resulted in the identification of issues that may explain some of the complexities of the

relationships. Miller's (1981) general findings suggested that continuing higher education departments often feel uncomfortable and not fully accepted at their host institutions. Differing missions, functions, governance, and organizational structure contribute to the "blurring of identity" (Miller, 1981, p. 30) of continuing education. For continuing education departments to succeed in enhancing student proficiency and institutional image, Miller (1981) recommended three initiatives: 1) continuing education needs its own organization, budget, and personnel; 2) university-wide links should be forged by joint appointments; and 3) once a strong identity is assured, coordination with other departments to develop programs should be encouraged. Overall, the continuing education department must tie its mission more closely to the host institution and receive recognition and respect from the broader campus community.

Historically, differing missions and activities have been identified as a result of and the cause for continuing higher education functions to be viewed as ancillary to the host institution (Beder, 1984; Gessner, 1987a). Gessner (1987a) argued that the entrepreneurial nature and "climate of pragmatism" (p. 6) of continuing higher education may put its professionals at odds with faculty and campus administrators. As a result, according to Beder (1984), when resources are limited, it is likely that continuing higher education departments will suffer cuts. Consequently, continuing higher education departments may find themselves in a state of "chronic resource insecurity and the imperative of acquiring resources needed to operate" (p. 4). Pittman (1989) added, "A transitory leadership, a legacy of impermanence and instability within sponsoring institutions, the stresses of financial exigency, and a counterproductive reward system are all serious symptoms of institutional marginality" (p. 20).

Other scholars of continuing higher education have recognized this ancillary status and state of insecurity. In fact, "marginality" is the term commonly found in the literature to describe the relationship between continuing higher education and the host organization (Clark, 1958; Eitel, 1989). In his comprehensive study of the status of "marginality," Eitel (1989) found that differing levels and extremes of integration distinguish four different groups or types of continuing higher education organizations. In addition, Eitel discovered that "the four groups of continuing higher education organizations are insecure with their parent institutions due to concerns over marginality" (p. xii).

Niemi (1989) found that the perception of marginality has a negative impact on faculty and students on campus. Specifically, limited resources and services for adult students create barriers to participation. In addition, little is done to reward or recognize faculty participation in adult and continuing education programs.

Gessner (1987b) and Pittman (1989) expanded upon the notion of institutional marginality and suggested that the entire field of adult and continuing education is perceived as unfocused and fragmented. Gessner (1987b) suggested that ". . .the diversity and complexity of continuing higher education contribute in part to the variety of circumstances in which it operates. It also serves to create policy and operational conflicts that can lead to a difference of opinion over its centrality or marginality" (p. 6).

The fragmentation of the profession is illustrated by the fact that "after half a century, no grand design, no generally accepted set of principles, and no universally accepted definition unites the scholars, practitioners, and institutions of adult and continuing education" (Pittman, 1989, p. 19). Pittman stated further, "This seemingly

permanent condition reinforces the image of adult and continuing education as existing outside the circle of American educational institutions" (p. 20).

Apps (1989) concurred with the lack of definition and focus in the field of adult and continuing education. He argued that professionals must define adult education and broaden the focus and purpose to reflect the changing needs of society and learners. Apps (1989) claimed that professionals in adult and continuing education must face the challenges of developing a broader vision of their field and fostering relationships with other areas of education as well as their affiliated institution. By focusing on similarities rather than differences, engaging in "cooperative research" (p. 29), and assuming a broader vision, adult and continuing education will be integrated into society; thus "all of society will see learning as integral to living, not some separate activity that is struggling for survival apart from the rest of society" (p. 29).

Respectability and acceptance are two other terms used to describe what is necessary to improve the image, relationship, and perceptions of the contemporary status of continuing higher education. According to Rohfield (1996), expanding access to higher education through continuing higher education programs has generated a level of skepticism regarding the quality of outreach and extension programs. The "campus equivalence model" and "adult learning model" were reviewed as previous efforts aimed at demonstrating respectability. The Campus Equivalence Model is based on the premise that continuing higher education students, faculty, and curriculum must be evaluated by the same standards and criteria used to examine more traditional academic programs. Conversely, the Adult Learning Model recognized the distinct needs of adult learners, justifying a different standard for quality (Rohfield, 1996). Rohfield (1996) suggested

that the debate between the two approaches continues, compelling continuing higher education administrators to constantly explain and demonstrate respectability and quality in their programs.

Snider (1987) placed some of the blame for the image on the marginal status and lack of acceptance on the continuing education unit's leadership and staff. He argued that the primary function of the continuing education unit is to complement the academic units. He found that, "One of the most common mistakes continuing educators make is to design and implement programs without involving academic units that have a vested interest in the substance of the program" (Snider, 1987, p. 51).

In a comprehensive study of seven Midwestern universities, Lesht (1989) interviewed various deans and directors and identified strategies for integrating continuing education into the campus community. She determined that, most importantly, "The division (of continuing education) must convince key decision makers that its work is critical to the institution" (p. 9). It is important for the division to present itself on campus in a way that emphasizes opportunities for increasing enrollment, conducting research, improving teaching skills, and maximizing efficiency. This requires contact with faculty and administration, recognition and respect for the context of the university setting, the cultivation of relationships, and expression of the desire to serve the campus. Furthermore, "Divisions of continuing education must understand the institution and be willing to adapt to its culture" (Lesht, 1989, p. 15). This may require that continuing education professionals become more involved in campus life, show concern for the institution, and develop networks and relationships by serving on committees and attending social functions.

Agreeing with these premises, Donaldson (1992) stated that continuing education professionals can have an impact on the perceptions and support for their programs. Specifically, he argued that the lack of research conducted by continuing education professionals about continuing education programs has perpetuated the marginal status. He recommended an increase in research activities to aid in ". . .furthering the professional, creating a more professional image, and fostering readier acceptance of continuing education by the parent institution as well as by the higher education establishment as a whole" (p. 70). Donaldson (1992) also stated that continuing education professionals could participate in research activities by initiating new research, communicating research findings, and serving as a broker to foster collaborative research activities within the university and with outside groups. By demonstrating a knowledge and capacity for research activities, continuing education professionals can alter the campus perceptions of the role of continuing education and the potential opportunities and benefits of collaboration.

Donaldson and Ross-Gordon (1992) suggested that, while continuing higher education is in a unique position to assist universities in responding to changes in the student demographics and societal learning needs, ". . .continuing education operates at the boundary of the institution" and can be effective only ". . .if it develops its boundary-spanning capacity more fully" (p. 34). Specific boundary spanning activities include the processing and transmission of information to and from the parent organization and external environment, the identification and acquisition of resources for the continuing education unit and the university, and participation in determining the boundaries and outreach of the parent organization (Donaldson and Ross-Gordon, 1992).

This review of the historical perspective of the nature and scope of the relationships between continuing higher education and academic departments has shown that they vary. In spite of the inconsistencies in structure and policy, many experts agree that a positive relationship requires institutional leadership support for continuing education, a clear understanding of the continuing education function, budgetary support for continuing education, and a statement of priority of continuing education (Gessner, 1987a). A valid summary statement in this area is one by Robertson (1998):

> To the extent that continuing higher educators recognize the mission and goals of their parent universities and to the extent that continuing higher educators can articulate their relationship to them, they will be vital members of the academic community and will most probably prosper (p. 29).

Need for Change in Higher Education

As previously suggested, social, demographic, and economic issues are impacting higher education in a variety of ways. This final section of the literature review discusses in greater detail some of the changes and challenges prompting the need for innovations and creativity in the business of higher education.

Over a quarter of a century ago, the 1972 Carnegie Commission report on higher education presented strong evidence of a coming financial crisis and called for more effective use of resources. The investigators identified the decades of the 1950 and 1960s as periods of rapid growth for higher education, which were accompanied by escalating costs for educating growing student enrollments. The increasing costs were also attributed to advances in technology and declines in public financial support. While the costs would continue to rise, the report issued warnings of future declining

enrollments and the need for increasing financial assistance. The authors concluded their report with a call for programmatic and operational innovations to improve organizational effectiveness and efficiency. One specific proposal recommended the acceleration and integration of programs and suggested decreasing the time needed to complete programs, granting students credit for outside work, integrating bachelors and masters degree programs, and reducing duplicate programs. In their summary, the authors called for action, stating, "The Commission believes that the intensive review of degree structures that is underway holds great promise, not only for constructive economics in higher education, but also for the elimination of overlaps and duplication in the curricula at various levels of education, for a closer relationship between pre-professional and professional education and for widening the range of options for the students" (Carnegie Commission, 1972, p. 57).

In the same time period, Ratchford (1974) argued that the separation of disciplines accomplished the original objectives of enrolling and certifying the competence of students and collecting scholars of similar interest, but "flexibility and multidisciplinary activities are seriously restricted" (p. 79). Consequently, the university will not be able to satisfy public service and the extension mission with the existing organizational structure.

A decade later, based on changes in businesses, Toffler (1984) recognized that organizational operations that worked in the past might not be effective for the present and future. He stated specifically that "universities can't keep up with the changing demands of services" (p. 27), and called for changes in policy and guiding assumptions.

He emphasized that the "structure of any company must be appropriate to its external environment" (p. 18) and that "ideas that worked in the past must be reexamined" (p. 18).

Wright (1976) presented a critical analysis of continuing education programs to investigate how colleges and universities were responding to the learning needs of adult students. His analysis of data suggested that creating an environment conducive to adult learning would require a change in the philosophy of the parent organization, the development of "semi-independent" (p. 22) structures for the operation of adult programs, and the modification of policy to create the "sub-environment" (p. 22) for programs. Furthermore, Wright (1976) concluded that if there wasn't a special unit designated for adult education programs, ". . .the task will not be carried out effectively, or even at all" (p. 23).

Some twenty years ago, in his economic analysis of higher education, Bowen (1980) contended that institutions would experience an overall decline in full time enrollment and therefore would need to consider strategies to increase their market share and efficiency. He presented various approaches to address these challenges such as redirecting money and resources to enhance the quality of programs, services and facilities; redirecting resources to expand research activities; increasing funds to attract and retain new students; and large-scale retrenchment and personnel cuts. Ultimately, he argued, "the important message is that serving new clientele and bringing non-traditional students into the mainstream is the most desirable and significant option that is available to higher education institutions in terms of national economic gain, cultural advancement, and institutional survival" (p. v).

Many of the challenges identified by the 1972 Carnegie Commission and other earlier reports continue as issues. This is shown in a more recent public policy report. The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1997) identified and discussed the ten most significant current public policy issues affecting higher education. The report recognized the need for more innovative financing approaches due to the decline in federal and state funding for higher education. In addition, the report recognized the emerging significance of technology to education, calling for review and changes in traditional tuition, financial aid, accreditation, quality assurance, governance, and financing policies. Finally, the analysts acknowledged the emerging and heightened "competition between traditional institutions and nontraditional providers, including the private sector" (p. 25).

While some of the specific policy issues have changed, the 1997 report illustrates that declining resources and increased competition continue to be of concern for higher education institutions. Furthermore, accountability, efficiency, and effectiveness continue to be priority issues.

Lerner, Simon, and Mitchell (1998) referred to the current and future technological- and knowledge-based society as the "coming wave," and contended that the "external demographic and attitudinal shifts" will cause "internal vibrations" as the institutions of higher education respond and adapt (p.2). Furthermore, he argued for the essential role of continuing education due to its "ability for quick action to accommodate change" (p. 16), and its inherent ability to "assemble groups of faculty from across departments, schools, and colleges, from other universities, and from nonacademic institutions employing researchers" (p. 16).

It was the contention of Shoemaker (1998) that two major changes occurring in society and in the workplace would impact all formal education and specifically higher education. The first is the "ongoing transition into the Information Age" (p. 1) and the second is the "rapidly expanding multicultural demographics" (p.2). These trends will affect institutional missions, program content, faculty, scheduling, administration, budgets, goals, and expectations (Shoemaker, 1998). Ultimately, these changes are going to require leadership and organizational strategies that promote collaborations and cooperation among members of the internal and external campus environment.

Donaldson and Ross-Gordon (1992) emphasized continuing higher education's increasing responsibility in meeting the learning needs of individuals in the new society. Specifically, they stated that continuing higher education is and will remain one of the fastest growing components of higher education due to ". . .the need to maintain and develop a competent workforce, the mandate of many states that professionals continue their education, and the zest for learning among an increasing number of the adult population" (p. 23). The ability of continuing higher education to meet these challenges and responsibilities will depend upon its relationship with its parent organization, administrative staff, and faculty from academic departments and the various service units on campus. "The continuing education unit must develop a network of policy and practical working arrangements to coordinate and facilitate contributions by the variety of resources available in the campus wide structure" (Snider, 1987, p. 62).

Given the fact that the continuing education unit typically has overlapping responsibilities in all areas inside and outside the institution, Sweeney, Ryan, and Fitzgerald (1994) called for more internal and external partnerships. Madere (1994)

added that partnerships with academic departments will provide lateral coordination and avoid groups within the institution competing for the same market.

There are differing views as to the extent of change that will be necessary. Gessner (1987a) opined that the changing relationship between higher education and society will evolve with continuing higher education serving as a major catalyst for change. This will require internal shifts including changes in organizational structure, financing, reward systems, program content, outcome measures, and ". . .the development of new institutional relationships leading to increased numbers of consortia and other forms of collaboration" (p. 237). There is general agreement that the changes needed will take more than a single program or policy implementation. "The world is becoming interdisciplinary and that is a problem for universities" (Desio, 1987, p. 26). Apps (1988) stated that ". . .to make such fundamental changes requires more than a fine tuning of existing programs" (p. 3) and called for a complete institutional transformation. He identified specific significant changes including structural changes to accommodate technologies, the blurring of distinctions between teaching, research and outreach, new approaches to teaching and learning, creative financing, special programs for special populations, and the development of change strategies to keep up with the dynamic internal and external environments. Ultimately, Apps (1988) advocated that institutions need to reconsider their missions and the purpose of higher education to reflect the societal changes and form priorities for institutional aims.

Summary

McCroskey (1998) argued that ". . .something has gone terribly wrong in communities across the nation" (p.3). Complex social problems and situations require better models of professional education that bring together various disciplines and perspectives to help professionals develop the knowledge and skills needed. Ideally, by participating in a formal collaborative education or training activity, students and professionals will experience the benefits and importance of such an interdisciplinary experience, thus enhancing future interprofessional collaboration (Wood, 1998).

Academic departments on university campuses have long histories of autonomy and independence. Collaboration and interdisciplinary activities may go against faculty and departmental traditions. Collaboration with continuing education units, which may be perceived as marginal, non-academic, and differing in value and mission, is likely to generate even greater resistance. Nevertheless, such collaborative arrangements are increasingly called for to address complex social issues, provide more practical and appropriate education and professional preparation for students, and utilize resources more effectively, efficiently, and productively. Long-term and system-wide strategies must be adopted that involve leadership, organizational structure, and faculty and staff involvement that will create, support, and sustain effective intra-institutional collaboration.

Based on the review of the literature, it is fair to say that in the 21st Century, the difficulties facing our nation are becoming so profound that such integrative visions must be developed and sustained. The breadth of problems affecting our society requires the realization that all the issues pertain to all populations and sub-populations. Our nation's

institutions, and certainly its universities, must participate in bringing knowledge to bear on circumstances critical to the quality of life in our nation and in finding viable solutions to the attending problems. Responses to this historically unparalleled challenge will influence not only the structure of much of higher education in the 21st century, but also will determine the very viability of public and private universities at that time (Lerner et al., 1998, p. 272).

The pressures on the universities and communities will foster an increased reliance on integrative visions and perspectives that are made possible through collaborative programs and activities. It is therefore essential to explore various aspects of intra-institutional collaborations, and to identify and understand the factors that may support or inhibit such efforts. The review of the literature revealed scanty reports of research and few models for guidance in the conceptualization, development, and/or implementation of intra-institutional collaborations. Therefore, the present study was designed to explore intra-institutional collaborations between continuing higher education units and academic departments at selected four-year, degree-granting institutions, as well as the leadership, organizational structure, and faculty/staff issues which may support or inhibit such efforts.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent and nature of collaboration between continuing education departments and academic units on university campuses, and to identify the elements essential to successful collaborations. The primary goals of this exploratory investigation were to: 1) identify existing collaborations involving continuing higher education departments and academic units on campuses of all degree-granting, higher education, organizational members of UCEA; 2) explore the nature and characteristics of these collaborations; and 3) identify factors perceived to be crucial to the success of the collaborations. This study also investigated the roles of institutional leadership, organizational structure, and faculty in supporting or inhibiting collaborative efforts. This chapter will discuss the methodology used to investigate these issues.

Research Methodology

This study used descriptive research methodology, specifically, the survey design approach. The descriptive approach was most appropriate for this study because, "Descriptive research is concerned with the current or past status of something. A descriptive study asks what is or what was; it reports things the way they are or were" (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997, p. 445). The survey design approach was chosen

because the goals of this investigation were to identify and describe the current status of collaborations and related factors. The survey method is recognized as effective for this type of investigation (Babbie, 1973), and provided the opportunity to collect representative data from a relatively large group of professionals at the national level so that the broadest possible array of ideas could be gleaned. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected as part of a multi-method effort to describe and understand the situations and experiences from the participants' perspectives (Babbie, 1995) and to allow for an in-depth investigation with the potential of being exploratory, descriptive, and confirmatory (McMillan and Schumacher, 1997).

Population and Sample

The target population identified in this investigation included all of the official representatives of four-year, degree-granting, higher education member institutions of UCEA. UCEA was founded in 1915 and consists of ". . .accredited, degree-granting higher education institutions and comparable non-profit organizations with a substantial involvement in postsecondary continuing education. UCEA organizational members include public and private institutions offering credit and non-credit instruction at the pre- and post-baccalaureate levels" (UCEA, 1997, p. iii). The target population for this study had the following characteristics:

- They were institutional representatives of organizational members of UCEA.
- They represented degree-granting post secondary institutions.
- The institutions they represented had adult and continuing education programs.

This population was identified using the 1999-2000 UCEA Membership Directory. The directory is updated and published annually and lists the names and addresses of all institutional representatives of organizational members. Some individual e-mail addresses are also included. While there are currently 421 total institutional members of UCEA listed, some are two-year colleges. The decision was made to survey only those representatives of four-year, degree-granting institutions of higher education, since this was the institutional type that was of interest. The potential study sample was purposely limited to this group to control for the diversity in missions, organizational structure, policies, and programs that are inherent in the different types of institutions. The strategy used was one suggested in Alreck and Settle's (1985) guidelines for selecting sample units. They specifically stated that, "If the unit contains several individuals who might provide different data, the specification of the unit is too broad and should be narrowed" (p. 71). Consequently, the total number in this defined or accessible population was 355.

A letter was mailed to each of the 355 individuals listed as the institutional representatives for his/her respective institutions. An e-mail message was also sent to each of those whose e-mail address was available. The mailing included a letter of introduction from the researcher explaining the nature and intent of the research project, a notice of the survey to follow, and an appeal for participation. A copy of this initial letter of introduction and notification can be found in Appendix A. One week later, a second letter was sent. It included a cover letter referring to the previous correspondence and reminder of the project, the survey instrument, and a return addressed, postage-paid envelope. In return for participation, the institutional representatives were promised a

summary of the results of the study. A copy of the cover letter can be found in Appendix B.

Of the letters and surveys sent to 355 institutional representatives, 106 (30%) of the surveys were completed, returned, and included in the analyses carried out for this study. These 106 respondents comprise the study sample.

Design of the Instrument

The review of the literature indicated that there were many investigations of inter-institutional collaborations, but little research on intra-institutional collaborations. Further, the literature search was not able to produce any previously-generated, single instrument that captured completely the variables and concepts that had been identified as desirable to be studied. Therefore, a survey instrument was developed specifically for the purpose of this investigation.

The literature review did, however, yield relevant related research, which aided in the direction to the generation and inclusion of pertinent items for the survey. In addition, questions were derived from suggestions and comments made in conversations with professionals in the field of higher education.

Efforts were made to construct a survey instrument that was both thorough in coverage and parsimonious in use of space and length of the questionnaire. In its first section, Part One: Professional Assignment and Program Description, the survey instrument solicits basic demographic data on the respondent and the institution that the respondent represents. Also included are open-ended questions designed to provide descriptive information on the respondents' professional assignment and background, as

well as the size, type, and location of the institution and continuing education department. The second section of Part One solicits program data, inquiring into the types of programs offered and the primary focus of the continuing education department. A five-point, Likert-type scale asks for the frequency of offering for each type of program listed (i.e., non-credit community programs, professional certificate programs, credit programs), with 5 indicating "Always Offer," 4 indicating "Often Offer," 3 indicating "Sometimes Offer," 2 indicating "Rarely Offer," and 1 indicating "Never Offer." The final section of Part One was designed to ascertain if student and faculty support services are available for credit and non-credit continuing education participants and programs. If they are available, the respondent is asked to indicate if the central administration or the continuing higher education department provides the services.

Part Two of the instrument, Organizational Structure and Characteristics, includes questions regarding organizational structure and various institutional policies and operational procedures that the literature suggested might be related to intra-institutional collaborations. The questions are presented in a forced choice format and were designed to solicit descriptive information regarding the continuing education organizational structure, funding sources, and proximity to the host campus and central administrative office. This part also includes a series of items intended to assess the general level of regard or value placed on continuing education programs and participants as perceived by the respondent. For each item, the respondent was instructed to select from three responses: "yes," "no," and "not sure." Each item is preceded by the root "In general, on my campus..." and sample items are, "The Continuing Education Function is supported by my institution's mission statement," "Continuing Education students are considered of

equal importance to traditional students." Part Two concludes with two open-ended questions, which ask the respondent to identify specific factors that enhance or inhibit collaborative efforts on his/her campus. Open-ended questions were used to generate qualitative data, which can provide "well-grounded, rich descriptions and explanations of processes occurring in local contexts"(Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 15). Furthermore, qualitative data have the benefit of providing ". . .concrete, vivid, meaningful flavor that often proves far more convincing to a reader, another researcher, a policy maker, a practitioner, than [do] pages of numbers" (p. 15).

The questions in Part Three of the survey instrument, Campus Leadership, are designed to yield data to assess the level of institutional leadership support for continuing education and collaborative efforts as perceived by the respondent. The respondent is instructed to indicate if top campus administrators demonstrate support of continuing education in various ways, including suggesting possible program ideas, providing seed money for new programs, including continuing education staff in campus activities, and so forth. The stem preceding each item is: "In general, top administrators on my campus demonstrate support of continuing education in the following ways:" For each item, the respondent is asked to select their response from three choices: "yes," "no," "not sure." Sample items include: "Help promote continuing education in the campus community;" "Support academic faculty's participation in extension programs;" "Consider continuing education programs of equal status to academic units." The individual items were selected from the literature and/or emerged from personal, telephone, and electronic conversations with professionals in higher education representing both academic and continuing education departments.

Part Four of the instrument, Academic Faculty, addresses the level of academic faculty support for continuing education and collaborative efforts as perceived by the respondent. The respondent is asked to indicate whether or not academic faculty demonstrate support of continuing education and collaborative efforts in various ways, including suggesting possible program ideas, teaching continuing education classes, including continuing education staff in campus activities, and other endeavors. The stem preceding each item is "In general, members of the academic faculty on my campus demonstrate support of continuing education in the following ways:" For each item, the respondent is instructed to select their response from three choices, "yes," "no," "not sure." Sample items include "Use continuing education programs to support and communicate their research;" "Teaching continuing education/extension classes;" "Encourage their students to participate in continuing education programs." The individual items were selected from the literature and also emerged from personal, telephone, and electronic conversations with professionals in higher education and representing both academic and continuing education departments.

Part Five: Status of Collaborations of this survey explores the existence and frequency of collaborative activities between the respondent's continuing education department and academic units on their campuses, as well as the respondent's level of satisfaction with each particular level and type of collaboration. This section solicits information on specific collaborative programs such as non-credit classes, credit classes, and conferences, and also on collaborative administrative activities such as joint planning of specific courses, recruitment of students, and evaluation of programs. For each collaborative program and activity, the respondent is asked to indicate the extent to

which their program is involved in a variety of particular collaborative efforts and their level of satisfaction with that involvement. The respondent must select one of five responses: 5 indicating "No, and am not interested"; 4 indicating "No, but would like to;" 3 indicating "Yes, we collaborate on these activities but would like to collaborate less;" 2 indicating "Yes, but would like to do more"; and 1 indicating "Yes, and am satisfied." The list of collaborative programs and activities was constructed from those mentioned in the literature or those that emerged from personal, telephone, and electronic conversations with professionals in the field of higher education.

The final section of Part Five of the survey instrument includes two open-ended questions. The first asks the respondent to describe a successful collaborative activity that their department has participated in, and to identify the factors that contributed to its success. The respondents are then asked to describe a collaborative effort that was not successful and to offer their opinion as to why it failed. As previously stated, the open-ended questions provide qualitative data, which can be exploratory, descriptive, and confirmatory, as well as "assess local causality" and lead to "new theoretical implications" (Miles and Huberman, 1984, p. 15).

The survey concludes by asking the respondents if they could be contacted at a later date, and if so, to indicate their name, phone number, and email address.

Pilot Test

A pilot test was conducted to assess the clarity of the survey questions, the ease of administration, and the appropriateness and effectiveness of the questions and vocabulary. A request was made to participants of a professional electronic listserv

comprised of members of the Association for Adult and Continuing Education (AACE), asking for volunteers to participate in this pilot study. This moderated listserv provides a forum by which professionals in the field of adult and continuing education can network and discuss relevant issues. Membership in AACE is encouraged but is not a requirement for participation on the listserv. Twenty-four people responded to the request, and fifteen completed and returned the survey pilot draft. The pilot study participants who were sent the survey were limited to those who were affiliated with adult and continuing education and were not institutional members of UCEA. This insured that pilot test participants would not also be part of the study's final population.

The pilot study identified several necessary vocabulary changes for increased understanding and clarity. The pilot study also identified items that needed more clear instructions. A few of the participants recommended that some of the questions be asked in an open-ended format, to allow for more flexibility in responses, thus aiding in the gathering of more in-depth data. Pilot test participants indicated that the survey took approximately 20 minutes to complete. Most affirmed the need for the study, shared some of their own professional challenges and experiences with collaboration, and expressed support for the project. The suggested changes and clarifications were made. The final version of the survey questionnaire as it was actually used in the study can be found in Appendix C.

Data Collection and Analysis

This exploratory study utilized a survey design and quantitative and qualitative data analysis. It was felt that by incorporating both quantitative and qualitative data and

analysis the study would be strengthened. This approach would decrease the possibility of insufficient bases for interpretation, reduce ambiguity and confusion, and strengthen validity by providing multiple reference points for interpretation. According to Newman and Benz (1998), utilizing both quantitative and qualitative data invariably helps to enhance validity by using more than one reference point. Furthermore, cross validation is possible, which allows researchers to have more confidence in their research results, and can stimulate creative interpretations of data and thus more constructive and useful resolutions to a problem.

As previously explained, after previous notification, the survey questionnaire, an instructional cover letter from the researcher and a return self-addressed stamped envelope were mailed to each of the institutional representatives of the four-year, degree-granting, organizational member institutions of UCEA as listed in the 1999-2000 member directory. A reminder letter encouraging those who had not yet responded to do so was mailed out to all of the survey participants approximately three weeks after the original survey was mailed. An additional follow-up email notice was also sent to those with email addresses.

The surveys were returned to the Cannon Research Center at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, where the data were recorded. The responses were scanned onto a computer disc and made available to the researcher for the quantitative and qualitative data analysis. Appropriate analyses of the quantitative data were carried out based upon the level of measurement and depending on the type of question asked. Responses that could be analyzed by applying descriptive statistics were treated appropriately and yielded sums, averages, ranges, and percentages accordingly.

The analysis of the qualitative data, based upon the open-ended questions asked, involved the identification of recurring themes, which were classified and counted. The process of inductive analysis was utilized, guided by the four cyclical phases as identified by McMillan and Schumacher (1997). These four phases as described on page 502 are:

1) Continuous discovery to identify tentative patterns

2) Categorizing and ordering of data

3) Assessing the trustworthiness of the data

4) Written synthesis of theme and/or concepts

The data were initially reviewed and evaluated for quality and relevance. Topical similarities and themes were identified and guided the categorizing, ordering, analysis, and interpretation of the data. The organization of the data followed McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) guidelines and included the following steps: 1) All of the data were read to get a sense of the whole; 2) Emerging topics were identified; 3) The topics were reviewed and compared for duplication and overlap in meaning and a provisional classification system was developed; and 4) The classification system was refined and finalized. The recurring themes that resulted from the process were then used as the basis for inductive interpretation of the qualitative data.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of an analysis of the data from the survey of institutional representatives of organizational members of UCEA regarding the nature and extent of their intra-institutional collaborative programs, their level of satisfaction with the collaborations, and the factors perceived to support or inhibit collaborations on their campus.

Description of the Sample

Part One of the instrument collected demographic data on both the respondent and the institution that he or she represented. It included open-ended questions designed to provide descriptive information on the respondent's professional assignment and background, as well as the size, type, and location of the institution and continuing education department. The second section of Part One solicited program data. It inquired into the types of programs offered through the continuing education program and the primary focus of the continuing education department.

Demographic Information

Respondents

A total of 106 surveys were returned for a response rate of 30%. Six of the surveys were not useable. Therefore, a total of 100 completed instruments representing four-year, degree-granting institutions of higher education were included in this study. Of the 100 professionals, 89% indicated a full-time assignment in continuing education. Only 7% had a part-time assignment in continuing education, and those indicated that they were also assigned to various other responsibilities including summer session programs, programs for academic credit, athletic and scholarship programs, graduate studies, and distance learning. The remaining respondents (4%) did not indicate their assignment status.

The respondents differed greatly in their official titles, reporting lines, and professional and academic experiences. The vast majority of respondents' professional titles were either Dean or Director which, taken together, represented approximately 75% of the total. The entire array of titles is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Professional Titles of Respondents

Title	Frequency (N=98)
Dean	38
Director	37
Associate Dean	6
Associate Vice President	5
Executive Director	3
Administrator of Programs	2
Associate Director	2
Vice President	1
State Director	1
Chief Administrative Officer	1
Assistant Vice Chancellor	1
Vice Provost	1

In addition to their own professional title, respondents were asked to indicate the title or office to which they directly report. There were twelve different reporting lines identified, with one-half reporting to the comparable offices of Provost or Vice President of Academic Affairs. The reporting lines and frequency of each of the responses are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Reporting Lines of Respondents

Reporting Line	Frequency (N=99)
Provost	32
Vice President of Academic Affairs	18
Dean	13
Vice/Associate Chancellor	8
Associate Provost	6
Associate Vice President	6
President	5
Vice President: External Affairs/Outreach	3
Vice President, Adult/Continuing Education	2
Vice President	2
Senior Vice President	2
Executive Director	1
State Office/Public Instruction	1

The professionals participating in this study possessed a wide range of professional and educational experiences. The respondents also varied in the amount of time they had been at their current respective institutions as well as the number of years they had been involved in continuing education. The following tables present responses and frequencies provided by the respondents with regard to their time at their institution (Table 3), time in the field (Table 4), highest degree conferred (Table 5), and discipline in which the highest degree was earned (Table 6).

Over 25% of the respondents were relatively new at their current institution (five years or less). Conversely, approximately 10% indicated 26 years or more. The

remaining responses were distributed relatively equitably. A complete presentation of the responses can be found in Table 3.

Table 3. Time at Institution	
Time At Your Institution	Frequency (N=101)
Five years or less	29
6 – 10 years	13
11 – 15 years	19
16 – 20 years	16
21 – 25 years	12
26 – 30 years	7
31 years or more	5

The responses to Question 6 as presented in Table 4 indicate that the majority of respondents have extensive long-term experience in the field of continuing education. In fact, 30% stated that they had at least 21 years of experience in the field.

Table 4. Time in the Field	
Time In the Field	Frequency (N=100)
Five years or less	14
6 – 10 years	12
11 – 15 years	18
16 – 20 years	26
21 – 25 years	12
26 – 30 years	8
31 years or more	10

When asked to indicate their highest degree conferred, the majority of respondents (68%) had achieved a doctoral level education. Of those with a doctorate (67), 68% had earned a Ph.D., and about 27% had earned an Ed.D. Approximately 28% had achieved a Master's Degree level. A complete listing of responses can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. Educational Background		
Degree Level	Degree	Frequency (N=98)
Doctoral		
	Ph.D.	46
	Ed.D	18
	DPA	2
	JD	1
Masters		
	M.S.	14
	M.Ed.	5
	MBA	5
	M.A	4
Bachelors		
	BS	1
	BA	1
ABD		1

While the respondents were relatively homogeneous with regard to the level of education attained, there was less consistency in the field in which they received their education. As indicated in Table 6, approximately one-half received their degree in a particular area of Education, although the specializations varied. Business was the second most common area of educational background, with 15 respondents receiving their degree in some Business-related specialization. The remaining responses were distributed over a variety of other disciplines. A complete display of responses can be found in Table 6.

Table 6. Discipline of Highest Degree

Discipline	Specialization	# of Responses
Education	General	14
	Continuing Adult Education	13
	Higher Education	8
	Education Leadership Administration	8
	Education Psychology	3
	Early Childhood, Vocational, Business Ed, Instructional Technology, Bilingual Ed, History and Philosophy of Education, Physical Ed	1 each
Business	General	1
	Administration	5
	Management	5
	Economics, Organizational Development, Global Management, Intellectual Management	1 each
Psychology /Counseling		3
Health Education and Promotion		3
Public Administration		3
History		3
Communication		2
Law		2
Theology, Film, Sociology, Chemistry, Geography, Zoology, American Literature, English, Germanic Languages, Human Behavior, Political Science, Mathematics, Media Technology		1 each

Respondents were asked to indicate their primary professional duties within their continuing higher education assignment. Some answered this question by indicating their official title. Others listed their functions or roles. Still others listed the specific types of programs under their charge. The responses were grouped and counted

accordingly. Some respondents included more than one type of duty. Table 7 describes the different types of responses and the frequency of each response.

The greatest number of responses related to the functions or roles of the respondent's professional position. While many of the specific roles may overlap, the greatest number identified their primary role as "administration." Of those referring to programs under their direction, the majority specified "self-funded continuing education." Only seven responses referred to the respondent's professional title.

Table 7. Primary Professional Duties

Type of Response	Specific Responses	# of Responses
Title		
	Director	4
	Dean	2
	Vice Provost	1
Function/Role		
	Administration	23
	Leadership	9
	Coordinate/Collaborate Outreach	8
	Management	6
	Academic Management	6
	Budget Administration	5
	Supervision	4
	Program Planning and Development	4
	Operation, policy, procedures	3
	Hire faculty	2
	Student Advising	1
	Marketing	1
Types of Programs		
	Self Funded, Continuing Education	24
	Distance Education	5
	Off Campus, Evening Programs	4
	Non Traditional Student Programs	3
	Summer Session	2
	Graduate Programs	2
	Credit Classes	1

Institutions

Part One: Professional Assignment and Program Description of the survey questionnaire also solicited descriptive data regarding the name and estimated annual enrollments of the continuing higher education unit, as well as the estimated annual enrollment of the respective institution. Respondents were also asked how long the continuing education unit has existed at their institution.

The 100 respondents provided 35 different names for the continuing higher education unit at their institution. While approximately one-half of the responses listed unit names which included the term "continuing education," other unit titles were identified including "extended education," "lifelong learning," and "continuing studies," to name a few. Of those titles that incorporated the term "continuing education," approximately one-half referred to their unit as the "Division of Continuing Education." All of the unit names and frequency of responses are listed in Table 8.

As with the department/unit names, there is little consistency in the amount of time that the units have existed on their respective campuses. Approximately 15% of the respondents indicated that the continuing education unit has existed on their campus for less than 10 years. A few more (approximately 20%) indicated that continuing education had existed on their campus for more than 51 years. The greatest number of responses fell in the "21 to 30 year" category. The remaining responses were dispersed across a variety of responses and are presented in Table 9.

Table 8. Unit/Department Name		
	Unit Name	# of Responses
Continuing Education	Continuing Education	10
	Division of Continuing Education	24
	Office of Continuing Education	5
	School of Continuing Education	5
	Center for Continuing Education	2
	Department of Continuing Education	1
	College of Continuing Education	1
	Program of Continuing Education	1
Extended Education	Extended Education	7
	Office of Extended Studies	6
	College of Extended Studies	1
	Center of Extended Learning	1
Lifelong Learning		4
Continuing Studies		4
Metro College, University Outreach, University College, Distance Education and Learning, Extension Campus Programs		2 each
Career Services, Academic Outreach, Summer Programs, College of Professional Studies, University Extension, School of Adult and Graduate Education, Division of Independent Studies, Division for Public Services, College of Professional Skills, General Studies, Special Studies, Outreach College, Academic Affairs, Adult Extension		1 each

Table 9. Continuing Education Unit: Time on Campus	
Time frame of unit	# of responses
Less than 10 years	15
11 – 20 years	8
21 – 30 years	29
31 – 40 years	16
41 – 50 years	7
51 or more years	19
N/A	9

To get a better picture of the continuing education unit and its respective institution, two questions were included to ascertain the total annual enrollment of each of the continuing education units and the respective institutions. Once again the responses illustrate the diversity in the institutions and continuing education units included in this study. Nearly one-third of responses fell between 1,001 and 6,000 annual course or activity enrollments; however, an impressive proportion (22%) indicated a total of course or activity enrollments greater than 18,000. The responses to the "more than 18,000" category were broken down further to provide a more accurate picture of the annual enrollments of the relatively larger continuing higher education units. Five responses fell between 18,001 and 21,000. A total of nine responses fell between 21,001 and 60,000. Three respondents had enrollment estimates between 60,001 and 100,000. A total of five respondents indicated that their continuing higher education units demonstrated over 100,000 annual enrollments. A listing of the responses can be found in Table 10. The table does not include the specific breakdown of the "more than 18,000" category.

Table 10. Continuing Education Annual Enrollment

CHE annual enrollment (headcount)	# of responses
Less than 1000	10
1001 – 6000	31
6001 – 12000	17
12001 – 18000	10
More than 18000	22
N/A	9

Finally, the respondents indicated the estimated annual student enrollment in headcount for their respective institution. Approximately one-third of the respondents indicated that their institution had an estimated annual student enrollment of 5,000 –

15,000. Similarly, close to one-third represented institutions that had an annual student enrollment of 15,001 – 25,000. Approximately 15% of the respondents represented institutions with less than 5,000 annual student enrollments. A complete listing of responses can be found in Table 11.

Table 11. Institutional Annual Enrollment

Institutional annual enrollment (headcount)	# of responses
Less than 5000	15
5001 – 15000	36
15001 – 25000	30
25001 – 35000	5
More than 35,001	5
N/A	2

It is important to note that six respondents listed their institutional enrollments as Full Time Equivalent (FTE) rather than by actual student headcount. The six FTE responses were: 4,000, 4400, 7500, 10,000, 14,000, and 20,000.

Program Characteristics

In order to gain more insight into the specific types of programs offered through each of the continuing education units represented in this study, respondents were asked questions regarding program offerings and focus. Question 13 listed the following choices in types of programs:

Non-credit:	Community/Leisure classes
Non-credit:	Professional classes
Certificate:	Professional Certificates, Conferences, Distance Education, Correspondence Education, Academic Credit Classes, Undergraduate Degree Programs, and Graduate Degree Programs.

Using a Likert-type scale, the respondents were asked to indicate if they Always, Often, Sometimes, Rarely, or Never offered each of these programs. A compilation of the responses is presented in Table 12.

The results from the data analysis show which programs are offered more or less regularly through the continuing education units represented in this study. As the results indicate, Academic Credit classes are "Always" offered by over three-fourths of the respondents' continuing education departments. Distance Education and Professional Certificate programs were also "Always" offered by a relatively large portion of the sample (68%). Undergraduate Degree Programs, Graduate Degree Programs, and Non-credit: Community/Leisure classes were "Always" offered by slightly more than half of the respondents. Conversely, Correspondence Education was "Never" offered by more than half (53%) of the respondents' continuing education programs.

Programs were considered to be regularly offered (more than just "Sometimes") by combining the "Always" responses with the "Often" responses. Thus it was revealed that Academic Credit classes are offered on a regular basis most often by a good majority of the respondents (81%), followed closely by Professional Certificate and Distance Education programs that are offered regularly by 80% and 79% of the respondents, respectively. Non-credit Professional classes (70%), Undergraduate Degree Programs (60%), Graduate Degree Programs (53%), and Non-Credit Community/Leisure classes (56%) were also found to be offered regularly by a majority of the programs. The data also indicate that Correspondence Education and Conferences are not offered regularly by a majority of the programs.

Table 12. Frequency of Program Offerings		
a. Non-credit: Community / Leisure classes	Frequency	%
Never Offer	17	17.53%
Rarely Offer	12	12.37%
Sometimes Offer	15	15.46%
Often Offer	7	7.22%
Always Offer	46	47.42%
b. Non-credit: Professional classes	Frequency	%
Never Offer	8	8.16%
Rarely Offer	9	9.18%
Sometimes Offer	12	12.24%
Often Offer	19	19.39%
Always Offer	50	51.02%
c. Certificate: Professional Certificates	Frequency	%
Never Offer	4	4.08%
Rarely Offer	1	1.02%
Sometimes Offer	14	14.29%
Often Offer	12	12.24%
Always Offer	67	68.37%
d. Conferences	Frequency	%
Never Offer	10	10.31%
Rarely Offer	17	17.53%
Sometimes Offer	23	23.71%
Often Offer	7	7.22%
Always Offer	40	41.24%
e. Distance Education	Frequency	%
Never Offer	5	5.10%
Rarely Offer	6	6.12%
Sometimes Offer	10	10.20%
Often Offer	10	10.20%
Always Offer	67	68.37%

f. Correspondence Education	Frequency	%
Never Offer	51	53.13%
Rarely Offer	8	8.33%
Sometimes Offer	1	1.04%
Often Offer	0	0.00%
Always Offer	36	37.50%

g. Academic Credit classes	Frequency	%
Never Offer	11	11.46%
Rarely Offer	2	2.08%
Sometimes Offer	5	5.21%
Often Offer	4	4.17%
Always Offer	74	77.08%

h. Undergraduate Degree Programs	Frequency	%
Never Offer	33	34.38%
Rarely Offer	3	3.13%
Sometimes Offer	2	2.08%
Often Offer	3	3.13%
Always Offer	55	57.29%

i. Graduate Degree Programs	Frequency	%
Never Offer	37	38.14%
Rarely Offer	6	6.19%
Sometimes Offer	3	3.09%
Often Offer	2	2.06%
Always Offer	49	50.52%

Question 14 asked the respondents to indicate the major focus(es) of the continuing education/extension program by selecting from a menu of choices that included:

Evening/Weekend Credit Courses
Adult Basic Education
Non-credit Community Interest
Professional and Continuing Professional Education
Distance Education
Academic Departments Usually Control the Focus

Respondents were prompted to make more than one choice if appropriate.

The responses clearly indicated that Professional and Continuing Professional Education is the major focus of most of the programs represented in this study. Approximately 80% selected this response choice. Distance Education also emerged as a significant focus for a strong majority (approximately 66%) of the programs represented. A little more than one-half of the respondents identified both Evening and Weekend Credit courses and Non-credit Community Interests courses as major focuses. Only 11% identified Adult Basic Education as a major focus of their programs. Interestingly, 21% indicated that the academic departments (not the continuing education departments) have control over determining the major focus of the programs offered. A complete display of the results is presented in Table 13.

Table 13. Focus of Continuing Education Program

The focus is on:	Freq.	%
Evening / weekend credit courses	55	55.56
Adult basic education	11	11.11
Non-credit community interests	50	50.51
Professional and continuing professional education	79	79.80
Distance education	66	66.67
Academic departments usually control the focus	21	21.21

In addition to the program offerings, respondents were asked about the administrative functions and services which support their continuing education programs, students, and faculty. Of particular concern were student registration, advising, and record-keeping including the posting of transcripts for both credit and non-credit classes. Queries were also made about program marketing and evaluation, and faculty training and evaluation.

The responses clearly demonstrate that there is a difference in the way non-credit and credit students are served by the continuing education office and the main campus. With regard to registration, the continuing education office attends to almost all (93%) of the non-credit students but handles less, although still a substantial amount (35%), of the credit registrations. The results for student advising are similar in that the continuing education office handles most of the student advising for non-credit classes (81%), while covering a significant portion of the student advising for credit classes (42%). It is also important to note that while 14% of the respondents indicated that student advising was not offered for non-credit students, only 3% indicated that student advising was not offered for credit students. Posting of student transcripts illustrates another function in which credit and non-credit students are treated differently, although the main campus does assist in this function for non-credit students more often (20%) than with registration and advising. In addition, the continuing education office was not responsible for posting the students' transcripts for credit. It is also important to note that non-credit student transcripts were not formally kept at 15% of the programs represented in this study.

The continuing education offices represented in this study also assumed a lion's share of the other administrative responsibilities to support their programs and faculty. 97% of the continuing education offices handled their own program marketing, and 93% conducted their own program evaluation. The main campus was a little more involved with respect to functions related to faculty, but the primary responsibilities still fell on the continuing education office. The continuing education office conducted approximately 80% of faculty training, while the main campus assisted in 15% of the programs represented in this study. In 5% of the programs, no continuing education faculty training was offered.

While the main campus was involved to a slightly greater extent in the evaluation of continuing education faculty (a little more than 20%), the brunt of this responsibility fell to Continuing Education. A complete listing of the functions and assigned responsibility can be found in Table 14.

Part Two: Organizational Structure and Characteristics

Part Two of the survey included questions pertaining to the organizational structure and characteristics of the respondents' continuing education departments and respective institutions. The overall organizational structure of continuing education within its respective institution may impact collaborative efforts. Question 16 inquired into this structural component. The most common organizational structure was identified. Over half (58%) of the respondents indicated that their continuing education program was "Centralized: A separate CE department." A little more than one-quarter (27%) said they had a mixed model with "Formal Arrangement and approved

combination of centralized and decentralized models." Only 8% had a mixed model with academic departments performing their own CE without CE unit participation. In addition, only 2% indicated that continuing education in their institution was completely decentralized. A complete presentation of the responses follows in Table 15.

Also related to the organizational structure and collaborative effort is the funding structure. Question 17 asked respondents to indicate the funding structure of their continuing education unit. Over one-half (54%) indicated that their continuing education unit was "Primarily self-supporting, partially subsidized." Approximately one-quarter (26%) were completely self-supporting and receive no funding support. A relatively small group indicated that their continuing education unit was "primarily subsidized, partially self-supporting." Only one respondent represented a program that was completely subsidized by state, government, or university funding. A complete list of the responses is presented in Table 16.

Table 14. Functions and Responsibility		
a. Student Registration: Non-credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	89	92.71%
Main Campus Office	4	4.17%
Not Offered	3	3.13%
b. Student Advising: Non-credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	74	81.32%
Main Campus Office	4	4.40%
Not Offered	13	14.29%
c. Student Transcripts: Non-credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	62	64.58%
Main Campus Office	19	19.79%
Not Offered	15	15.63%
d. Student Registration: Credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	35	36.46%
Main Campus Office	58	60.42%
Not Offered	3	3.13%
e. Student Advising: Credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	39	41.94%
Main Campus Office	51	54.84%
Not Offered	3	3.23%
f. Student Transcripts: Credit classes	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	1	1.05%
Main Campus Office	92	96.84%
Not Offered	2	2.11%

g. CE Program Marketing	Frequency	%
Continuing Education Office	91	96.81%
Main Campus Office	3	3.19%
Not Offered	0	0.00%
h. CE Program Evaluation	**Frequency**	**%**
Continuing Education Office	88	92.63%
Main Campus Office	7	7.37%
Not Offered	0	0.00%
i. CE Faculty Training	**Frequency**	**%**
Continuing Education Office	73	79.35%
Main Campus Office	14	15.22%
Not Offered	5	5.43%
j. CE Faculty Evaluation	**Frequency**	**%**
Continuing Education Office	72	77.42%
Main Campus Office	20	21.51%
Not Offered	1	1.08%

Table 15. Organizational Structure	Frequency	%
Centralized: separate CE department	56	57.73%
Decentralized: Each academic college / department is responsible for field-related CE programs.	2	2.06%
Mixed: Formal arrangement and approved combination of centralized and decentralized models.	26	26.80%
Mixed: Formal centralized model but academic departments perform their own CE programs without the CE unit participation.	8	8.25%
Other: Please explain . . . "Fully integrated. There is no distinction between CE and academic departments" "We are decentralized but academic departments offer their own CE program without the CE unit participation"	5	5.15%

Table 16. Funding Structure	Frequency	%
Completely self-supporting	25	26.04%
Completely subsidized by state / government / university funding	1	1.04%
Primarily self-supporting, partially subsidized	52	54.17%
Primarily subsidized, partially self-supporting	15	15.63%
Other: Please explain . . .	3	3.13%

Organizational Structure

Part Two: Organizational Structure and Characteristics of the survey instrument included two questions pertaining to the location of the continuing education department as well as the location of classes offered by the unit. Question 18 asked the respondent to indicate where, physically, the continuing education office is located in relation to the institution's central administrative offices. Almost all (89%) of the respondents indicated that the continuing education office is located on the main campus. One-half indicated that their continuing education department has their own building on the campus, while 20% share a building with other academic departments and 18% share a building with administrative offices. The responses to Question 18 are presented in Table 17.

Table 17. Location of Continuing Education Office

	Frequency	%
In same building as main administrative offices	17	17.53%
In same building as other academic departments	20	20.62%
On main campus but CE has own facility	49	50.52%
Separated and off campus	9	9.28%
Other: Please explain . . .	2	2.06%

In addition to the location of the continuing education office, the respondents were also asked to indicate where the continuing education classes are held. As presented in Table 18, an overwhelming majority (96%) indicated that their continuing education classes are held both on and off the main campus.

Table 18 Locations of Continuing Education Programs

	Frequency	%
Only on the main campus	2	2.13%
Only off campus	2	2.13%
Both on and off campus	90	95.74%

Collaborative Relationships

Part Two of the survey concluded with a Likert-type item asking the respondent to rate, in general, the collaborative relationship between continuing education and academic departments on campus. The response choices included: Very Positive, Somewhat Positive, Neutral, Somewhat Negative, and Very Negative. The respondents were asked to select only one response.

The results indicate that almost all of the individuals perceived that a positive collaborative relationship exists between their continuing education departments and academic units on their campus. Approximately 95% felt that the relationship was positive, with close to 50% choosing "somewhat positive" and 46% "very positive." None of the respondents indicated a "very negative" relationship, and only 2% felt that the relationship was "somewhat negative." A complete list of the responses is presented in Table 19.

Table 19 General Collaborative Relationships

	Frequency	%
Very Positive	45	46.39%
Somewhat Positive	48	49.48%
Neutral	2	2.06%
Somewhat Negative	2	2.06%
Very Negative	0	0.00%

Aspects of Support

The respondents' perceptions of the general collaborative relationship between the continuing education department and academic units on their campus was explored further. Specific aspects of the relationship were explored, including institutional support for continuing education programs and attitudes towards continuing education students, programs, and faculty. The respondents were asked to respond to a series of statements pertaining to these components of the collaborative relationship with either "Yes," "No," or "Not Sure."

While most respondents (90%) agreed with the first statement, "The CE function is supported by my institution's mission statement," there were less positive responses to the subsequent statements. For instance, only 36% indicated that CE programs are respected as much as traditional academic programs; a little over half of the respondents answered in the affirmative that "CE students are considered to be of equal caliber to traditional students" and slightly less than half (45%) felt that "CE students are considered to be of equal importance to traditional students." Only 61% stated that CE students have access to the same campus services as traditional students. Furthermore, only 58% thought that continuing education faculty is considered of equal caliber to academic department faculty. A complete list of responses is presented in Table 20.

Table 20 Support for Continuing Education		
a. The CE function is supported by my institution's mission statement	Frequency	%
YES	87	90.63%
NO	6	6.25%
Not Sure	3	3.13%
b. CE students are considered to be of equal caliber to traditional students.	Frequency	%
YES	54	55.67%
NO	32	32.99%
Not Sure	11	11.34%
c. CE students are considered to be of equal importance to traditional students.	Frequency	%
YES	43	44.79%
NO	48	50.00%
Not Sure	5	5.21%
d. CE programs are respected as much as traditional academic programs.	Frequency	%
YES	35	36.46%
NO	51	53.13%
Not Sure	10	10.42%
e. CE students have access to the same campus services as traditional students.	Frequency	%
YES	59	61.46%
NO	36	37.50%
Not Sure	1	1.04%
f. CE faculty are considered equal to academic faculty.	Frequency	%
YES	54	58.06%
NO	33	35.48%
Not Sure	6	6.45%

Benefits of Collaboration

Part Two of the instrument, Organization Structure and Characteristics, concluded with three open-ended questions asking respondents to describe, in their own words, their perception of the benefits of collaboration, and factors which support or inhibit collaborative activity on their campuses. All respondents who answered (98%) indicated that they did perceive collaboration to be beneficial. Respondents were also asked to explain their reasons for stating that collaboration was or was not beneficial. Following is a summary of the responses.

As previously explained, the qualitative data analysis followed McMillan and Schumacher's guidelines (1997) and included the following steps: 1) all of the data were read to get a sense of the whole; 2) emerging topics were identified; 3) the topics were reviewed and compared for duplication and overlap in meaning and a provisional classification system was developed; and 4) the classification system was refined.

The open-ended question inquiring into the respondents' perceived benefits of collaboration solicited a total of 96 comments. Initially, the responses were read for general understanding and clarity. The topics were reviewed and duplicate responses were grouped together. The responses were then listed again in groups based on the similar themes and topics that were identified. The groups were reviewed to check for consistency of themes within each group and to avoid duplication between groups. Two individuals, not involved with this study, were asked to review the responses and classification. Both confirmed the appropriateness of the classifications.

The respondents identified a variety of benefits of collaboration, which fell into four main categories:

1) Benefits to the Program and Students;
2) Benefits to the Institution;
3) Benefits to the Field and Profession of Adult and Continuing Education; and
4) "Mandated," particularly with academic credit classes offered through continuing education.

The response category, "Benefits to the Program and Students," encompassed a variety of benefits including the expansion of program offerings and the enhancement of program quality. According to the respondents, the students would benefit, positively, from the quantity and quality of programs that the collaboration produced.

The benefits of collaboration, according to the respondents, extend beyond the individual program and students, affecting the institution as well as the field of adult and continuing higher education. Specifically, the outcomes of successful collaborative efforts can enhance the image of the institution and fulfill its outreach mission. Through the increased programs, enhanced quality, and recognized contribution to the institutional mission, the field and profession of adult and continuing higher education may also benefit. Continuing higher education can begin to be perceived as integral rather than marginal to the campus community, thus enhancing the image and perception of the profession.

In the "mandated" cases, collaboration was not just beneficial but essential. Table 21 displays this matrix and gives examples of some of the statements which fell into each category. A complete list of responses can be found in Appendix D.

Only two comments offered were less positive about the benefits of collaboration. When asked if they believed that collaboration is beneficial to their program, two

respondents did not answer "yes" or "no." When asked to explain, one respondent stated that "It depends on the discipline," and the other responded that, "Sometimes it helps and sometimes it holds us back because the departments and faculty do not have cutting edge and worldly experience."

Table 21 Benefits to Collaboration

Benefit to the Program Use of shared resources Provide richness, creativity Legitimacy, rigor, quality Faculty provide instructional resources	**52 comments** "Continuing Education could not exist without collaboration with academic departments. They approve and legitimize the quality of CE outreach." "In order to maintain the academic integrity of our courses." "We can't or simply are not subject matter experts in all areas." "Enables us to distinguish ourselves from our competitors."
Benefit to the Institution Supports campus mission Academic outreach Improve campus image	**19 comments** "Duplication of efforts and mixed image to the public are more likely with little or no collaborative activities." "Collaboration is essential if the program is to be truly representative of the institution." "We do not separate CE and academic department faculty. We are one institution dealing with the needs of adult students."
Benefit to the Field of Adult and Continuing Education Improve understanding and awareness of Continuing Education to the academic community	**14 comments** "CE keeps faculty interested in non-traditional populations." "They (academic faculty and staff) can learn more about non-traditional education." "Increases, enhances the perception of continuing education."
Collaboration Required Mandated by policy Required for credit class offerings	**11 comments** "When credit is involved, collaboration is essential." "Anytime we offer credit, it has to be approved by the appropriate academic department." "Mandated by our accrediting agency."

Enhancement of Collaboration

Question 23 asked the respondents to identify, in their own words, the factors that they feel would enhance their department's collaborative efforts on their campus. A total of 125 comments were gathered in response to this open-ended question. Once again the qualitative data analysis followed McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) guidelines. The data were read, compared, and classified, revealing six main categories of factors perceived to enhance collaborative efforts, including:

- Faculty and Staff issues;
- Funding and Institution Policy;
- Understanding of Continuing Education Function;
- Leadership Support;
- Department Incentives; and
- Communication.

Approximately thirty-one of the responses were categorized as "Faculty and Staff Issues," indicating that faculty and staff are perceived as essential to the collaborative process. The respondents consistently expressed the importance of the faculty members' expertise and knowledge to the collaborative process and programs. The participation of faculty and staff was perceived as essential for program quality, legitimacy, and rigor.

"Funding and Institutional Policy" also emerged as another response category. The respondents acknowledged the importance of start-up funding and institutional support for collaborative program development and operations. Flexible funding policies and procedures were also perceived as essential for the success of the collaboration.

The respondents indicated that for the collaborative program to succeed, there needed to be an awareness, understanding, and appreciation of continuing higher education. Furthermore, this awareness needed to extend throughout the institution, from

the administration, to the faculty and staff, to the students. Some indicated that this level of understanding and value was also necessary for individuals to enter into equal and reciprocal collaborative relationships where respect is mutual and roles are appropriately designated. This, according to the respondents, needs to stem from strong leadership support, which emerged as another response category. The support from the institutional leader must be expressed in word and in deed if it is to contribute positively to collaborations on campus.

While the "Faculty and Staff Issues" response category included the importance of rewards and incentives, the respondents also indicated that incentives for the academic departments were essential for successful collaborations. Specifically, revenue sharing and other funding sources were identified as effective incentives to encourage departmental involvement in collaborations with continuing higher education units.

Finally, the respondents indicated that communication was essential for successful collaborations. Open lines of communication which, contributed to dialogue and the development of genuine, trusting, reciprocal relationships, were identified as some components of communication essential for collaboration.

Table 22 displays this matrix and offers examples of some of the statements which fell under each category. A complete list of responses can be found in Appendix E.

Table 22. Factors that support collaboration	
Faculty and Staff Issues Faculty support, faculty involvement Faculty incentives, more available and qualified faculty and staff	**31 comments** "Greater availability of faculty to participate in continuing education programs" "Reward structures that support collaboration." "More weight in tenure and promotion"
Funding and Institutional Policy	**24 comments** "Institutional policies that support collaboration" "Flexibility in service and pricing." "Centralization of all continuing education"
Awareness, Understanding, Appreciation of the Value of Continuing Education	**21 comments** "A better understanding of what continuing education does." "Better understanding of the role our unit (CE) plays in the collaborative relationship. "Greater value placed on extension and continuing education work"
Leadership Support	**18 comments** "Clear articulation from central administration on the value of collaborative efforts" "Continuing proactive support of CE mission by the senior VP for Academic Affairs" "Full Support from senior administration"
Department Incentive	**13 comments** "Shared risk and revenue" (with the departments) "Revenue sharing" "Appropriate incentives for academic units"
Communication	**11 comments** "Improved communication" "More CE involvement in internal collegiate committees." "Good communication. Information to the departments."

Additional responses alluded to issues of program quality and demand for collaborative programs. In other words, the demand for high quality, interdisciplinary programs would drive the initiation and implementation of such collaborations. A few respondents working in decentralized continuing education programs indicated that they felt having a centralized continuing education unity would enhance their ability to collaborate. One respondent recognized that the collaborative process must be intentional and stated that, "We need to become more systematic in our collaborative efforts."

Inhibitors of Collaboration

The respondents were then asked to list the factors that they felt inhibited their department's collaborative efforts on their campus (Question 24). A total of 125 comments were offered. Once again the qualitative data analysis followed McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) guidelines. The data were read, compared, and classified, revealing five main categories of factors inhibiting collaboration, including:

Funding Issues and Resources, Faculty and Staff Issues,;
Funding Issues;
Issues related to the Understanding, Value and Perceptions of Continuing Education programs;
Internal communication issues;
Issues related to competing missions and University tradition; and
Leadership issues.

Table 23 displays this matrix and offers examples of the statements which fell under each category. A complete list of responses can be found in Appendix F.

Additional responses regarding inhibitors of collaboration identified union, contract, and bargaining unit issues, indicating limitations on faculty workloads, which limit their availability for collaborative activities. Additional concerns were also identified related to this and other internal communication and trust issues. Specifically, a perception of distrust between administrators, faculty, and staff in academic and continuing education departments was identified as an inhibitor to collaboration. Some also described a climate of competition and conflict, which limited collaborative efforts. Specific comments stated "internal competition" and "competing goals and objectives between continuing education and (academic) departments."

Table 23. Factors that inhibit collaboration

Faculty/Staff Issue Lack of time, lack of incentives, Staff/Faculty shortages	**36 comments** "Tenure decisions do not place much merit on CE teaching" "Lack of rewards for collaboration." "Faculty is stretched too far for effective collaboration."
Funding/Policy Issues Lack of funding, seed money, policy on collaboration	**31 comments** "The way programs are funded with state dollars." "Funding models, institutional resources, registrar and other services." "Everything is reduced to dollars, yet access to those dollars is not supported by financial model adopted by campus. If we could generate surplus dollars and return them to the academic units, our collaboration would greatly improve."
Lack of Understanding **Knowledge of Continuing Education** **Perception of value and quality**	**22 comments** "Misunderstanding of our role among academic personnel." "CE as a concept is new to the campus teaching faculty and staff." "Lack of knowledge and understanding of the adult learner's needs throughout the college."
Internal Communication	**15 comments** "Perception of competition between campus (academic units) and continuing education." "Poor or failure to communicate" "The promotion of internal competition."
University Mission, Tradition	**15 comments** "Traditional academic focus. Unwillingness to adapt, to change." "Research mission that takes precedence over service." "Research orientation of the university."
Leadership	**6 comments** "Lack of support (verbal and financial) from the top." "Distrust of administration." "(leader) who lacks willingness to understand value of CE."

Administrator Attitudes

In Question 25, the respondents were asked to indicate if top campus administrators demonstrated support for continuing education and collaboration in a variety of ways. The responses clearly indicate that while top administrators on their campus are very supportive with some behaviors, there is a message of lack of support by others. For instance, approximately 90% of the respondents indicated that campus administrators showed support for continuing education by including its staff in campus activities; only 37% considered continuing education programs to be equal in status to traditional academic programs. Similarly, only 47% felt that their administrators considered continuing education students to be of equal caliber to traditional academic students. Less than half of the respondents indicated that administrators showed support for continuing education by providing seed money for its programs; participating in the continuing education strategic planning process; advocating faculty rewards for participation in continuing education; or recognizing, through promotion, tenure, and merit, involvement in continuing education.

Conversely, more than half of the respondents indicated that top campus administrators demonstrate support for continuing education and collaboration by actively participating in specific CE activities; suggesting possible program activities; promoting continuing education in both the campus and external communities; advocating policy supporting continuing education; granting autonomy and flexibility for its fiscal issues; encouraging creativity and innovation for CE program planning; considering continuing education central to the institution's mission; and supporting academic faculty's participation in continuing education programs. A complete list of the responses is presented below in Table 24.

Table 24. Administrator's Support for CE

In general, do top administrators on your campus . . .		
a. Actively participate in specific CE activities	Frequency	%
YES	66	69.47%
NO	27	28.42%
Not Sure	2	2.11%
b. Suggest possible program activities	Frequency	%
YES	66	68.04%
NO	30	30.93%
Not Sure	1	1.03%
c. Help promote CE in the campus community	Frequency	%
YES	69	72.63%
NO	19	20.00%
Not Sure	7	7.37%
d. Help promote CE in the external community	Frequency	%
YES	71	75.53%
NO	18	19.15%
Not Sure	5	5.32%
e. Advocate policy supporting CE	Frequency	%
YES	70	75.27%
NO	16	17.20%
Not Sure	7	7.53%
f. Provide seed money for new CE programs	Frequency	%
YES	42	43.75%
NO	51	53.13%
Not Sure	3	3.13%
g. Grant autonomy and flexibility for CE fiscal issues	Frequency	%
YES	74	77.08%
NO	19	19.79%
Not Sure	3	3.13%
h. Encourage creativity and innovation for CE program planning	Frequency	%
YES	86	89.58%
NO	7	7.29%
Not Sure	3	3.13%

i. Consider CE central to the institution's mission	Frequency	%
YES	59	62.11%
NO	23	24.21%
Not Sure	13	13.68%
j. Participate in the strategic planning for CE	Frequency	%
YES	47	50.00%
NO	44	46.81%
Not Sure	3	3.19%
k. Include CE staff in campus activities	Frequency	%
YES	86	91.49%
NO	5	5.32%
Not Sure	3	3.19%
l. Consider CE programs of equal status to academic units	Frequency	%
YES	35	37.63%
NO	44	47.31%
Not Sure	14	15.05%
m. Consider CE students equal to traditional students	Frequency	%
YES	44	47.83%
NO	36	39.13%
Not Sure	12	13.04%
n. Support academic faculty's participation in CE programs	Frequency	%
YES	68	73.12%
NO	14	15.05%
Not Sure	11	11.83%
o. Advocate faculty rewards for participation in CE	Frequency	%
YES	32	35.16%
NO	47	51.65%
Not Sure	12	13.19%
p. Recognize academic faculty's participation in CE programs for promotion, tenure, and merit	Frequency	%
YES	26	28.57%
NO	49	53.85%
Not Sure	16	17.58%

Faculty Attitudes

In Question 26, the respondents were asked to indicate if campus faculty demonstrated support for continuing education and collaboration in a variety of ways. The responses clearly indicate that while faculty on their campus are very supportive with some behaviors, there is a lack of support with others. With regard to the former, the respondents opined that campus faculty showed support for continuing education by Teaching Continuing Education classes (87%); Actively Participating in Continuing Education (80%); and Suggesting Continuing Education Classes (84%). Well over half of the respondents also indicated that faculty support continuing education by helping promote continuing education in the campus community (65%), helping promote continuing education in the external community (59%), and contributing to the creativity and innovation of continuing education programs (72%). Just half, or slightly more than half, consider CE faculty to be of caliber to academic faculty (51%) and are familiar with the nature of Continuing Education (50%).

Less positive were the perceptions of the respondents that the majority of the faculty at their institutions are not supportive of CE. For instance, only 40% indicated that faculty on their campus consider CE services central to the institution's mission, and only 41% consider CE students of equal status to traditional students. Even fewer thought that campus faculty considered CE programs of equal status to academic units (30%), and only 34% encourage their students to participate in CE programs. While over half use CE programs to support their service responsibilities (51%), many fewer use CE programs in their research. A complete display of the results showing the level of faculty support of CE as perceived by CE leaders is shown in Table 25.

Table 25 Faculty Support for CE

In general, do members of the academic faculty on your campus . . .		
a. Teach CE / extension classes	Frequency	%
YES	83	87.37%
NO	12	12.63%
Not Sure	0	0.00%
b. Actively participate in specific CE program activities	Frequency	%
YES	75	80.65%
NO	16	17.20%
Not Sure	2	2.15%
c. Suggest possible CE program activities	Frequency	%
YES	79	84.95%
NO	12	12.90%
Not Sure	2	2.15%
d. Help promote CE in the campus community	Frequency	%
YES	62	65.96%
NO	29	30.85%
Not Sure	3	3.19%
e. Help promote CE in the external community	Frequency	%
YES	55	59.14%
NO	30	32.26%
Not Sure	8	8.60%
f. Contribute to the creativity and innovation in CE program planning	Frequency	%
YES	68	72.34%
NO	25	26.60%
Not Sure	1	1.06%

Table 25. Continued.

g. Consider CE services central to the institution's mission	Frequency	%
YES	38	40.00%
NO	41	43.16%
Not Sure	16	16.84%
h. Include CE staff in campus activities	**Frequency**	**%**
YES	70	74.47%
NO	20	21.28%
Not Sure	4	4.26%
i. Consider CE programs of equal status to academic units	**Frequency**	**%**
YES	28	29.79%
NO	54	57.45%
Not Sure	12	12.77%
j. Consider CE students of equal status to traditional students	**Frequency**	**%**
YES	39	41.05%
NO	44	46.32%
Not Sure	12	12.63%
k. Are familiar with the nature of CE	**Frequency**	**%**
YES	47	50.54%
NO	27	29.03%
Not Sure	19	20.43%
l. Consider CE faculty to be of caliber to academic faculty	**Frequency**	**%**
YES	47	51.65%
NO	32	35.16%
Not Sure	12	13.19%

m. Include CE service and teaching activities in their requests for promotion, tenure, and merit	Frequency	%
YES	41	44.57%
NO	37	40.22%
Not Sure	14	15.22%

n. Use CE programs in their research	Frequency	%
YES	23	25.84%
NO	51	57.30%
Not Sure	15	16.85%

o. Use CE programs to support their service responsibilities	Frequency	%
YES	52	54.74%
NO	27	28.42%
Not Sure	16	16.84%

p. Encourage their students to participate in CE programs	Frequency	%
YES	33	34.74%
NO	36	37.89%
Not Sure	26	27.37%

Collaborative Engagement and Levels of Satisfaction

Programs

The purpose of this study was not only to investigate the status of intra-institutional collaborations, but also to assess the continuing education professional's satisfaction with the level of collaborative action. Question 27 listed a variety of collaborative programs and administrative activities and asked the respondent to indicate the extent in which they engage in these efforts and their level of satisfaction. For each of the eleven collaborative programs, respondents were presented with a Likert-type scale consisting of five points: "Yes, and am satisfied," "Yes, but would like to do more," "Yes, but would like to do less," "No, but would like to," and "No, and am not interested." The same response options on a Likert-type scale were used for eleven collaborative administrative activities. A display of the responses are found in Table 26 (Collaborative Programs) and Table 27 (Collaborative Administrative Activities).

Table 26 Satisfaction with Collaboration Programs		
a1. Non-credit Class	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	25	26.04%
Yes, but would like more to do	54	56.25%
Yes, but would like to do less	1	1.04%
No, but would like to	10	10.42%
No, and am not interested	6	6.25%
a2. Credit class	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	35	36.46%
Yes, but would like more to do	48	50.00%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.08%
No, but would like to	8	8.33%
No, and am not interested	3	3.13%
a3. Non-credit Certificate Program	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	18	19.35%
Yes, but would like more to do	54	58.06%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0.00%
No, but would like to	15	16.13%
No, and am not interested	6	6.45%
a4. Credit Academic Program	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	28	29.17%
Yes, but would like more to do	50	52.08%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.08%
No, but would like to	13	13.54%
No, and am not interested	3	3.13%
a5. Undergraduate Degree Program	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	20	21.74%
Yes, but would like more to do	41	44.57%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.17%
No, but would like to	20	21.74%
No, and am not interested	9	9.78%

a6. Graduate Degree Program	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	19	21.11%
Yes, but would like more to do	33	36.67%
Yes, but would like to do less	1	1.11%
No, but would like to	21	23.33%
No, and am not interested	16	17.78%
a7. Conference	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	19	19.79%
Yes, but would like more to do	44	45.83%
Yes, but would like to do less	3	3.13%
No, but would like to	14	14.58%
No, and am not interested	16	16.67%
a8. Corporate / Workforce Training	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	13	13.54%
Yes, but would like more to do	57	59.38%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0.00%
No, but would like to	16	16.67%
No, and am not interested	10	10.42%
a9. Distance Education Course	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	17	18.28%
Yes, but would like more to do	62	66.67%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.15%
No, but would like to	9	9.68%
No, and am not interested	3	3.23%
a10. Community Outreach / Service	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	21	22.11%
Yes, but would like more to do	49	51.58%
Yes, but would like to do less	3	3.16%
No, but would like to	15	15.79%
No, and am not interested	7	7.37%

Table 26. Continued

a11. Research Activity	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	6	6.45%
Yes, but would like more to do	34	36.56%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.15%
No, but would like to	30	32.26%
No, and am not interested	21	22.58%

Administrative Activities

Table 27 Collaborative Administrative Activities

b1. General program planning	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	30	31.57%
Yes, but would like more to do	49	51.57%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0%
No, but would like to	12	12.63%
No, and am not interested	4	4.21%

b2. Collaborative planning for a specific project	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	33	34.74%
Yes, but would like more to do	52	54.74%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0.00%
No, but would like to	8	8.42%
No, and am not interested	2	2.11%

b3. Needs assessment research	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	16	17.39%
Yes, but would like more to do	47	51.09%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0.00%
No, but would like to	22	23.91%
No, and am not interested	7	7.61%

b4. Program promotion and advertising	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	24	25.53%
Yes, but would like more to do	47	50.00%
Yes, but would like to do less	0	0.00%
No, but would like to	12	12.77%
No, and am not interested	11	11.70%

Table 27. Continued.

b5. Recruitment of students	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	20	21.51%
Yes, but would like more to do	46	49.46%
Yes, but would like to do less	1	1.08%
No, but would like to	18	19.35%
No, and am not interested	8	8.60%
b6. Common budget requests	**Frequency**	**%**
Yes, and am satisfied	17	19.54%
Yes, but would like more to do	35	40.23%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.30%
No, but would like to	14	16.09%
No, and am not interested	19	21.84%
b7. Sharing of course expenses	**Frequency**	**%**
Yes, and am satisfied	22	25.29%
Yes, but would like more to do	34	39.08%
Yes, but would like to do less	5	5.75%
No, but would like to	14	16.09%
No, and am not interested	12	13.79%
b8. Local committee involvement	**Frequency**	**%**
Yes, and am satisfied	20	22.47%
Yes, but would like more to do	42	47.19%
Yes, but would like to do less	8	8.99%
No, but would like to	7	7.87%
No, and am not interested	12	13.48%
b9. Campus committee work	**Frequency**	**%**
Yes, and am satisfied	27	29.67%
Yes, but would like more to do	39	42.86%
Yes, but would like to do less	11	12.09%
No, but would like to	6	6.59%
No, and am not interested	8	8.79%

b10. Evaluation of programs	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	26	28.26%
Yes, but would like more to do	46	50.00%
Yes, but would like to do less	3	3.26%
No, but would like to	11	11.96%
No, and am not interested	6	6.52%

b11. Evaluation of faculty	Frequency	%
Yes, and am satisfied	29	31.52%
Yes, but would like more to do	36	39.13%
Yes, but would like to do less	2	2.17%
No, but would like to	13	14.13%
No, and am not interested	12	13.04%

An analysis of the data reveals program and administrative areas in which respondents are currently collaborating with academic departments, and identifies areas in which there may be potential for further collaboration. Conversely, selecting the response "No, and am not interested" suggests that there is little potential for collaborative activity in that program or administrative area. Also, activities in which respondents were currently collaborating and are satisfied with the current level of satisfaction also suggests limited potential for additional collaboration.

Collaborative Programs

Non-Credit Classes: It was found that over 83% of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on non-credit classes. Of these, 26% were satisfied while over half (56%) would like to do more. Nearly 17% of the respondents were not currently participating in this type of collaboration, but most (10%) are open to doing so, while approximately 6% are neither participating nor are interested in doing so.

Credit Classes: The results show that a great majority (86%) of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on credit classes. Of these, 36% were satisfied while half (50%) would like to do more. Only 2% indicated that they would like to do less. Over 11% of the respondents were not currently participating in this type of collaboration, But most (8%) would like to. Only 3% are not participating and are not interested in doing so.

Non-Credit Certificate Programs: A little over three quarters (77%) of respondents were found to be currently collaborating with academic departments on non-credit certificate programs. Approximately 20% were satisfied but over half (58%) would like to do more. Twenty-two percent of the respondents were found to be not

participating in this type of collaboration, but most of these (16%) would like to. Only a few (6%) are not participating and are not interested in doing so.

Credit Academic Programs: Over 81% of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on academic credit programs. Of these, approximately 30% were satisfied and another 52% would like to do more. Two percent indicated participation but would prefer to collaborate less. Approximately 17% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration but the majority of them (14%) would like to do so, and approximately 3% are not interested in doing so.

Undergraduate Degree Programs: It was found that about two-thirds of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on undergraduate degree programs. Approximately 20% were satisfied with their level of collaboration while many more (45%) would like to do more. Another 2% indicated that, while they are involved in collaborative activities, they would like to be less involved with such programs. Fewer than one-third of the respondents reported participating in this type of collaboration, and, of these, approximately 10% are not interested in doing so.

Graduate Degree Programs: Nearly 59% of respondents are currently collaborating with academic departments on Graduate Degree programs. Twenty-one percent of the respondents were satisfied while 37% would like to do more, and 1% would like to do less. Approximately 40% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration. The majority of these (23%) would like to be doing so, while 18% are not interested in doing so.

Conferences: Over two-thirds of the respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on conferences. Approximately 20% of the respondents were

satisfied and close to half (45%) would like to do more. Only 3% indicated that they would like to be doing less. Over 30% of the respondents were not currently participating in this type of collaboration, although 15% would prefer to do so. Finally, 17% are not interested in doing so at all.

Corporate/Workforce Training: Nearly 73% of respondents reported currently collaborating with academic departments on Corporate and Workforce Training Programs. Within this number, 14% of the respondents were satisfied, but nearly 60% indicated they would like to be doing more. None indicated that they would like to do less. Slightly over 27% of the respondents reported they were not participating in this type of collaboration at all but most (17%) would like to, and approximately 10% are not participating and are not interested in doing so.

Distance Education Course: A great majority (87%) of respondents indicated they are currently collaborating with academic departments on distance education programs. Slightly over 18% of the respondents said that they were satisfied, while a relatively large number (67%) would prefer to be doing more. Only 2% indicated that they would like to be doing less. Only 13% of the respondents are not participating on distance education courses, but only 3% are not interested in doing so.

Community Outreach: Approximately three fourths of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on community outreach and service programs. The results showed that 22% of the respondents were satisfied with the degree of collaboration, while slightly over 51% of all the respondents would like to do more. Only 3% indicated that they would like to do less. Close to one-fourth of the respondents

are not participating in this type of collaboration, but 16% of such CE leaders would like to be doing so, while 7% are not interested in doing so.

Research Activity: Research Activity was the area in which the fewest respondents were collaborating and the largest group were not interested. Less than half (44%) of respondents were currently collaborating with academic departments on research activity. Only 6% of all the respondents were satisfied while 37% would like to be doing more. Another 2% indicated that they would like to do less. Over half (55%) of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, although about one-third (32%) of all the respondents would like to. A relatively large group, 23%, are not collaborating in this area and are not interested in doing so.

Collaborative Administrative Activities

General Program Planning: It was revealed that over 83% of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on general program planning. While 30% of the respondents were satisfied with the current level of collaboration in this area, a larger number (49%) would like to be doing more. None indicated that they would like to do less. About 16% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, but only 4% are not interested in doing so.

Specific Project: An inspection of the results shows that the vast majority (90%) of respondents are currently collaborating with academic departments on some type of specific project. Approximately 35% of the respondents were satisfied with this level and type of collaboration, while over one-half (55%) of the respondents would like to elevate this involvement. Approximately 10% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, but most of them (8%) would be interested in doing so.

Needs Assessment: The results show that about 68% of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on need assessment research. Only 17% of the respondents reported being satisfied with this level of collaboration, while over half (51%) would like to be doing more. None indicated that they would like to do less. While 31% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, only 8% are not interested in doing so.

Program Promotion and Advertising: Slightly over three quarters of the respondents revealed they were currently collaborating with academic departments in program promotion and advertising. While 25% indicated satisfaction, 50% would like to do more. The remaining 25% are not currently collaborating on promotional activities but 13% are interested in doing so.

Recruitment of Students: The survey results showed that 71% of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on student recruitment. Of all respondents, 22% were satisfied with this level of collaboration but 50% expressed a desire to be doing more. While 28% of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, only 8% are not interested in doing so.

Common Budget Requests: Approximately 62% of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments by sharing common budget requests. Twenty percent of the respondents were satisfied with this arrangement while a relatively larger number (40%) would like to do more. However, another 2% indicated that they would like to do less. Of the 38% who are not participating in this type of collaboration, a relatively large group (22%) are not interested in doing so; thus "common budget

requests" was cited as the collaborative activity the greatest number of respondents would like to continue to avoid.

Sharing of Course Expenses: Approximately 70% of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments by sharing course expenses. Twenty-five percent of the respondents expressed satisfaction in doing so, while a relatively large number (40%) would like to do more. However, 5% indicated that they would like to do less. Of the 30% of the respondents not participating in this type of collaboration, slightly less than half of them (14%) are not interested in doing so.

Local Committee Involvement: Over three quarters (77%) of the respondents reported currently collaborating with academic departments by participating in local committee works. Of the total of all respondents, 23% were satisfied while 47% would like to do more. Compared to other collaborative administrative activities, a relatively large proportion of all respondents (9%) indicated that they would actually like to participate in this type of activity less often. Only 21% of all respondents are not currently participating in this type of collaboration, and only a third of this component (7%) are interested in doing so.

Campus Committee Work: An overwhelming majority (85%) of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on campus committee work. While 30% of the respondents were satisfied with this involvement, 43% would like to do more. As was revealed earlier with "local committee works," a relatively large group (12%) would actually prefer to be doing less of this collaborative activity. A relatively small portion of respondents (15%) were reported to not be participating in this type of collaboration, and somewhat over half of these (9%) are not interested in doing so.

Evaluation of Programs: The survey results disclose that over three quarters (81%) of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on Program Evaluation. Further, 29% of the respondents were satisfied while a relatively larger number (50%) would like to do more. Only 3% indicated that they would like to do less. Eighteen percent of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, of which 7% are not interested in doing so.

Evaluation of Faculty: A little less than three quarters (73%) of respondents currently collaborate with academic departments on faculty evaluations. While 32% of the respondents were satisfied, a relatively equal number (39%) would like to do more. Only 2% indicated that they would like to do less. Twenty-seven percent of the respondents are not participating in this type of collaboration, with about an even split as to whether or not they are interested in doing so.

Collaborative Projects

The final two questions asked respondents to describe, in their own words, a collaborative effort in which they participated and found to be successful, and one in which they felt had failed. For each, they were also asked to explain why they felt the collaboration was a success or failure. Once again, following McMillan and Schumacher's (1997) guidelines, the data were read, compared, classified, and counted.

Successes

The respondents identified a variety of collaborative programs that were successful for their continuing education program. A total of 66 responses were generated, yielding eight different categories of collaborative efforts including Distance

Degree Programs (26 responses), Professional Licensure and Certification Programs (14 responses), Individual class/course (12 responses), Conferences (7 responses), Degree Completion Programs (4 responses), Alumni Programs (1 response), Extension Learning Centers (1 response), and Faculty Development Program (1 response). A reproduction of all of the responses can be found in Appendix G. The categories of responses and examples of the descriptions of the collaborative efforts that were offered are displayed below in Table 28.

Table 28. Successful Collaborations	
Categories of Successful Collaborative Efforts	**Sample Responses**
Distance Education Degree Programs	26 comments "We developed a distance degree in Criminal Justice" "Establishing an MS in education off campus based on a cohort learning community concept."
Professional Licensure /Certification	14 comments "Certificate program (in Industrial Management) with Industrial Technician and Community College" "Teacher preparation program for individual seeking vocational technical teachers certification"
Individual Class/Course	12 comments "Collaborate with the College of Business to deliver a series of accounting courses to students in Japan."
Conferences	7 comments "Regional Internet and Technology Expo co- sponsored by academic departments, CE, administration, support staff, and numerous local agencies." "Body, Mind, and Spirit Conference. Joint effort of CE, Psychology Department and Department of Human Development Family Living and Community Educational Services."
Degree Completion Program	4 comments "Off campus degree completion program at employer site."
Additional Responses: Alumni Program, Extension Learning Center, Faculty Development Program	

The respondents were instructed to also indicate why they believed the particular collaborative effort was a success. In spite of the diversity in collaborative efforts identified, there were commonalities in the reasons for success. There were 69 different comments addressing this question. Of the 69 comments, one-third (N=23) felt that the collaborative effort succeeded because there was an appropriate division of labor, whereby each of the collaborative parties contributed to the effort based on his/her expertise. For most, this meant that the academic department assumed responsibilities for the collaborative program's content and curriculum, while the continuing education department was responsible for the program's operation and administration. In addition to this division of labor, many (N=16) of the respondents also attributed the collaboration's success to the fact that all parties supported, valued, and shared the vision and goals of the program. Some (N=16) felt that the program was a success because everyone benefitted from the program and there was shared revenue. Other reasons for success included a strong need and demand for the program and the availability of seed money to support the program. A display of all of the responses can be found in Appendix G. The categories of responses and examples of reasons for success are presented below in Table 29.

Table 29. Reasons for Success

Categories of Reasons for Success	**Sample of Responses**
Appropriate division of labor	23 responses "I believe it was successful because we handled the non-academic details and left the curriculum planning to the academic department." "Successful because of regular pre-planning sessions and involvement of all players."
Shared support, value, vision	16 responses "successful because content was excellent and because outreach faculty worked very hard with campus faculty to demonstrate the merits of the course" "It was successful because both CE and the department had a common objective, a willingness to work together, and both CE and the department got good feedback from central administration."
Shared benefits	16 responses "The program also generated good revenue that is shared with the academic departments." "Returned money to the department to support graduate students and faculty pleased with good evaluations."
Need/Demand for Program	7 responses "The Hispanic Population is growing in our area and there is a very real need for (language skills) for medical community and business community." "Successful primarily because faculty were committed to the idea and because there was a very great off-campus demand."
Seed Money Available	3 responses "It was successful because the state had a grant for tuition." "Continuing Education was able to take some risks by supporting some up-front costs. The department was also successful in securing a USDA grant."
Additional responses: Good Timing Communication Research Oriented Program	1 response each

The final survey question asked the respondent to describe a collaborative effort which had failed, and to explain why they believed the collaboration was not a success. As in the previous question, a variety of collaborative efforts were identified. A total of 37 comments yielded four main categories of collaborative efforts, which "never really got started" or "fell apart." Of the 38 responses, approximately 26% (n=10) referred to professional continuing education programs. Nine responses described non-credit courses, eight referred to collaborative degree programs, and six pertained to distance/on-line collaborative efforts. A complete list of responses can be found in Appendix H. The primary categories of responses and examples of failed collaborative efforts are presented below in Table 30.

Failures

Common themes emerged when respondents were asked to identify the factors that contributed to the failure of an unsuccessful collaboration. A total of 72 comments were listed in response to this question. A general lack of support for collaborative efforts was cited in 20 (28%) of the responses. Other common reasons included Budget constraints (N=9), Role conflict and ambiguity (N=9), Lack of information and understanding of the CE programming/budget process (N=9), No market/demand identified (N=8), Inflexible institutional policies (N=4), Lack of reward/incentive (N=4), and staff turnover (N=3). The responses are shown in their entirety in Appendix H. The categories of responses and examples of reasons for lack of success are displayed in Table 31.

Table 30. Unsuccessful Collaborations

CATEGORIES OF UNSUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS	SAMPLE RESPONSES
Continuing Education for professionals	10 responses "Continuing education for engineering alumni" "Professional Certificate in applied organization development and training with our organization development center."
Non-credit classes/programs	9 responses "Campus faculty are not interested in non-credit programs in general" "Off campus (non-credit) computer classes never materialized."
Degree Programs	8 responses "Undergraduate BLS (Liberal Studies) Degree program" "Learning Communication Master's Degree"
Distance/On-line Courses	6 responses "We have tried very hard to connect our CE unit with both the library, electronic resources available and specific colleges in the creation of online courses" "We tried to deliver BS in Management to rural areas using ITV. "
Additional Responses: Conferences, Degree Completion, Weekend College, Summer Travel Study	1 response each

Table 31. Reasons for Lack of Success

Categories of Reasons for Lack of Success	**Sample of Responses**
General lack of support for collaboration	20 responses "It's never been high on the priority list for faculty" "Department was too much a closed system and it was everyone for themselves, rather than for the greater good."
Budget constraints	9 responses "Didn't work because it was too expensive"
Role conflict and ambiguity	9 responses "Goal and role conflict issues have been troubling." "They wanted all the revenue and benefits but none of the work, or the costs, or the risks associated with the program"
Lack of information and understanding of CE	9 responses "CE was not clear enough as to its goals." "Academic department didn't understand the finances and that revenue had to be generated with reasonable non-credit fees. They also didn't understand marketing, logistical support, etc."
No market/demand	8 responses "Could not identify or develop necessary market at the time" "The program was developed without a thorough understanding of the target organization / market needs/wants."
Inflexible institutional policies	4 responses "Department couldn't commit to long range planning on specific courses so that students could plan." "Basically the faculty was unable to deliver the content because they lacked internal college support and financial (infrastructure) resources."
Lack of reward /incentives	4 responses "(CE teaching) doesn't count towards tenure, promotion or merit, doesn't carry the status of credit teaching nor does it pay as well" "Lots of lost opportunities because of lack of incentives for academic colleges."
Staff turnover	3 responses "Communication became sparse...new staff were being hired." "Change of leadership at college and department level."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status and nature of intra-institutional collaborations between continuing education and academic departments at four-year, degree-granting institutions of higher education, and to identify additional factors that support or inhibit intra-institutional collaborations. Additional information was garnered to investigate the roles of institutional leadership, organizational structure, and faculty in supporting or inhibiting intra-institutional collaborative efforts.

A survey instrument was designed and mailed to 355 representatives of four-year, degree-granting institutions of the University Continuing Education Association (UCEA). A response rate of 30% was secured. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected. Following are the most notable findings of the study:

There is a lack of consistency in the position titles, department names, and professional and academic preparation of the continuing higher education leaders participating in this study. This may contribute to the lack of awareness and understanding of the continuing education functions as expressed by the respondents. Before expecting professionals outside the field to appreciate and embrace the field and function of continuing higher education, its professionals must first look to themselves to develop a more consistent set of standards and criteria for practice. Standards and

criteria for professional practice may instill more consistency in the operations of continuing higher education as well as enhance the quality of programs and services. This may contribute positively to the effort of increasing the understanding, awareness, and value of continuing higher education at the individual, departmental, institutional, and professional levels.

Overall, the respondents described a relatively positive and satisfying collaborative relationship with the academic departments on their respective campuses. In addition, the respondents recognized the benefits of collaboration, including benefits to the program and students, to the institution, and to the field of continuing higher education.

A variety of successful collaborations were identified as well as the factors that contributed to their success. The most common collaborative programs included credit classes, distance education, non-credit certificate programs, and academic credit programs.

Factors that were perceived to contribute to the success of intra-institutional collaborations included faculty and staff involvement, organizational policies, campus leadership, and the general level of awareness and value for the continuing higher education function. Factors that were perceived to inhibit intra-institutional collaborations included faculty and staff, funding issues, understanding and value for continuing education, internal communication, competing missions between continuing education units and academic departments, and institutional leadership support.

A strategic plan should guide the process of intra-institutional collaboration and include a needs assessment, goals and objectives, regular meetings and communication,

clarification of each participant's role and level of responsibility, monitoring of the progress, and an evaluation component for accountability. This will help ensure that all parties to the collaboration have a common vision and value for the effort. Additionally, the strategic planning process can help insure an appropriate division of labor, assignment of duties, and clarified roles and expectations.

The collaborative unit should be treated as a temporary organization. Therefore, the strategic process should include a plan for the termination of the collaborative group. Once the collaborative unit's goals and objectives are realized, the group should break up before its productivity falls and its members become discouraged and see the time together as wasteful.

The remainder of this chapter will provide a presentation of the conclusion and a more detailed discussion of the implications of the findings. The discussion will be organized to address the specific issues that comprised the purpose of this study. This chapter will conclude with recommendations for professionals working in continuing higher education, as well as suggestions for future research.

Continuing Higher Education Programs and Professionals

The first section of the survey gathered demographic and descriptive data on the respondents and their respective institutions. Above all, the data from this section clearly illustrated the diversity that exists among the professionals and programs represented in this study. Given that all of the respondents were institutional representatives of the same professional academic association (UCEA), and close to 90% had full-time

assignments in continuing higher education at four-year, degree-granting institutions, one would expect some homogeneity in the professionals' educational and professional experiences, their reporting lines, and the programs they represent. The data indicated that this was clearly not the case and that their professional and academic experiences were more different than similar. Despite these individual differences, there were definite commonalities in the respondents' experiences with intra-institutional collaborations and their perceptions of factors that support and inhibit their collaborative efforts.

The diversity in the academic and professional experiences of the continuing education professionals included in this study may impact their collaborative efforts on campus. While the impact may be positive with respect to the richness of programs and services offered, it may inhibit collaborative efforts and the ability of continuing education professionals to work effectively with their colleagues in academic departments. In a hierarchical organization, "titles" imply authority and privilege. This is particularly true in institutions of higher education that often are entrenched in traditions and rituals. Similarly, because of the value placed on the terminal doctoral degree, professionals who have not attained that level of education may not receive the full regard and status on campus. Therefore, the title and reporting line of the continuing education professional may influence his/her internal relations and regard on campus and, hence, their intra-institutional collaborations.

In a hierarchical organization, a professional must share the title, position, and status to be treated truly as an equal. Whereas academic unit leaders typically enjoy the authority and status of the "Dean" title, the leader of the continuing education unit may

be treated as "less than" that if the same title and authority are not shared. Those referred to as "Director" or "Administrator" may find it difficult to attain the status, respect, and resources equal to their academic colleagues. Similar issues may also exist with the professional's reporting line and position in the organizational chart. Ultimately, this can affect the continuing education professional's ability to interact with his or her colleagues in academic departments, the academic faculty's perception of the value of the collaboration, and access to the resources available for collaboration. If the continuing education leader is not treated with equal regard on campus, access to institutional resources and privileges may not be available, which can significantly impact his/her productivity and success at intra-institutional collaboration. Furthermore, if the continuing education department is not perceived as integral to the campus, representatives from the different academic areas may be less motivated to associate and collaborate.

The nature and level of their academic experiences also distinguish the continuing education professionals included in this study from their academic department colleagues. While academic unit leaders typically possess a doctoral-level degree in a discipline related to their academic department, continuing education unit leaders appear to attain a variety of degrees from disciplines outside of the field of continuing higher education. Only 68% of the respondents had doctoral-level degrees, and these degrees represented a wide range of disciplines seemingly unrelated to continuing higher education. The responses clearly show that there is relatively little similarity in the fields in which their degrees were earned. While possessing a lower-level degree in a different discipline does not necessarily imply that the professional is less competent, it may

impact negatively on their status on campus and their ability to successfully engage in intra-institutional collaborations with their academic department colleagues. It is important to note that it is not possible to determine from the data the respondents' positions at their institutions. While their titles allude to a particular professional level, it does not indicate whether or not he/she is consider the "leader" of their continuing education unit. When asked to indicate their primary professional duty, most stated "administration" as opposed to "leadership." Hence, we can only assume that the respondents are professionals in continuing higher education and serve as their institutional representative in UCEA.

According to Shoemaker (1998), "there is no typical organization of a continuing education division, department, or unit in higher education, but it is usually different from the traditional college or department organization" (p. 42). Once again, this in itself is not a negative quality but may be a detriment to internal relations and collaborative efforts. The data from this study illustrate the variability and lack of a "typical" continuing education organization, structure, and even unit name. Whereas academic units are typically structured as "colleges" and "departments" within colleges, the approximately 100 respondents of this study listed 35 different names of their continuing education units including, but not limited to, "department," "division," and "college." This is yet another factor that separates continuing education from the academic departments and may also affect the field of continuing higher education's ability to earn the credibility and status of a profession (Apps, 1988). Additionally, it poses a challenge to those outside the field of continuing education to understand and value the scope and purpose of the work. In fact, Shoemaker (1998) suggested that the first thing a

continuing education leader must do is "define" what it is they are, so that others will understand the nature and purpose of their unit on the campus.

In addition to the lack of homogeneity in the professionals' titles and experiences and the name of the continuing education unit, there were considerable differences in the size and age of the continuing education units represented in this study. For example, there were approximately the same number of continuing education units that had existed on their campuses for less than ten years as there were those existing for more than 51 years. Similarly, there was the same number whose continuing education units had experienced less than 1,000 annual headcount enrollments as there were units with 12,000-18,000 annual headcount enrollments. This may partially explain the lack of homogeneity in the continuing education unit's name and structure. Some of the relatively "young" units may still be trying to establish their identity and purpose on their campus. Some of the "older" departments may be more established and shaped by the traditions of their particular institution. As suggested in the literature, the field of continuing education has experienced major changes in the past few decades, which certainly has had an impact on the structure and programmatic focus of individual units.

As previously suggested, the fact that differences exist between the professional titles and experiences and department name, size, and age is not necessarily "positive" or "negative" but can impact campus relations and thus intra-institutional collaborative efforts. In addition, it may have some effect on the ability of continuing education to establish itself as a profession. Continuing higher education's struggle to achieve the status as a "profession" has been ongoing. Apps (1989) argued that the "field of adult and continuing education suffers from a lack of definition" (p. 23). Poor quality and lack

of standards has been attributed to this open and uncontrolled environment, compromising continuing education's position as a profession. Consequently, Apps (1988) stated, "The range and scope of the field of continuing education is unlimited and currently has had few restraints placed on it and few boundaries. Herein lies one of its greatest strengths and also one of its most serious weaknesses" (p. 110).

Program Focus

Over a decade ago, Knox (1989) recognized that there was a shift in continuing education programs from individual courses to more comprehensive programs. According to the present study, many of the continuing education units represented "always offer" academic degree classes and programs rather than individual non-credit classes. There also appears to be a greater focus on continuing professional education rather than on evening and weekend courses and community interest classes. Distance Education was also identified as a major focus of the continuing education departments represented in this study.

The focus of the continuing education units represented in this study illustrates how the institutions represented are responding to the "new" learners and their learning needs. This need for change was discussed extensively in the review of the literature and appears to be recognized by the continuing education professionals who participated in this study. It should be noted that there appears to be a considerable emphasis on providing academic credit classes through the continuing education units rather than solely non-credit community education classes. This information may be surprising and of interest to continuing education and other academic professionals on university

campuses who may have a different perception of continuing education programs and course offerings. Knowledge of the extensive number of academic classes offered may alter the impression of continuing education programs being less rigorous or non-academic. This is important, as the distinction of "non-credit" may have contributed to the common perception of continuing education programs lacking in substance and academic rigor. Communicating this knowledge may help to enhance the image and perceptions of continuing higher education programs and professionals. Ideally, correcting any misconceptions could enhance the image of continuing education and the interest and desire of academic department members to participate in collaborative activities and programs.

Status and Nature of Intra-Institutional Collaborations

The remainder of this section specifically addresses the issues that guided the present investigation. The discussion will triangulate the qualitative and quantitative data gathered in this study with the information found in the review of the literature.

The primary purposes of this study were to identify existing intra-institutional collaborations, explore the nature and characteristics of such collaborations, and assess the continuing education professionals' levels of satisfaction with the collaborative activities and relationships on their campus. This information was gathered through the survey instrument designed for this investigation. In one section, the respondents were asked to identify and describe a successful collaborative activity in which their continuing education department participated within the past three years. The various experiences were classified under eight main categories of programs, including distance

education, professional licensure and certification programs, individual courses and classes, conferences, degree completion programs, alumni programs, extension learning centers, and faculty development.

Another section of the survey inquired into the respondents' involvement in specific collaborative programs and administrative experiences and asked them to indicate their level of satisfaction with those collaborative experiences. The data from this section demonstrated that over three quarters of the continuing education units represented in this study are currently collaborating on programs including credit classes, distance education, credit academic programs, non-credit classes, and community outreach. The respondents seemed to be satisfied with their levels of collaboration, but over half wished to engage in even more collaborative non-credit classes, credit classes, non-credit certificate programs, academic credit programs, corporate/workforce training, distance education, and community outreach. In these instances, the respondents were currently involved in such collaborative programs but desired to do more.

This section also provided the opportunity for the respondents to identify collaborative programs that they were not involved in but would like to be, hence expressing dissatisfaction with their non-involvement. This was more often the case with research activity, graduate and undergraduate degree programs, credit academic programs, corporate/workforce training, conferences, and community outreach.

The greatest number of respondents were satisfied with their current level of collaboration with non-credit and credit classes, credit academic programs, and community outreach. Similarly, most were satisfied with the lack of collaboration on conferences, graduate degree programs, and research activity. While these numbers are

obviously specific to the individuals participating in this study and the institutions they represent, they can have utility in identifying program areas fruitful of new collaborative opportunities. Program areas in which the respondents indicated a desire to engage in more collaborative efforts may be a more productive place to initiate new intra-institutional collaborations as opposed to program areas in which no interest was expressed.

Many different administrative activities such as program planning, evaluations, and campus committee involvement go into the work and programs available in different university settings. These administrative activities provide additional opportunities for collaboration between academic units and continuing education departments. As with the different program areas, the respondents had the opportunity to indicate their current level of involvement and satisfaction with specific collaborative administrative work. According to the responses, administrative activities were less likely to be collaborative than program areas, with the exception of general program planning, specific project planning, and marketing and promotion. In these three administrative functions, over three-fourths of the respondents were currently collaborating with academic units. In addition, over half were interested in increasing their involvement in such collaboration with general program planning, specific project planning, needs assessment research, program promotion, and evaluation. Of those not participating in these collaborative administrative activities, there was more likely to be an interest in working together with academic units on needs assessment research, recruitment of students, budgets, expenses, and program evaluation.

Once again, while these perceptions and the status of collaborations are specific to the individuals and programs represented in this study, the information can be helpful in identifying areas in which collaboration may be more successful and areas that may be more fruitful with collaborative opportunities. These data also demonstrate that all collaborative programs and opportunities are not equally desired or appropriate. The literature strongly supports the need for all parties in the collaborative relationship to support the effort equally and fully. Therefore, by first assessing the current status and level of interest for specific intra-institutional collaborative programs and activities, more appropriate and efficient decisions and efforts can be initiated.

Current Collaboration: Status and Satisfaction

While the respondent's level of satisfaction with their collaborative efforts varied depending upon that specific program area or administrative activity, in general, most enjoy a positive relationship with academic departments on their campus. In fact, 96% indicated that they felt their collaborative relationships were positive, with 46% stating "very positive." This appears to contradict much of the literature which presents a less positive picture of the collaborative relationship between continuing education units and academic departments and the marginal status continuing education often assumes on the campus. The respondents participating in this study seem to have a much more positive experience at their four-year degree granting institution.

Overall, there seems to be a substantial amount of collaboration currently going on, and the perception of continuing education not engaging in intra-institutional collaboration with academic departments was not fully supported by the data in this

study. Additionally, there was little evidence of continuing education professionals desiring less intra-institutional collaboration, except with campus and local committee involvement. Most expressed satisfaction with their current level of intra-institutional collaboration in programs and administrative activities. While these data do not confirm that such collaborative efforts are without difficulty and challenge, they do describe a relatively active and positive level of intra-institutional collaboration between the continuing education and academic departments at the four-year degree granting institutions represented this study.

Benefits of Collaboration

It is clear from the data that the respondents realize there are benefits to be derived from intra-institutional collaboration and see it as necessary to maintain the quality of their programs and services. When asked to identify some of the benefits of collaboration, the respondents iterated many of the potential benefits discussed in the literature. The various benefits of intra-institutional collaboration fell under four main categories of responses, including benefits to the specific program, to the institution, and to the field and professional of continuing education. The fourth category of responses focused on those instances where collaboration was required by institutional policy. Within these four categories, there were a variety of examples of such benefits and opportunities, which may result from intra-institutional collaboration. For instance, benefits to the program included enhanced quality and legitimacy, improved profitability through the more efficient use of resources, and enhanced creativity and innovation in program planning. In other words, the respondents felt that the collaborative process

improved their programs and course offerings by combining the richness, rigor, and resources of the various academic departments and faculty. Benefits to the institution included supporting the institutional mission, facilitating community outreach, and improving the external relations and public image of the institution. Continuing education was clearly seen by many of the respondents as a vehicle for extending the university out to the business and local community, which in turn enhanced the image of the institution. Finally, benefits to the field included improving the understanding and awareness of continuing education programs, opportunities, and resources, while enhancing the image, credibility, and standards of the profession. This would not only help continuing education with other professionals in higher education, but could perhaps enhance the image and relationship with outside professionals in businesses and industries.

Factors Which Support Collaboration

While the various collaborative programs and activities appear to be specific to the individual professionals and institutions, the respondents shared many of their perceptions of the factors that support and inhibit intra-institutional collaborations. Identifying these factors was one of the primary purposes of this investigation. Therefore, the survey instrument designed for this study included questions that addressed these issues.

First, the respondents were asked to explain, in their own words, the factors that they felt would enhance their intra-institutional collaboration. Six main categories of responses were identified, including faculty and staff issues; funding and institutional

policy; awareness, understanding, and value for the continuing education function; campus leadership; and department incentives and communications. Upon review, these categories of responses appear to correspond with the salient factors discussed in Chapter Two's review of the literature.

Faculty and Staff

As the most frequently identified factor, faculty and staff appeared to have a significant and complex impact on intra-institutional collaboration. There seem to be many ways faculty support and enhance collaboration. First, simply having enough academic faculty available to work with continuing education was important. Many of the respondents described situations of faculty workload and overload, with faculty and staff having little time available for intra-institutional collaboration. Faculty perception of the value of continuing education was also seen as essential for successful intra-institutional collaboration. Some indicated that faculty did not place much value on continuing education and were therefore less likely to be interested or invested in intra-institutional collaboration. Some respondents also indicated that faculty utilizing the opportunities of intra-institutional collaboration to enhance and communicate their research and fulfill their service responsibilities would positively impact the opportunities for and experiences of intra-institutional collaboration. This list is certainly not exhaustive, but reflects some of the benefits of intra-institutional collaboration identified in this investigation and discussed in the literature.

Organizational Structure

Funding and institutional policy were other factors which respondents believed could enhance intra-institutional collaboration. This was also supported in the literature

pertaining to the impact of organizational structure on intra-institutional collaborations. Respondents indicated that organizational policy and funding issues related to finances, faculty workload, revenue sharing, and access to start-up funds enhanced their ability to collaborate. Having flexibility in many of the financial policies and procedures appears to be essential for the success of the intra-institutional collaborations.

The literature identified various organizational policies that may impact collaborative efforts. Specifically, organizational structures and policies regarding student support services, finances, and issues of centralization versus decentralization have been found to impact the relationships continuing education departments have with their host institution. This study investigated some of those organizational policies to ascertain if the organizational structure supported or perhaps inhibited continuing education and intra-institutional collaborations.

The importance of organizational policies and services that support continuing education programs and students is discussed extensively in the literature. Specifically, the need for policies and procedures that support the non-traditional student was emphasized. These may include issues of student access, admissions, assessment, placement, curriculum and delivery. Therefore, this study inquired into the support services available on the represented campus, which may impact a student's success and create an environment that supports or inhibits collaboration. In other words, having policies and procedures which support continuing education programs are valuable, and students may contribute to the success and be evidence of a level of support or perceived value of such programs and students.

The respondents indicated that many of the services available for continuing education students are not offered by the host institution, but rather are provided by the continuing education department. This may have a negative impact on collaborative efforts in a few respects. First, the continuing education departments represented in this study are primarily, if not completely, self-supporting. Therefore, financial and human resources may be limited, restricting the level of service that can be provided for students. Second, the failure of the main campus to provide basic support services to continuing education students may reflect an institutional attitude and/or value placed on these "non-traditional" students. Third, if continuing education departments are using their limited funds on administrative and support services, it will have less funding available to start up collaborative projects with academic departments. As indicated by the qualitative data collected in this investigation, lack of funds was perceived to inhibit collaborative efforts. Finally, continuing education professionals may be less likely to instigate new and innovative intra-institutional collaborations if there are no institutional support services to assist in the program management and serve the participating students.

Campus leadership was another factor identified by the respondents and discussed in the literature as a factor that impacts collaborative efforts. While the respondents did not overwhelmingly indicate that campus leadership support was essential for successful intra-institutional collaboration, the impact and influence of the leadership cannot be ignored. The leadership can have an impact on intra-institutional collaborative activity by supporting and encouraging such efforts. The leader can impact intra-institutional collaboration through the development of institutional policies and formal structures that

accommodate such collaborative activities. Furthermore, the campus leader plays a significant role in creating and managing the culture of the institution, which can support or inhibit intra-institutional collaboration. Specifically, the leader can help create an organizational culture, which supports collaboration by exhibiting specific behaviors and communicating a positive attitude and perception of the value of continuing education and collaborations.

The data from this study suggest that the top leaders at the institutions represented in the study are not completely consistent in their behaviors and attitudes toward continuing education and intra-institutional collaboration. While the majority of the respondents indicated that their campus leaders demonstrated supportive behaviors such as participating in continuing education activities, suggesting activities, promoting continuing education in the campus and local community, and encouraging creativity and innovation in program development, relatively few provide seed money for new programs or participate in the strategic planning for continuing education programs or units. In addition, the respondents perceived that their institutional leader did not place a high value on continuing education programs and students. This was confirmed not only in the quantitative portion of the survey, but also emerged from the qualitative data where the respondents identified a lack of understanding and value for continuing education as a factor that may inhibit collaborative efforts.

The respondents purported that the campus leaders do not encourage academic faculty participation in continuing education and intra-institutional collaboration as evidenced by the lack of incentives for collaboration and the failure to include such collaborative activities in the promotion and tenure reward process. The quantitative and

qualitative data support the notion that campus administrators represented in this study do not actively support faculty involvement in intra-institutional collaborations which, according to the respondents and the literature, may inhibit collaborative efforts.

The respondents also indicated that the institutional attitude and understanding of the continuing education function impacts their ability to collaborate. The institutional attitude may stem directly from the attitude of the leadership. Many argued that they could be much more successful at intra-institutional collaborations if there was a grater understanding, awareness, and appreciation for continuing education by the academic units and administration on their campuses. While this factor was not discussed in the review of the literature specifically as a factor that may impact collaboration, the history and relationships of continuing education and academic departments on university campuses was introduced.. In addition, this can relate directly to the verbal and active support of the institutional leader. Misperceptions and the lack of knowledge of continuing education may be limiting opportunities for intra-institutional collaboration. Thus, it appears as if the need still exists to continuously educate the campus and local community on the opportunities and benefits of continuing higher education.

Factors Which Inhibit Collaboration

When the respondents were asked to identify the factors that they felt inhibited their intra-institutional collaborative efforts, five main categories emerged, including faculty and staff issues, funding issues, understanding and value of continuing education, internal communication, competing missions of continuing education units and academic departments, and institutional leadership support. Once again these responses confirmed

what was found in the literature and mirrored the responses to the question pertaining to factors that enhance collaboration.

Faculty and Staff

Faculty and staff was again the most frequent response and implied a variety of ways faculty could actually inhibit intra-institutional collaborations. Specifically, faculty may not be interested in such collaboration and can actively prevent certain collaborations from occurring. This is of particular concern in programs and institutions where faculty approval and involvement are required by institutional policy. Ultimately, this will prevent the realization of the potential benefits of intra-institutional collaboration including enhanced rigor, legitimacy, and richness that would result from academic faculty involvement.

Organizational Structure

Institutional policy and funding issues again emerged as significant factors that may inhibit intra-institutional collaboration. As previously suggested, the availability of resources and flexibility in funding policies were factors that can enhance collaborative efforts. Conversely, the lack of funds and inflexible fiscal policies can inhibit such efforts. The respondents recognized the negative impact that the lack of resources and inflexible funding policies had on their collaborative efforts and blamed the scarcity of human, financial, and technological resources as well as outdated and inappropriate funding formulas. Specific policies were identified related to faculty and staff workload, the availability and generation of seed money for new program development, and the reliance on funding formulas for budgeting and funds. The respondents expressed

frustration with the inflexible policies, which many felt do not accommodate or support non-traditional programs offered through continuing education.

Leadership

Finally, the attitude towards, value for, and awareness of continuing education were perceived to be factors that inhibit intra-institutional collaborations on the respondents' campuses. The ongoing struggle persists for continuing education units to prove their worth and value to the organization. Unfortunately, the respondents felt that this negative perception limits their ability to interact and collaborate on their campuses. As previously discussed, this may ultimately be a reflection of the institutional leadership support, or lack thereof, for continuing higher education and intra-institutional collaboration.

Additional Factors

Interestingly, when asked to identify factors that support and inhibit their collaborative efforts in general, the same top three issues of faculty and staff, institutional funding and policy, and the understanding and awareness of continuing education (or lack thereof) emerged. On the other hand, when asked to explain why specific collaborative efforts did or didn't succeed, additional factors were identified. For instance, when asked why a specific recent collaborative effort succeeded, the respondents cited reasons such as the appropriate division of labor, a shared vision and value for the effort, and mutual/shared benefits. In addition, when asked why a specific recent collaborative program failed, the respondents blamed role conflict and role ambiguity, as well as the previously mentioned factors. According to the respondents, specific initiatives failed because the roles and responsibilities of the individuals and

groups participating in the collaborative effort were not defined and communicated clearly. Conversely, clarifying the roles and scope of responsibility was more likely to lead to the appropriate division of labor, which was identified as a factor that contributes to the success of the intra-institutional collaboration.

Overall, it appears that this investigation confirmed many of the findings found in the literature regarding factors affecting collaboration. While there was little previous research specifically related to intra-institutional collaboration between academic departments and continuing education units, the proposed factors found in the related literature appeared to be relevant. Academic faculty was consistently identified throughout this investigation and the literature as having significant and variable affects on intra-institutional collaborations. Organizational policy and structure were also confirmed as salient, as well as the direct and indirect impact of leadership. In addition, the attitude, understanding, and value placed on continuing education by the academic departments and leadership on campus were consistently identified as affecting both the success and failure of intra-institutional collaboration.

Recommendations for Professionals

This chapter provided a discussion and overview of some of the findings of this study and their implications, which specifically addressed the research goals of this investigation. The remaining sections of this chapter will discuss recommendations for professionals and researchers on how this research can be used to improve professional practice and contribute to the body of research on the specific and related topics. In general, the data from this study suggest that the current status of intra-institutional

collaboration between continuing education and academic departments on university campuses is not as bleak as previously thought. In general, the continuing higher education professionals participating in this study described a positive and active collaborative relationship with their academic department colleagues. This does not mean that there is no room or opportunities for improvement. In fact, this investigation identified various strategies continuing education professionals can employ in the field and in their respective institutions to improve and expand the collaborative relationships and activities on their campuses.

Work within the Profession

It is evident from the literature and this investigation that the image of continuing education continues to affect the work of continuing education professionals and is perceived as a factor which may support or inhibit their intra-institutional collaboration. Before working with campus leaders, administrators, and faculty, continuing higher education professionals must look to themselves to understand and address their responsibility in this ongoing struggle for status and acceptance.

The field of continuing education is diverse and dynamic. As witnessed in this study, there is a lack of consistency in the titles and organization of continuing education units on university campuses as well as a lack of consistency in the professional and academic experiences of continuing education representatives of UCEA. While this may be inherent in a field that brings together so many different professions and disciplines, it may also contribute to the lack of acceptance in a discipline-based organization. If continuing higher education is going to strengthen its status as a profession, it will have to look at some of these inconsistencies and begin to set and enforce professional

standards. This is not to suggest a rigid standardization that would compromise the very diversity inherent to the field, but instead calls for guidelines for professional preparation and best practices. Communicating with a common language with regard to professional titles, programs, and units may also enhance the status of the profession as well as the credibility and relations with academic colleagues on their campuses. If continuing higher education professionals cannot seem to agree on what to call its professionals and programs, how can people outside the profession be expected to understand and support its function?

The discussion of continuing higher education as a profession is not new or unique to this study. Griffith (1980) presented a debate of this topic, identifying the costs and benefits to establishing a profession. Some of the potential disadvantages included standardization, alienation of "outsiders" who could make valuable contributions, and difficulty in clearly defining the parameters of a new profession, hence eliminating ties to other fields. In spite of these potential disadvantages, attaining the status of a profession implies a level of prestige, which can increase access to resources. This prestige also enhances the perception of competence of the members within the profession and helps to attract more qualified professionals. Griffith (1980) concluded his discussion with a call for professionalism and stated, "The practice of adult education and its services to the public would be significantly improved if everyone working in the field had more of a common understanding of the field, possessed a certain minimal vision of what it's all about. We would be less scattered, would be able to recognize other people who are in our field, and could work together with them (p. 219).

Work with Campus Leadership

Once continuing education professionals develop a collective standard of professionalism and vision of the field, leaders within the individual continuing education units will be better equipped to work with their institution leadership on supporting continuing higher education and enhancing opportunities for intra-institutional collaboration. This investigation and the literature suggest that campus leaders can enhance or inhibit intra-institutional collaborations by facilitating a supportive campus culture and climate and through the establishment and enforcement of campus policy and procedures. Therefore, continuing higher education professionals must work with campus leadership and participate actively in the campus community.

Campus leaders are particularly concerned with the public image of their institution. Related to this is the institution's ability to attract funding sources as well as competent professionals and reputable faculty. As suggested by the literature and data from this investigation, the benefits to intra-institutional collaboration exceed the disadvantages and may include enhancing the public image of the institution. Extending the campus to the local and business community through intra-institutional collaborations could do much to enhance the visibility of the institution. This could in turn increase public support and ultimately result in greater funding opportunities. Continuing higher education professionals must remind campus leaders of these potential benefits to enhance the perceived value of such intra-institutional collaboration. As the leaders' perception of the value of such collaborations expands, so too may the supportive climate and institutional culture. In other words, the campus leader must first be convinced of the benefits of such collaborations to ensure that their attitudes and behaviors enhance

and support rather than inhibit intra-institutional collaboration. If the leader does not appreciate fully the benefit of such efforts, it is not likely that the necessary attitudes, behaviors, and policies will be in place to allow those relationships to develop and flourish. Complete and genuine support by the campus leadership will help to encourage the involvement and support of other campus leaders and faculty.

Work with Campus Administrators

Once the institutional leader is supportive of the concept of intra-institutional collaboration, continuing higher education professionals must then work with other campus administrators who are responsible and involved in the daily implementation of policies and procedures. Particular emphasis should be placed on communication with financial and budget officers, as well as those responsible for student support services. As suggested by the literature and confirmed in this investigation, inflexible financial policy and procedures can greatly inhibit intra-institutional collaborations. By communicating the specific terms and needs of the particular collaborative effort, financial officers and administrators will be better able to assist with the project and support the effort. Without such communication, it is unlikely that policy and procedures will be supportive of such non-traditional programs and efforts. While the institutional financial officer may not have complete control over the budgetary policies and procedures, knowledge of the nature and circumstances of the intra-institutional collaborations can only enhance their ability and willingness to implement strategies, which support rather than inhibit collaborative programs and activities.

Continuing higher education professionals must also work with campus administrators in charge of student support services. As indicated by the respondents

participating in this study, continuing education students do not always have access to campus support services. Before intra-institutional collaborative programs are developed and implemented, continuing education professionals must ensure that the students who participate in the program are supported appropriately. Failure to attend to the needs of the students will inevitably result in the failure of the programs.

Work with Academic Deans

Fostering an institutional climate that supports intra-institutional collaboration will not necessarily guarantee the successful implementation of such programs. The data from this study identified academic deans as yet another significant factor in the success or failure of intra-institutional collaborations. Many of the respondents identified the academic dean or department chair as a factor which contributed to the success of the intra-institutional collaboration. While the academic dean's authority may not extend beyond the specific college, department, or discipline, he/she may have extensive control over the workload of faculty. In addition, academic deans may support or inhibit collaborative programs involved in their discipline and subject content. It is therefore essential to gain the support of academic deans, which will only serve to enhance the access to resources and quality of the intra-institutional collaboration.

Whereas the academic dean may determine the criteria for faculty promotion, tenure, and merit, their support for intra-institutional collaboration is essential. The data and literature consistently supported the role that promotion and tenure criteria play in determining faculty activity. Those activities, which are not recognized and valued in the promotion and tenure process, may be seen as less desirable to faculty members. While academic deans may not have complete control over the criteria for promotion and

tenure, they will likely have some say in the rewards received by their faculty members. If the academic dean does not support the involvement of faculty in intra-institutional collaboration, it may reduce, if not eliminate, the faculty member's interest in such involvements. While the academic dean may not be able to prevent the faculty member from engaging in such activities, they may impact negatively the rewards and promotions received by the faculty member.

While the need to gain support from academic deans may be obvious, the strategies for generating that support may be less clear. As suggested for working with campus leaders and administrator, the continuing higher education professional must consider what is important to academic deans and department chairs, and demonstrate how intra-institutional collaborations can satisfy their needs and priorities. Communicating the benefits of such arrangements is essential to ensure that the academic deans perceive the value of such efforts, and thus support the involvement of their faculty and their department's resources. The desired benefits may vary by institution but may include the promise of revenue sharing, the split of FTE, or the enhanced image and visibility of the particular program and discipline.

Working With Faculty

Support from the campus and department leader and administrators can help create an environment supportive of intra-institutional collaboration. Ultimately, though, it's up to the individual professionals and faculty members to make the intra-institutional collaboration work. The respondents in this study clearly found faculty members to have a significant impact on the success and failure of intra-institutional collaborations. Many argued for the importance of faculty expertise and creativity to ensure the high quality

and rigor of the collaborative program. Some also indicated that faculty involvement was mandated by institutional policy, therefore making the collaborative relationship essential. Furthermore, the potential benefits of intra-institutional collaborations are mutual, and faculty can also derive personal and professional rewards from such experiences. The potential benefits to the institution, department, and faculty member are well accepted. The challenge is enhancing the value of that potential benefit to help motivate the individuals to take the time and energy necessary for successful intra-institutional collaboration.

One of the most elementary steps is to make sure that faculty members are even aware of the continuing education department and opportunities for intra-institutional collaborations. Whereas university organizations are separated by discipline-based colleges, many may have little opportunity to explore opportunities outside their discipline and research area. Target marketing and public relations strategies must be employed to increase the campus awareness and interest in the many programs and opportunities available.

Knowledge about the programs and opportunities is not sufficient to ensure interest and participation in intra-institutional collaboration. As indicated by the respondents and supported in the literature, faculty members are increasingly burdened with multiple responsibilities for teaching, research, service, student advising, and, in some instances, the generation of grant funding and revenue. Therefore, faculty members must be selective in the activities that consume their time and resources. It is imperative for the continuing higher education professional to explain to faculty members how certain intra-institutional collaborations could assist them in fulfilling their

responsibilities and are not just other sources of work. One of the best ways to do this would be to identify faculty members who have enjoyed such collaborative activities, and have them provide testimonials and help spread the word. Examples of the use of intra-institutional collaboration to improve classroom experiences, communicate research, and fulfill service roles will help faculty members comprehend fully the range of opportunities and, ideally, their desire and interest in participation. It is important to note that, as previously discussed, this will first require the full support of the campus and department leadership.

A Strategic Approach to Collaboration

In additional to the factors that can support and inhibit collaboration, this study also identified potential areas of collaboration and some suggested strategies for maximizing success. The literature discussed and the respondents confirmed the need to employ a strategic planning approach to the collaborative process. Following are some suggested steps that should guide the collaborative process to help ensure success.

First and foremost, before initiating any intra-institutional collaborative activity, a needs assessment should be conducted. This will help to identify the level of need and interest for a particular effort and insure that all potential parties are invested and prepared for the relationship. The collaborative effort must satisfy a need for both parties in the relationship to maximize the chances for success.

Once the assessment is conducted and the program need identified, the mutual interest must be articulated and expressed through shared visions and goals for the particular collaborative program. In addition to the goals and objectives, the parties must

define and delimit the roles and responsibilities of each member of the collaborative relationship. Role conflict and ambiguity can destroy the collaborative effort, so it is essential that the roles and responsibilities are clarified for each participant. Furthermore, it is imperative that the assigned responsibilities are appropriate for each participant. As indicated by the respondents who participated in this study, intra-institutional collaborative activities were much more likely to be successful when the administrative duties were assigned to continuing education professionals, leaving academic faculty responsible for the curriculum content and instruction issues.

Once the program need, goals, and roles are established, the planning process and program implementation will begin. As seen from this study and the literature, it is important that the program's progress be monitored. Some of the respondents discussed the importance of regular planning meetings for updates and to keep the communication flowing. Regular "check-ups" are necessary to make sure that the shared vision and goals are being satisfied and are still appropriate. It may be necessary to re-direct the program, modify roles, or make other changes. And, as discussed, the importance of true dialogue and open communication cannot be minimized, and requires regular contact and interaction.

The process of intra-institutional collaboration must include an evaluation component. This can be formative and/or summative, and can include formal and informal methods. The plan for evaluation must be articulated from the very beginning of the planning process so all parties are aware of when and how their progress will be assessed. It is important for all parties to remember that the members of the collaborative form a temporary organization, brought together for the sole purpose of the particular

program. Once that program has met its goals, it may be necessary for the group to break up and cease working together. This step must be part of the planning process to ensure that the group is dissolved once their work is done.

Finally, the existence and successes of the intra-institutional collaboration must be communicated to the campus community. Administrators, department leaders, and other faculty members should be made aware of the group's work, productivity, and achievements. This could help spread the word about potential opportunities and benefits of intra-institutional collaborations, and encourage others to become involved in such efforts.

Recommendations for Future Research

The purpose of this investigation was not only to improve the professional practice of continuing higher education, but also to contribute to the knowledge and research base. As previously suggested, there is a paucity of research on intra-institutional collaborations, and virtually none pertaining specifically to continuing education and academic departments on university campuses. Given the changing nature of higher education and the demand for more interdisciplinary work and programs for non-traditional students, there is a strong need for further study and enhanced practice. This final section will discuss some of the research strategies, which may be employed to expand upon this present study and contribute to the research on intra-institutional collaboration.

While this present investigation gathered a considerable amount of data on the continuing higher education professionals, units, programs, and the nature and status of

existing intra-institutional collaborations, the data were strictly descriptive. Further research should expand upon this descriptive data and employ a research design that is more comparative and causal. The descriptive data set the stage to ask more questions which may allow the researcher to compare institutions, continuing education departments, and program foci to see if differences exist in their level and satisfaction with intra-institutional collaboration. A more sophisticated research design supported by the theoretical knowledge gathered in the review of the literature may lead to the development and testing of a "model of intra-institutional collaboration." The individual factors identified could be tested in a regression analysis to determine their individual and combined effect on intra-institutional collaboration. While this present study answered many questions regarding the current status of intra-institutional collaborations, it also opened the doors for additional questions that could be explored.

One of the limitations of this investigation was that it only included the continuing higher education professionals. Future research should investigate the perceptions of academic faculty, deans, and administrators, to determine if their perceptions of intra-institutional collaborations differ from those of the continuing higher education professionals. Do professionals outside of the field of continuing education agree with the findings from this study, or is there a different perspective on the factors which support or inhibit intra-institutional collaborations? This investigation also only included representatives from four-year, degree-granting institutions. Do other types and sizes of institution of higher education experience similar issues and challenges with intra-institutional collaboration? Utilizing a different population sample may provide a new set of relevant issues and challenges.

Finally, additional research is needed to expand upon the theoretical knowledge of intra-institutional collaboration. While much research exists on inter-institutional collaboration, little is known about the unique experience of intra-institutional collaboration, particularly in higher education when disciplines separate groups within the same institution.

REFERENCES

Alreck, P.L. and Settle, R.B. (1985). *The Survey Research Handbook.* Homewood Illinois: Irwin.

Apps, J. (1988). *Higher Education in a Learning Society: Meeting New Demands for Education and Training.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Apps, J. (1989). What should the future focus be for adult and continuing education? In B.A. Quigley (Eds.) *Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 44*, Winter. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers. P. 23-30.

Apps, J. (1990). Beliefs, values and vision making for continuing higher education. *Continuing Higher Education Review, Vol. 54, (3).* P. 124 – 136.

Ashkenas, R., Ulrich, D., Jick, T., & Kerr, S. (1995*). The Boundaryless Organization: Breaking the Chains of Organizational Structures.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1997). *Ten Public Policy Issues for Higher Education in 1997 and 1998.* AGB Public Policy Paper Series No. 97-1. Washington DC: AGB.

Babbie, E.R. (1973). *Survey Research Methods.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Babbie, E. (1995). The practice of social research. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Baldridge, J.V., Curtis, D.V., Ecker, G.P. and Riley, G. (1986). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In M. Peterson (Ed). ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education. ASHE Reader Series. Washington D.C.: Ginn Press. p. 11-27.

Beatty, P.T. and Robbins, B.P. (1990). The Educating role of religious institutions. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. No. 47, Fall.* P. 29-36.

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

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why Leaders Can't Lead.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bowen, H.R. (1980). *Adult Learning, Higher Education, and the Economics of Unused Capacity.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Briar-Lawson, K. (1998). Community collaboration and service integration: Models and challenges. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 155-166.

Brown, J. (1995). Dialogue: Capacities and Stories. In S. Chawla and J. Reneschi (Eds.) *Learning Organizations.* Oregon: Productivity Press.

Cabell, H.W. (1985). Extending the college to serve adults. In Rocco, T.M. and Murphy, L.R. (Eds.) *Institutional and Staff Structures for Non-Traditional Programs: Alliance Manual No. 2.* Scarecrow Press. p. 1 – 24.

Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1972). *The more effective use of resources: An imperative for higher education.* New York: McGraw Hill Book Company.

Castle, J. (1997). Rethinking mutual goals in school-university collaborations. In H. Christiansen, L. Goulet, C. Krentz, M. Maeers (Eds.) *Recreating Relationships: Collaboration and Educational Reform.* New York: State University of New York Press. P. 59-67.

Cervero, R.M. (1984). Collaborations in university continuing professional education. In H. Beder (Eds.) *Realizing the Potential of Inter-Organizational Cooperation: New Directions for Continuing Education,* 23. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. P. 23-38.

Cervero, R.M. (1988). *Effective Continuing Education for Professionals.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Chance, E.W. (1992). *Visionary Leadership in Schools.* Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas.

Chobot, M.C. and Chobot, R.B. (1990). Museums as educational institutions. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. No. 47, Fall.* P. 55- 62.

Clark, B. (1958). *The Marginality of Adult Education.* Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Conger, J.A. (1992). *Learning to Lead.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Courtnay, B. (1990). Community education for older adults. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education.* No. 47, Fall. P. 37-44.

Desio, R. (1987). The Corporation and the Campus: Developing New Partnerships. Challenges to Continuing Higher Education. Washington D.C. NUCEA, Kellogg Foundation.

Donaldson, J.F. (1992). Research and continuing higher education. In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.). *Continuing Higher Education: The Coming Wave.* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 64-82.

Donaldson, J.F. and Ross-Gordon. (1992). Population diversity and the organization and function of continuing higher education In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.). *Continuing Higher Education: The Coming Wave.* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 1-20.

Donaldson, J.F. and Kozoll, C.E. (1999*). Collaborative Program Planning: Principles, Practices, and Strategies.* Malabar, Florida: Kreiger Publishing Company.

Edelson, P. (1992). Leadership and the future of adult and continuing education. In P. Edelson (Eds.) Rethinking Leadership in adult and Continuing Education. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 56,* Winter. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher. p. 95 – 105.

Edwards, R. (1999*). The Academic department: How does it fit into the university reform agenda*? Change, 31, (5). P. 17-27.

Eitel, D.F. (1989). *The Dynamics of marginality in continuing higher education. Doctor of Philosophy in Public Policy Analysis.* Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.

Escott, M.D., Semlak, W.D., Comadena, M.E. (1992). Change in continuing higher education: Implications for faculty. In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.).

Continuing Higher Education: The Coming Wave. New York: Teachers College Press. p. 49-63.

Etzioni, A. (1986). Administrative and professional authority.. In M. Peterson (Ed). ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education. ASHE Reader Series. Washington D.C.: Ginn Press. p. 28-35.

Ferro, T.R. (1990). Social and fraternal organizations as educators. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education.* No. 47, Fall. P. 13-20.

Fingeret, H.A. (1984). Who's in Control? A case study of university-industry collaboration. In H. Beder (Eds.) Realizing the potential of interorganizational cooperation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Foley, E.M. (1998). Lessons Learned: A Three-year project to advance interprofessional education in nine universities. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 221-228.

Gabor, S.C. and Yerkes, A.M. (1999). The university's changing role in post-baccalaureate education. In M. Shinagel (Eds.). *Continuing Higher Education Review, 63,* Fall. Pp. 56-67.

Galbraith, M.W. (1990). He Nature of community and adult education. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education. No. 47,* Fall. P. 3-11.

Gessner, Q.H. (1987a). Overview. In Q.H. Gessner (Ed.), Handbook on Continuing Higher Education. (pp. 1-11). *American Council on Education.* McMillan.

Gessner, Q.H. (1987b). A look to the future for continuing higher education. In Q.H. Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on Continuing Higher Education. (pp. 233-242). American Council on Education.* McMillan.

Glowacki-Dudka, M. (1999). Interorganizational Collaboration: Opportunities, Challenges, and Strategies for Program Development. Doctoral Dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison. Doctor of Philosophy: Continuing and Vocational Education.

Gray, B. (1985). Conditions facilitating interorganizational collaboration. Human Relations 3. 1-10.

Helgesen, S. (1996). Leading from the grass roots. In F. Hesselbeim, M. Goldsmith, and R. Beckhard (Eds.) *The Leader of the Future: New Visions, Strategies, and Practices for the Next Era.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Hershey, P., Blanchard, K.H., Johnson, D.E. (1996). *Management of Organizational Behavior.* Seventh Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Higgins, P. (1997). A Study of Coupling and Organizational Models in Continuing Education. Dissertation submitted. Doctor of Education. Graduate School of Education. George Mason University.

Hohmann, L. (1985). *Inter-organizational collaboration in continuing professional education.* In R.M. Cervero and C.L. Scanlan (Eds.) Problems and Prospects in Continuing Professional Education. New Directions for Continuing Education. No. 27. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Houle, C. O. (1961). *The Inquiring Mind.* 2nd Edition. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kanter, R.M. (1972). *Commitment and Community.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Karabell, Z. (1998). *What's college for? The struggle to define American higher education.* New York: Basic Books.

Katz, D. and Kahn, R.L. (1966). *The Social Psychology of Organizations.* New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

King, B.K. (1992). A question of finance: Existing resources and a new mission. In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.). *Continuing Higher Education: The Coming Wave.* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 100-130.

King, B,K. and Lerner, A.W. (1992). Organizational structure and performance dynamics in continuing higher education. . In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.). *Continuing Higher Education: The Coming Wave.* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 83-99.

Knox, A.B. (1981). The continuing education agency and its parent organization. In J.C. Vortuba (Eds.) *Strengthening Internal Support for Continuing Education: New Directions for Continuing Education,* 9. P. 1 – 13.

Knox, A.B. (1989). Designing comprehensive programs in adult and continuing education. In B.A. Quigley (Eds.) *Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing*

Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 44, Winter. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers. P. 47-54.

Kuh, G.D. and Whitt, E. (1988). *The invisible tapestry: Culture in American colleges and universities.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education.

Lerner, A.W. (1992). The Coming wave. In A.W. Lerner and King, B.K. (Eds.). Continuing Higher Education: *The Coming Wave.* New York: Teachers College Press. p. 1-20.

Lerner, R.M., Simon, L K., and Mitchell, D.B. (1998). Creating outreach universities: Challenges and choices. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 268-282.

Lesht, F. (1989). Turning Challenges into Opportunities: Securing Institutional Support for Continuing Education. The Guide Series in Continuing Education. Champaign, Illinois: The University of Illinois.

Levine, A. & Cureton, J. (1998). When hope and fear collide. *Change.* May/June. P. 14 – 17.

Long, H. (1990). Research trends, topics, results, approaches, and funding in continuing higher education 1989 – 1998: A Delphi study. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, Winter, p. 1 – 10.

Madere, J.J. (1994). Cohorts: Building internal networks for more efficient college-corporate partnerships. In D. Boyd (Ed). Enhancing Continuing Education through Partnerships: The Importance of Cooperation and Collaboration. Proceedings from ASHE Meeting, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. October 22-25, 1994. p. 48 – 53.

Marienau, C. (1985). Effective liaison within the institution. . In Rocco, T.M. and Murphy, L.R. (Eds.). *Institutional and Staff Structures for Non-Traditional Programs: Alliance Manual No. 2.* Scarecrow Press. p. 37-62.

Mason, R.C. (1989). Developing leaders in institutions of higher education. In B.A. Quigley (Eds.) *Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 44, Winter.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers. P. 79-86.

Matusak, L. and Dowd, R. (1985). Administrative structures in alternative degree programs. In Rocco, T.M. and Murphy, L.R. (Eds.). *Institutional and Staff*

Structures for Non-Traditional Programs: Alliance Manual No. 2. Scarecrow Press. p. 25-36.

McGaughey, J.L. (1992). Symbolic leadership: Redefining relations with the host organization. In P. Edelson (Eds.*) Rethinking Leadership in adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 56, Winter.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher. p. 39 – 50.

McCroskey, J. (1998). Remaking professional and interprofessional education. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 3-24.

McMillan, J.H. and Schumacher, S. (1997). Research in education: A conceptual introduction. New York, NY: Longeman.

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1984). Qualitative Data Analysis: A Sourcebook of New Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Miller, P.A. (1981). Strengthening the university continuing education mission. In J.C. Vortuba (Eds.) *Strengthening Internal Support for Continuing Education: New Directions for Continuing Education, 9.* P. 29 – 36.

Newman, I. And Benz, I. (1998). *Qualitative-Quantitative Research Methodology: Exploring the Interactive Continuum.* Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

Niemi, J.A. (1989). Strengthening the field's impact within institutions of higher education. In B.A. Quigley (Eds.*) Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Continuing Education, 44, Winter.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers. P. 55-62.

Nowlen, P.M. (1987). Special characteristics of continuing education for the professions. In Q.H. Gessner (Ed.*), Handbook on Continuing Higher Education.* (pp. 211-232). American Council on Education. Macmillan.

Nowlen, P.M. (1988). *A New Approach to Continuing Education for Business and Professionals.* London: Collier Macmillan Publishers.

Otte, M. R. (1980). *The disposition of the faculty toward continuing education at Rutgers, the state university of New Jersey.* Doctoral Dissertation. Doctor of Education in Teachers College, Columbia University.

Owens, R.G. (1998). *Organizational Behavior in Education.* (6th Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Patterson, W. (1999). A model of shared leadership for graduate certificate programs. Continuing Higher Education Review, 63. P. 68-79.

Picus, L.O. (1998). University fiscal management structures and interprofessional collaboration among faculty. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 245-256.

Pittman, V. (1989). What is the image of the field today? In B.A. Quigley (Eds.) *Fulfilling the Promise of Adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Continuing Education*, 44, Winter. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers. P. 15-22.

Ratchford, C.B. (1974). Organization to accomplish the public service objectives. Proceedings. National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education. University of Georgia and National Association of State Universities and Land Grant colleges. June 23-26, 1974. Conference Proceedings. P. 79-83.

Robertson, P.J. (1998). Inter-organizational relationships: Key issues for integrated services. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 67-87.

Rocco, T.M. and Murphy, L.R. (1985*). Institutional and Staff Structures for Non-Traditional Programs: Alliance Manual No. 2.* Scarecrow Press.

Rohfield, R.W. (1996). Access and the search for academic respectability in Continuing Higher Education. *Continuing Higher Education Review, Vol. 60,* (1). P. 54-66.

Rolls, J. (1995). The transformational leader: The Wellspring of the learning organization. In S. Chawla and J. Reneschi (Eds.*) Learning Organizations.* Oregon: Productivity Press. P. 101 –108.

Rose, A.O. (1992). Visions of leadership: Understanding the research literature. In P. Edelson (Eds.) *Rethinking Leadership in adult and Continuing Education. New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 56, Winter.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publisher. p. 83 – 94.

Rowley, D.J., Lujan, H.D., Dolence, M.G. (1998). *Strategic Choices for the Academy.*

Rusk, D. (1974). Tomorrow's Need: The Universal Man. Proceedings. National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education. University of Georgia and National Association of State Universities and Land Grant colleges. June 23-26, 1974. Conference Proceedings. P. 3-8.

Sarason, S.B. & Lorentz, E.M. (1998). *Crossing boundaries: Collaboration, coordination, and the redefinition of resources*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Schein, E.H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership*. 2nd edition. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Schein, E.H. (1999). The corporate culture survival guide: sense and nonsense about culture change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schmuck, R.A. & Runkel, P. (1985). *The Handbook of Organization Development in Schools*. (3rd Edition). Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Shoemaker, C.J. (1998). *Leadership in Continuing and Distance Education in Higher Education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Sisco, B.R. and Whitson, D.L. (1990). Libraries: The people's university. In M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. No. 47, Fall. P. 21-28.

Snider, J.C. (1987). Components of a successful continuing higher education unit. In Q.H. Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on Continuing Higher Education*. (pp. 51-65). American Council on Education. McMillan.

Sorensen, C. & Robinson, D. (1992). Gender and psychological type: Implications for serving non-traditional students. *Continuing Higher Education Review, Vol. 56*, (1 and 2). P. 35 – 47.

Spafford, C.S., Pesce, A.I., Grosser, G.S. (1998). *The Cyclopedic Education Dictionary. Albany*: Delmar Publications.

Steward, H. (1997). Metaphors of inter-relatedness: Principles of collaboration. In H. Christiansen, L. Goulet, C. Krentz, M. Maeers (Eds.) *Recreating Relationships: Collaboration and Educational Reform*. New York: State University of New York Press. P. 27-53.

Sweeney, J.M., Ryan, M., and Fitzgerald, S.M. (1994). Leadership in building institutional partnerships. In D. Boyd (Ed). Enhancing Continuing Education through

Partnerships: The Importance of Cooperation and Collaboration. Proceedings from ASHE Meeting, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. October 22-25, 1994. p. 26 – 47.

Toffler, A. (1984). *The Adaptive Corporation*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Trow, M. (1977). Departments as a context for teaching and learning. In D. McHenry and Associates (Ed.) *Academic Departments*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Twigg, C. (1992). Improving productivity in higher education. Cause/Effect, 15, (2). Summer.

UCEA (1997). *University Continuing Education Association: Membership Directory* 1997 – 1998. Washington DC: UCEA.

Walshok, M.L. (1999). Dialogue and collaboration as keys to building innovative educational initiatives in a knowledge based economy. In P.J. Edelson and P. Malone (Eds.) *Enhancing Creativity in Adult and Continuing Education: Innovative Approaches, Methods, and Ideas. No 81, Spring*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers. p. 77-86.

Weick, K.E. (1986). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. . In M. Peterson (Ed). ASHE Reader on Organization and Governance in Higher Education. ASHE Reader Series. Washington D.C.: Ginn Press. p. 42-60.

Wiswell, A.K. (1990). Business and industry for continuous learning. M. Galbraith (Eds.). *Education through Community Organizations: New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education*. No. 47, Fall. P. 71-77.

Wood, G.J. (1998). An analysis of professional values: Implications for interprofessional collaboration. In McCroskey, J. and Einbinder, S.D (Eds.). Universities and Communities: Remaking Professional and Interprofessional Education for the Next Century. Westport, CT: Praeger. P. 25-35.

Wright, M. (1976). A Critical Analysis of Continuing Education Programs at Institutions of Higher Education in a Metropolitan Area. Dissertation. Ph.D.. University of Texas at Austin.

Young, K. (1987). Forces and questions in continuing higher education. In Q.H. Gessner (Ed.), *Handbook on Continuing Higher Education. (pp. 33-49). American Council on Education*. Macmillan.

APPENDIX A
NOTIFICATION LETTER

March 22, 2000

Amy Hyams
UNLV Continuing Education
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154

Dear Colleague:

As a fellow UCEA member, continuing educator, and lifelong learner, I am requesting your help. in a week or so, you wiil be receiving a letter from me. In the letter will be a questionnaire inquiring into the continuing education functions and collaborative programs on your campus. Aiso included, will be a return self-addressed stamped envelope. This survey is part of my dissertation research investigating the relationships between continuing education and academic departments on various campuses. The pilot study revealed that the survey takes approximately 20 minutes to complete.

I realize how busy you are and appreciate you taking the time to help. Please feel free to forward the survey to someone else in your department who may be better able to provide the information requested. I am confident that the data and study will be of great interest to all of us in continuing higher education, and i look forward to sharing the results when the study is complete.

Thank you for your time and dedication to lifelong learning.

Sincerely,

Amy Hyams
UNLV Continuing Education
ahyams@ccmail.nevada.edu
(702) 895-1022

APPENDIX B
COVER LETTER

Amy Hyams
UNLV Continuing Education
4505 Maryland Parkway
Las Vegas, NV 89154-1019

March 20, 2000

Dear Colleague:

As a fellow UCEA member, professional in continuing education, and lifelong learner, I am requesting your assistance with my doctoral research. A few moments of your time and some of your insight and wisdom are all I ask!

The topic and title of my dissertation research is **"Collaborations on Campus: Collaborative Activities between Continuing Education and Academic Departments on University campuses."** Specifically, I am interested in the types of collaborations that currently exist, as well as factors that may promote or stifle collaborative efforts. I selected this topic as a result of my personal experiences and challenges with collaborations on my own campus. In speaking with other colleagues at last year's UCEA conference, it became quite obvious that I was not alone with my issues and challenges. While we all recognize the benefits of collaboration and interdisciplinary work, the challenges and barriers cannot be ignored.

I would greatly appreciate you completing and returning the enclosed survey in the self-addressed postage paid envelope. If someone else in your department would be better able to answer the questions, please forward the survey to that person. The survey should take approximately 20 minutes to complete. I am hoping that all surveys will be returned by the time we meet in April for the UCEA National Conference.

Your participation in this project is essential for its success. All responses will be kept confidential and will be used only for the purpose of this study. Of course, I will be happy to share the results in an executive summary to all those interested. Aiso, I hope the findings will be the topic of future professional papers and presentations.

Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to receiving your survey and perhaps meeting you in San Diego at the UCEA conference.

Respectfully,

Amy Hyams
Program Coordinator
UNLV Continuing Education
(702) 895-1022
ahyams@ccmail.nevada.edu

APPENDIX C
FINAL SURVEY

27685

Collaborations on Campus Survey

Please take a moment to tell me about your continuing education department, and the collaborative relationships between continuing education and academic units on your campus. The more common term "continuing education (CE) is used, but may also include extension education programs and other department titles.

*Please use a **BLUE** or **BLACK PEN** to complete this survey*

Please shade circles like this: ○ ● ○ ○ ○

Part I: Professional Assignment and Program Description

1. What is your title? _____

2. What are your primary duties? _____

3. To whom do you report? _____

4. Is your CE assignment full or part-time? ○ Full-time ○ Part-time

4a. If part time what other programs are you assigned to? _____

5. How long have you been at your institution? _____

6. How many years have you been in the field of CE? _____

7. What is the highest academic degree you hold? _____

8. In what discipline is your highest academic degree? _____

9. What is the approximate annual enrollment of your institution? _____

10. What is the name of your department? (i.e. college of extended studies, department of continuing education etc.) _____

11. What is the approximate annual enrollment of your CE program? _____

12. How long has the CE division existed at your institution? _____

13. How frequently do you offer the following types of programs through your CE extension department?

Use this scale to determine your answers

	Always Offer 5	Often Offer 4	Sometimes Offer 3	Rarely Offer 2	Never Offer 1
13a. Non-credit: Community / Leisure classes	○	○	○	○	○
13b. Non-credit: Professional classes	○	○	○	○	○
13c. Certificate: Professional Certificates	○	○	○	○	○
13d. Conferences	○	○	○	○	○
13e. Distance Education	○	○	○	○	○
13f. Correspondence Education	○	○	○	○	○
13g. Academic Credit classes	○	○	○	○	○
13h. Undergraduate Degree Programs	○	○	○	○	○
13i. Graduate Degree Programs	○	○	○	○	○

formid [ ][ ][ ][ ]

27685

14. What is the current major focus(es) of your continuing education/extension program?

(Select all that apply)

The focus is on:

- O Evening / weekend credit courses
- O *Adult basic education*
- O Non-credit, community interests
- O Professionals and continuing professional education
- O Distance education (internet, *correspondence study*)
- O Academic departments usually control the focus

15. Please indicate who performs the following functions for continuing education credit and non-credit students, programs, and/or faculty by selecting the appropriate *circles*

	Continuing Education Office 1	Main Campus Office 2	Not Offered 3
15a. Student Registration: Non credit classes	O	O	O
15b. Student Advising: Non-credit classes	O	O	O
15c. Student Transcripts: Non-credit classes	O	O	O
15d. Student Registration: Credit classes	O	O	O
15e. Student Advising: Credit classes	O	O	O
15f. Student Transcripts: Credit classes	O	O	O
15g. CE Program Marketing	O	O	O
15h. CE Program Evaluation	O	O	O
15i. CE Faculty Training	O	O	O
15j. CE Faculty Evaluation	O	O	O

Part II: Organizational Structure and Characteristics

16. Select the *ONE* response which *BEST* describes the continuing education program within your institution?

- O Centralized: separate CE department
- O *Decentralized: Each academic college/department* is responsible for field related CE programs
- O Mixed: *Formal arrangement* and approved combination of centralized and decentralized models
- O Mixed: *Formal centralized model* but academic departments perform their own CE programs without the CE unit participation
- O Other: *Please explain* [ ]

17. Select the *ONE* response which *BEST* describes your continuing education program's funding structure?

- O Completely self-supporting
- O Completely subsidized by state/ government/ university funding
- O Primarily self-supporting, partially subsidized
- O Primarily subsidized, partially self-supporting
- O Other: *Please explain* [ ]

18. In relation to the institution's central administrative offices, the main continuing education office is: *(Select* ONE)

- O *In same building as central* administrative offices
- O In same building as other academic departments
- O On main campus but CE has own facility
- O Separated and off campus
- O Other: Please explain [ ]

19: CE program activities are held *(Select ONE)*

- O Only on the main campus
- O Only *off campus*
- O Both on and off campus

20. Overall, how would you describe the collaborative relationship between CE and academic departments on your campus? *(Select* ONE)

- O Very Positive
- O Somewhat Positive
- O Neutral
- O Somewhat Negative
- O Very Negative

formid [ ]

27685

21. Please indicate your response to the following by selecting the appropriate circle

	YES 1	NO 2	NOT SURE 3
In general, on my campus			
21a. The CE function is supported by my institution's mission statement	O	O	O
21b. CE students are considered to be of equal caliber to traditional students	O	O	O
21c. CE students are considered to be of equal importance to traditional students	O	O	O
21d. CE programs are respected as much as traditional academic programs	O	O	O
21e. CE students have access to the same campus services as traditional students	O	O	O
21f. CE faculty are considered equal to academic faculty	O	O	O

22. Do you believe that continuing education and academic department faculty and staff collaboration is beneficial for your program?

O YES O NO

Please Explain

23. Please list the factors that you feel would help enhance your department's collaborative efforts on campus.

Please Explain

24. Please list the factors that you feel inhibit your department's collaborative efforts on campus.

Please Explain

Part III: Campus Leadership

25. Please indicate your response to the following by selecting the appropriate circle

In general, do top campus administrators on your campus...	YES 1	NO 2	NOT SURE 3
25a. Actively participate in specific CE activities	O	O	O
25b. Suggest possible program activities	O	O	O
25c. Help promote CE in the campus community	O	O	O
25d. Help promote CE in the external community	O	O	O
25e. Advocate policy supporting CE	O	O	O
25f. Provide seed money for new CE programs	O	O	O
25g. Grant autonomy and flexibility for CE fiscal issues	O	O	O
25h. Encourage creativity and innovation for CE program planning	O	O	O
25i. Consider CE central to the institution's mission	O	O	O
25j. Participate in the strategic planning for CE	O	O	O
25k. Include CE staff in campus activities	O	O	O
25l. Consider CE programs of equal status to academic units	O	O	O
25m. Consider CE students equal to traditional students	O	O	O
25n. Support academic faculty's participation in CE programs	O	O	O
25o. Advocate faculty rewards for participation in CE	O	O	O
25p. Recognize academic faculty's participation in CE programs for promotion, tenure, and merit	O	O	O

formid

27685

Part IV: Academic Faculty

26. Please indicate your response to the following by selecting the appropriate circle

In general, do members of the academic faculty on your campus. . .	YES 1	NO 2	NOT SURE 3
26a. Teach CE / extension classes	O	O	O
26b. Actively participate in specific CE program activities	O	O	O
26c. Suggest possible CE program activities	O	O	O
26d. Help promote CE in the campus community	O	O	O
26e. Help promote CE in the external community	O	O	O
26f. Contribute to the creativity and innovation in CE program planning	O	O	O
26g. Consider CE services central to the institution's mission	O	O	O
26h. Include CE staff in campus activities	O	O	O
26i. Consider CE programs of equal status to academic units	O	O	O
26j. Consider CE students of equal status to traditional students	O	O	O
26k. Are familiar with the nature of CE	O	O	O
26l. Consider CE faculty to be of equal caliber to academic faculty	O	O	O
26m. Include CE service and teaching activities in their requests for promotion, tenure, and merit	O	O	O
26n. Use CE programs in their research	O	O	O
26o. Use CE programs to support their service responsibilities	O	O	O
26p. Encourage their students to participate in CE programs	O	O	O

Part V: Status of Collaborative Efforts

27. Please select the response which best indicates the extent to which your continuing education program *participates in and is satisfied with* the following collaborative activities with *academic units* on your campus

Programs	Yes and am satisfied 1	Yes but would like more to do 2	Yes but would like to do less 3	No but would like to 4	No and are not interested 5
27a1. Non-credit Class	O	O	O	O	O
27a2. Credit Class	O	O	O	O	O
27a3. Non-credit Certificate Program	O	O	O	O	O
27a4. Credit Academic Program	O	O	O	O	O
27a5. Undergraduate Degree Program	O	O	O	O	O
27a6 Graduate Degree Program	O	O	O	O	O
27a. Conference	O	O	O	O	O
27a8. Corporate / Workforce Training	O	O	O	O	O
27a9. Distance Education Course	O	O	O	O	O
27a10. Community Outreach / Service	O	O	O	O	O
27a11. Research Activity	O	O	O	O	O

continue on next page

formid

27685

Administrative Activities	Yes and am satisfied 1	Yes but would like more to do 2	Yes but would like to do less 3	No but would like to 4	No and are not interested 5
27b1. General program planning	O	O	O	O	O
27b2. Collaborative planning for a specific program	O	O	O	O	O
27b3. Needs assessment research	O	O	O	O	O
27b4. Program promotion and advertising	O	O	O	O	O
27b5. Recruitment of students	O	O	O	O	O
27b6 Common budget requests	O	O	O	O	O
27b7. Sharing of Course Expenses	O	O	O	O	O
27b8. Local Committee Involvement	O	O	O	O	O
27b9. Campus Committee Work	O	O	O	O	O
27b10. Evaluation of Programs	O	O	O	O	O
27b11. Evaluation of Faculty	O	O	O	O	O

28. Name a successful collaborative effort between your CE department and an academic department on your campus that was conducted in the past three years and describe why you believe the collaboration was successful.

29. Name a collaborative activity between your CE department and an academic department on your campus conducted in the past three years that "never really got started" or fell apart. Why do you think the collaboration was not a success?

30. May I contact you for a follow up phone or email conversation? If yes, please include your name, phone number and email address.

NAME: _____

PHONE: ☐☐☐ - ☐☐☐ - ☐☐☐☐

EMAIL: _____

Thank you for your time and assistance !

formid ☐☐☐☐

APPENDIX D

RESPONSES TO #22
BENEFITS OF COLLABORATION

Question #22. Do you believe that continuing education and academic department faculty and staff collaboration is beneficial? Please explain.

Required by policy, draw on expertise.

Would not be able to offer without their instructional help.

Our credit programs are regular university courses, approved by curriculum committee; CE department and deans must work together. We use many campus faculty to teach CE credit and non-credit courses. We're all in this together. Faculty provide help in curriculum and program development, needs assessment evaluation, etc.

Our model is that the academic departments are responsible for all academic issues and decisions related to distance education. Our unit provides support services for development and delivery. For non-credit programs, the academic connection is still important. We don't handle non-credit activities that are not related to an academic unit in some way.

Academic department cooperation is essential to our ability to offer credit course because they must sign off. More often than not, regular faculty teach our credit courses.

Enables those who work entirely in pedagogy to understand principles of adragogy.

CE could not exist on our campus without collaboration with academic departments. They approve and legitimize the quality of CE outreach.

When credit is involved, collaboration is essential.

We are a small branch campus of a regional college. We have to do many things as a campus family in order to fulfill our mission. Anything we do to advance that mission is supported.

The standards for each department are CE standards when academic faculty are involved. We need to keep the same standards.

Helps mainstream CE and helps academic departments further their goals.

We have adopted an academic integration strategy. Program developers work directly with regular academic faculty. I rarely promote programs by external consultants.

95% of CE instructors are full time faculty.

It couldn't happen without it because faculty controls content.

Most of our CE faculty are full time faculty members.

I believe collaborating between CE and academics essential for success. The key is working with more faculty who support and believe in CE.

We have no separate faculty for CE, they are the academic faculty. We can only provide programs that faculty and academic departments want to teach. Collaboration is the key to success.

It provides a common denominator for faculty and students and allows for the perception that both the programs and credit belong to the department.

Faculty is responsible for the academic quality. CE keeps the faculty interested in non-traditional student populations.

We can't or simply are not subject matter experts in all areas.

Though we have a number of our own faculty, our academic programs use faculty from the other colleges. We use many faculty in the extension part of the operation.

Department provides faculty, we assess need and develop programs.

In order to maintain the academic integrity of courses.

Yes. We need regular faculty to teach in our program.

CE is totally dependent on academic department faculty. We don't have our own faculty.

Provides a different experience for faculty when they work with adult students. Faculty help connect CE to their respective professional communities. Learning program administration gives faculty a different point of view on budgets.

Many faculty members teach CE courses and facilitate training programs on campus. The faculty is always looking for ways to participate in CE.

Yes, to the extent the collaboration allows us to draw on rich resources and bolster legitimacy both within and outside the university.

Part of tripartite program model with CE, faculty and community.

We better serve the community when we have full campus cooperation.

Duplication of effort and mixed image to the public are more likely with little or no collaborative activities. To work effectively, must be equal partnership between CE and academic units.

The programs are University programs, not just CE programs. Collaboration is essential if programs are to be truly representative of the institution and maintain academic integrity.

Our programs are interdependent as collaboration is essential to program success.

Without the support of academic department staff and faculty, our program would not be successful. Any time we offer classes for credit, they have to be approved by the appropriate academic department.

We need them to provide credit classes at non-traditional times. They need us to supplement their offerings.

Depends on discipline.

In fact it's critical and essential. They are the resources of the university that CE capitalizes on for its academic outreach mission.

Provides resources.

Lifelong learning at ISU requires collaboration with faculty since they are our primary instructional resource. Without their support we would have very few courses, programs to offer.

We rely heavily on the departments to resource our programs. This also assures quality control in our programs. The departments are good sources for ideas for new program development.

Sometimes it helps and sometimes it holds us back because the departments and faculty do not have cutting edge and worldly experience.

Would gain credibility.

The academic faculty can speak highly of our program and experience it, thus selling our program for us.

In a hybrid model, we work with the academic departments and faculty on programming.

It gives the academic units a better appreciation of CE and also allows them to be creative and design new programs as well as enjoy the financial benefits.

Collaboration brings richness that non-university CE can't have.

Sparks new ideas, facilitates communication about shared interests, increases/enhances perception of quality of continuing education program and faculty

It is essential for success and quality of programs and acceptance of CE students.

CE functions on campus and off are directed in collaboration with academic units. This collaboration is the only way we would be able to proceed.

They can design/develop programs and course offerings that meet the needs of people in our community and region.

The programs we deliver come out of the departments, same course, degrees, and faculty, thus collaboration is essential.

All offerings of CE require departmental approval of programs, courses, faculty assigned, and other quality decisions.

Without collaboration, the CE programs do not gain campus support and respect, increasing the separation between CE activities and RI.

Insures academic quality and rigor.

The faculty drives the schedule of course offerings for off campus and electronic development and delivery of classes (i.e., Internet, TV, and Interactive Video)

The exchange of professional information helps both sides.

With our new focus, this will become much more possible.

It is crucial now that CE/Extension studies in the state are taking away summer and winter credit sessions. We must create more credit programs in Extended Studies to survive financially.

Provides legitimacy to programming. Enables us to distinguish ourselves from competitors.

All of our programs are a collaboration. We cannot offer credit without the department.

It allows us to meet the customer's needs by offering credit and non-credit programs.

It can add resources to the program, promote traditional students' participation in other areas of interest, and it can enhance the academic curriculum.

Essentially, we connect on campus intellectual capital to the needs of business community and higher education centers.

We do not separate CE and academic department faculty. We are one institution dealing with the needs of adult students.

CE doesn't have a separate faculty. We depend on academic departments for staffing.

Faculty seeks us out when wanting to do something innovative, cross-disciplinary and experimental.

Academic departments are where the original and new programs and ideas come from. They are our product. Without academic support, CE doesn't have much to offer.

Academic department faculty teach all of our credit courses.

Most of our faculty is academic faculty, our professional programs are developed to support the academic program.

It is beneficial to our students and mandated by our accreditation agency.

They can support each other. Academic department staff is needed to offer programs and they can learn more about non-traditional students.

Must be a partnership: They provide the credit curriculum and faculty.

Mutual benefit, fulfill mutual mission

APPENDIX E

RESPONSES TO #23
FACTORS THAT SUPPORT COLLABORATION

Question #23. Please list the factors that you feel would help enhance your departments' collaborative efforts on campus.

Consistent reaffirmation of college role.

Centralization of all CE in our school

We could spend 24/7 explaining ourselves to faculty. Internal marketing is a key, but I'm not sure how well we do.

Centralized and enforced policies. Faculty receives recognition towards promotion, tenure, and merit for CE work.

Greater value placed on extension/continuing education work by the campus leadership in terms of reward and tenure system. Greater subsidized salary support for CE staff to reduce dependency on full cost recovery resulting in higher administrative fees for service.

Improved communications, more CE representation on internal collegiate committees, top down clarification of CE role

A better understanding of what CE does. More support from one of the deans of the other divisions.

Greater funding.

Improved communication, revenue sharing, extra compensation for teaching which is not considered to be part of load.

Good communication with departments. Support from administration. Information to departments about CE activities. Good lifelong learning programs.

On-going success, good understanding of different functions which need to be performed.

Promotion and Tenure: Rewards. Academic unit funding for CE, new top leadership at campus level.

Greater support from central administration for the formally centralized CE unit directing academic units to us rather than competing with us.

Open communication, full support from senior administration, clear definitions of who has responsibility for what programs, appropriate incentives for academic units.

More conversations about how to improve delivery, different types of programs to deliver.

More frequent meetings with academic departments, increase in faculty development programs.

We currently have broad faculty support. However, we need to continuously educate faculty about ISU's responsibility to the community and state, and how the programs we offer are of value to a variety of stakeholders.

We need to become more systematic in our collaborative efforts. We need to do a better job making connections between our work and the research and teaching components of the departments.

A determinant factor will be to incorporate in faculty evaluation, a merit program for those faculty members who support and sponsor CE courses.

Revenue sharing possibilities to entice partnerships.

A policy of revenue sharing or compensation for off-campus programs.

Become more profitable and share.

Money for course development.

More departments/faculty willing to teach off campus.

Incentives in academic units for off-campus growth. Ability to connect directly to faculty, rather than through other deans. My own faculty salary budget instead of needing to have academic unit pay faculty.

Greater access to incentive funds to encourage collaboration with college and faculty.

Sharing net revenue.

If I, as the dean, had more time to educate all of the colleges concerning our program and the professional CEUs.

Increased number of professors at practice.

Support from higher administration to run conferences and seminars through CE rather than allowing each department to offer at will.

Better / more frequent communication. Stability of leadership.

Better understanding by the departments of the policies guiding extended education.

Recognition of efforts in faculty promotion and tenure process: compensation.

Insufficient funding for academic department leads to limited resources. On-campus courses are first priority.

Inclusion in the institutional strategic plan. Seed money from institution for developing new programs.

Financial "pay off" to departments.

Educate the campus as to the goals and responsibilities for continuing education.

Offer programs that they (the departments) don't have resources for. Be a service unit to leverage their efforts.

Financial incentives to departments.

To be recognized as a vital part of the university-not just the organization that wants $$$.

Revenue sharing, joint program planning and evaluation.

CE credit students aren't currently counted in the departmental load for reporting and budgeting purposes.

Better communication, if we had seed money. If we had time to write more proposals.

Involvement, communication, quality programs, trust and credibility.

More administrative support.

More weight on tenure and promotion.

Funding models, tenure requirements, time of faculty, institutional resources, registrar and other services.

Support from President and Provost that is seen by others on campus. They have to make the case that serving off campus students is important to the institution.

If CE was given a full time equivalent position (in terms of hours and salary) we could use it to support the hiring or replacement of faculty to teach in our programs. Faculty would still belong to departments but we could subsidize the departments to help cover their costs for our services.

More encouragement from university administration for such activities. Internal promotion and tenure rewards for faculty.

Extra pay is a plus right now.

Reward system for faculty involvement in CE.

Faculty rewards, recognition of benefits to faculty, both monetary and non-monetary, better marketing, flexibility in service and pricing.

Continuing proactive support of CE mission by the top administrators and infrastructure support.

Support of provost encouraging collaboration. Increase in PT non-traditional students over traditional FT students. Need for enrollment.

More staff time to develop relationships.

Change in policy regarding total compensation that faculty can earn in a year. Recognition of CE efforts of faculty toward promotion and tenure and raises.

Better pay for CE courses, shared risk/revenue, credit for teaching reflected in merit, promotion, tenure.

Stronger internal marketing, provost who understands how CE unit can benefit the university.

Greater availability of faculty, time to participate in CE programs, Greater recognition of CE involvement in tenure, promotion, raises, etc. Greater faculty expertise in distance education and technology.

Tenure judgments include teaching in CE. Campus faculty better appreciate knowledge and skills of CE participant.

Better understanding of the role our unit plays in the collaborative relationship. Clear articulation from central administration on the value of collaborative efforts. Institutional policies that support collaboration. Reward structure that supports collaboration.

Better internal marketing. Active use of interdepartmental advisory committee.

More faculty incentives to work with CE.

Greater awareness of activities. Inclusion of faculty in programs.

Increase access to either grants or preferably course development funds to better compensate faculty for such.

Involve departments and their faculty in planning process.

More formal CE department structure and budget.

Infusion of younger faculty who are willing to teach with evolving technologies. We have a substantial number of faculty within 1 to 3 years of retirement. Rewards to faculty for initiating courses using technology. Training troubleshooting and mentoring for faculty initiating use of new technology.

APPENDIX F

RESPONSES TO #24
FACTORS THAT INHIBIT COLLABORATION

Question #24. Please list the factors that you feel inhibit your department's collaborative efforts on campus.

The lack of incentive for faculty to pursue CE courses and new technology. Territorial issues at the dean's level. Scarcity of development and venture funds. Lack of knowledge and understanding of the adult learners' needs throughout the college.

Lack of understanding. Lack of support from academic affairs.

CE as a concept is new to the campus. Teaching faculty/staff what it is and can do needs to be done.

Faculty members setting up programs on their own.

Limited number of qualified resource faculty, or "one deep" campus faculty to also do CE outreach.

Faculty perception of CE functions. Involvement by faculty in CE is not rewarded or recognized. Self-supporting nature of CE. Research mission takes precedence over service.

Departments choose to offer their own CE programs and not pay our overhead charge.

Tenure decisions do not place much merit on CE teaching.

Misunderstanding of our role among academic personnel. In the non-credit arena, internal competition for programs and markets. Lack of clear institutional policies and rewards for collaboration, particularly in the non-credit arena.

Provost and others.

Department lack of knowledge, faculty lack of time, department lack of budget to afford CE services (CE is self supporting).

Emphasis on bringing in research dollars for faculty. Faculty work load already heavy. Unfilled vacancies in faculty.

Perception of competition between campus and CE. Perception of lack of quality of programs.

Traditional academic focus. Unwillingness to adapt to change, use of new technology and teaching methodologies.

Lack of faculty rewards, lack of benefits, lack of marketing, lack of flexibility.

Competing goals and objectives between CE and departments. Departments are not as invested in non-credit CE activities. Faculty are stretched too far to collaborate effectively.

More staff time to develop relationship.

Low salaries.

We can't guarantee offerings or courses and are totally dependant on academic departments to supply (and choose) both classes and instructors each term. We can't get a guaranteed rotation of courses a year in advance to help students plan.

Timing of classes, traditional students come first as they should on this campus.

Lack of support (verbal and financial) from the top. The way programs are funded with state dollars.

Funding models, tenure requirements, time of faculty, institutional resources, registrar and other services.

Union contract limits credit activities and, therefore, limits availability of faculty to one credit course per year.

Lack of respect for past faculty.

Some faculty, poor or failure to communicate.

Competition, stress, lack of knowledge of the way things are done.

Demands of faculty and resources from degree programs.

Since we are largely self-supporting, we are perceived as driven by the profit motive

Lack of control of who may do CE.

On-campus faculty teaching loads limit the number of faculty who are able to teach in CE programs. Salary for teaching CE programs has improved but we still have a way to go.

Time and focus of degree program faculty and administration.

Everything is reduced to dollars, yet access to those dollars is not supported by financial model adopted by campus. If we could generate surplus dollars and return them to academic units, our collaboration would greatly improve.

Many departments are already overloaded with a lot of their faculty members teaching overloads. This means time is a key factor. They simply don't have the time to develop new collaborative programs.

Ivory tower mentality. For the most part all goes pretty well.

Too few of us.

Lack of understanding of what we do. Traditional thinking on point of academic departments. Financial and administrative barriers.

Traditions.

Lengthy program review process, especially for new or revised degree program (up to 18 months in some cases). Revenue not reaching department level. CE getting all of the credit. Distrust on the part of the departments.

We are competing for people's time.

Misunderstanding and distrust about functions, abilities, etc.

More opportunities to get exposure of extended education processes.

Un-funded mandates on campus. Leaders who lack willingness to understand value of CE.

Lack of incentives for faculty department.

Primarily, we have a limited staff that is trying to do too many projects. Secondarily, there is a campus view on the part of some that CE is antithetical to academic units' goals. Others see us as a threat through the development of distance education.

Limited vision on the part of a segment of the faculty that is more interested in research and face to face teaching of traditional students using traditional methods. Therefore, (the education of faculty) needs to be a continuous endeavor as faculty leave and are replaced.

The factor that inhibits coloration is the promotion of internal competition among colleges and CE.

Over-extended staff.

Departments/faculty who will not participate, salary issues, bargaining unit.

Lack of resources to allow more full time faculty to teach in CE programs.

Business. Too many irons in the fire.

Budgeting process. History, predecessor was not diligent in keeping his word. No CE faculty, all faculty work for academic colleges.

Academic departments don't understand CE or its role on campus. They are not aware of the benefits and central administration doesn't feel the need to educate them on CE or urge collaboration.

Lack of understanding and support mission by faculty.

"NONE. Our offices' mission is literally and symbolically supported by the president's office."

CE (teaching) is not "on load."

Not enough autonomy, cumbersome academic approval system.

Budget structure, all academic units have revenue target. Limited faculty resources. Research orientation of the university.

Long-time attitude that CE not "really" part of academics on campus. Slowly changing for the better.

Campus lack of knowledge of our department. Ego of faculty.

Lack of adequate "extra comp". Lack of equal recognition of CE teaching in promotion and tenure process.

None of the CE activities count for faculty promotion, ADR, etc.

Separation from main campus. Distrust of administration. Communication.

They feel that we take business away from them, thus reducing their FTE and budget resources.

Reward system, finances.

Territoriality issues, space issues, attitudes, people feel overworked and unwilling to look for more to do.

Time, location, money.

Not being recognized as part of the campus/institution.

Turf, limited revenue sharing, limited faculty capacity, faculty contract, history of "special deals."

Due to lack of funding support. Different financial model. Creates arbitrary barriers.

Everybody struggles for resources.

Not all faculty members are aware of what CE can do for them. Sometimes we have good ideas and departments have good ideas, but we do not have the seed money. We don't have time to write as many proposals as we would like to.

Failure to understand how the market is changing.

APPENDIX G

EXAMPLES OF SUCCESSFUL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS AND REASONS FOR SUCCESS

Question #28. Name a successful collaborative effort between your CE department and an academic department on your campus that was conducted in the past three years and describe why you believe the collaboration was successful.

Post-Bac Psychology Program. Prepare students with undergraduate degree for graduate work in Psychology. Works because faculty/department commitment and because faculty saw program as part of their mission.

Advanced Management: A non-credit mini MBA. We pushed College of Business for years and wouldn't go away. They gave in after negotiating, from their perspective, a better economic deal.

Delivery of credit courses for teacher. Collaboration of physical education activities and continuing education activities.

Developed and implemented an annual faculty development tour in partnership with the deans and provost. The need was evident and the program supports and enhances the land grant mission of our university.

Currently, 20 graduate and 4 undergraduate off-campus programs operating successfully because CE only assumes responsibility for program administration while academic departments and faculty assume responsibility for academic content and evaluation. Over 95% of faculty teaching these programs are regular university faculty, not adjuncts. The centralized (administrative) and decentralized (academic) approach places responsibility appropriately.

College of Education and Human Services and CE have planned and delivered multiple M.Ed. programs using a cohort model and format to specific populations of teachers both locally and throughout this state. Here was a need, the format worked for teachers, and the program fulfilled both the outreach mission of the college and CE.

We set up an internship for teachers in Business Education in cooperation with our local Chamber of Commerce. It was a collaborative effort among our CE unit, the Education Department, and College of Business, as well as the Chamber. Teachers benefitted from the experience of working in the business community and hopefully the experience helped with their teaching.

Sponsored three major conferences in conjunction with department. Helped make money for departments. Started revenue sharing plan with departments provided discretionary funding for departments.

Set up a math boot camp for non-credit that MBA students could take instead of MA 109, to remove a deficiency in the calculus requirement prior to Graduate School Programs. It is an intense 20+-hour program over three weeks with several mastery tests that must be passed prior to the start up. Otherwise the student must attend the 10-week credit math course before beginning graduate studies. Huge success financially and large enrollments.

Corporate Engineering Degree Program, Collaboration between DCE and School of Engineering in delivery of 3 undergraduate degree programs at a distance to over 30 companies nationwide. Successful because it was win-win-win for DCE, Engineering and students. A successful program that continues to be successful.

New program development. New Master's Degree.

Very successful collaboration in conferences. The departments are actively involved in planning up-front. They are kept informed as work unfolds. Key is communication and involvement by the departments.

The award winning Masters in Agribusiness program. The department was well organized and committed to the program. In addition to the usual technical and facilitation services, CE was able to take some risks by supporting up-front costs. The department was also successful in securing a USDA grant. Strong marketing initiatives and a strategically appointed outside advisory group were significant factors.

Conference: Teaching and Learning: A conference CE conducts for the College of Education. This is a statewide conference that brings high visibility to the University.

Establishing a Master's degree program at a medical center for their employees. It was successful because the academic units worked to get staff assigned and developed the program outlines.

Development of a non-credit Conflict Management Certificate.

OCE and CS: Collaborate with shared programs including Certificates (academic credit) and collaborations with outside entities such as IEEE-CS and SEI, etc.

On-line distance learning with department of computer and information sciences.

Deliver microbiology courses to employees with Department of Biological Sciences. Biology faculty enjoy working with biology students, and we share net revenues.

CE handles all registrations, cashiering, drop/adds, etc., for the college of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering. It works well because we do what we say we are going to do and we are honest. We pay attention to the smallest detail, which ensures very high internal customer service. About 1500 students are served.

Development of conference for sciences and math faculty.

Off-campus Masters of Social Work. Successful primarily because faculty were committed to the idea and because there was a very great off campus demand.

We work closely with the Department of Speech and Language Pathology in promoting ASHA approved workshops.

Writer's Conference: offered in collaboration with Department of Languages, Literature and Communication for past 25 years. CE provides financial services, registration and conference facilitation. Tried and true effort with most kinks worked out.

New Nonprofit Management Graduate Certificate Program with the Department of Political Science. They are helpful but leave us alone to do the details so we can deliver the program in a way that makes sense to the students.

Instructional Technology: We packed in the students.

Working with the School of Management on accreditation issues and program oversight.

College of Veterinary Medicine: Program for international vets in Latin and South America. Great involvement of faculty and dean, very flexible to meet the needs of international market, program content, language, etc.

Off-campus state-funded program on a community college campus. Academic program established program course offerings and then let CE administer the program.
Education courses developed between CE and College of Education for new Illinois Teacher Re-certification requirements. This was successful because of the collaboration, cost-sharing basis for the project rollout.

Launching our first dedicated off-campus facility: Everyone wants it to succeed.

Assisted to form an alliance of 12 universities to offer the courses required for human science certification on line. Students can take the internet courses from any of the 12 universities to acquire this certification.

Faculty development program, for all faculty teaching web-based, TV and compressed video distance education courses. IT has enhanced the centralization of distance education in CE and garnered a respected reputation. An advisory committee with each college represented plus library and IT staff has integrated numerous independent entities.

College of Business: Certification program, Downtown Project

Elderhostel Program, enclosed a brochure showing our faculty and former faculty collaborating.

Collaboration with Biology Department to offer a degree in Biotechnology. It worked because the department chair is an innovative and student based person.

Development and delivery of a fee based MBA program. Successful due to close collaborating between appropriate administrators and staff.

We cooperate with the College of Nursing and Health Sciences to offer a successful BSRN degree completion program via distance learning.

All of our credit and non-credit programs are done in collaboration with academic departments. It is the history and culture of our institution for continuing education and the academic departments to work together.

Degree Link: A bachelors degree completion program is a collaboration with internal stakeholders, faculty and departments and external stakeholders. Through collaboration, ISU has articulated nearly 40 degrees and has developed 10 of those for delivery in their entirety though Distance Education.

Established 5 statewide learning centers jointly with Cooperative Extension Division, Community colleges, other higher education institutions, partnerships benefit all partners.

Satellite-delivered degree programs to corporate clients. All parties to collaborate understood role, functions, and responsibilities for success.

As a service to campus departments, we take care of the administrative duties for summer travel-study classes. It works because we will accommodate highly individualized needs of students and faculty. Nothing about these classes is "standard."

Off-campus degree completion program at employer site. Was successful when college designated us as single point of contact.

Develop a Teaching Assistant Certificate program.

Collaborated with the college of business to deliver a series of accounting courses to students in Japan. The faculty of accounting had a vision and worked with us to insure delivery and integration of Japan students/records into our regular student records.

Teacher preparation program in Vocational Technical Teacher Certification. Generated revenue that is shared with academic departments.

Support for a regional internet and technology expo.

We developed a licensure program for Special Education. It was successful because the state had a grant for tuition, the department approved faculty and curriculum, and CE handled financing and logistics.

English Internet Course development

Master in Management cohort recruited in nearby town for a three-year program last year. Business School faculty were supportive. We found a way to make it work financially for them. Hired someone we had past experience with that was very successful in recruiting students into the program. Had hoped for 20 and started with 32!

Developed four-degree completion programs in the arts and sciences in conjunction with the deans of Liberal Arts and Natural Sciences. It was successful because both groups benefitted by the addition of new students.

Non-traditional Dr. of Pharmacy. College of Pharmacy Dean was involved in the planning and assigned a coordinator from the faculty to work with CE in planning and ongoing administration of the program.

Teaching Spanish to the medical profession employees in our area. The Hispanic population is growing in our area, and there is a very real need in the medical and business communities.

Co-sponsorship with psychology department, showcasing faculty in non-credit program. Returned money to the department to support graduate students, faculty pleased, good course evaluation.

With the College of Engineering, we have developed a Technical assistance program that operates through CE. This proposal has something in it for everyone.

Classroom Technology Applications Certificate. It met its stated goals for both instruction and revenue.

Instituted a collaborative communications major at one of our off-campus sites using regular faculty. Was successful because both CE and the department had a common objective, a willingness to work together, and both CE and the department got good feedback from central administration.

Online Technical Writing Master's Degree Program. The program was highly innovative. It was the first time the English department had participated in a degree program through CE and it was and continues to be very successful.

Delivery of a Pre-service Corrections Office Certificate Program. Academic department provided faculty and taught program. CE handled marketing, promotion, registration and booked revenue.

Developed and delivered an MS in Mechanical Engineering for a major corporation. Designed and tailored program to company specifications to make it global research orientated and completable in two years plus two summers.

Alumni University: All instructional staff are leading scholars/teachers from resident academic departments.

Body, Mind, and Spirit conference. Joint effort between CE and various academic departments. Academic departments determined keynote and session speaker; it's their expertise. CE did the rest. Very successful.

Trauma Counseling program offered for credit and non-credit. Successful because content was excellent and because outreach faculty worked very hard with campus faculty to demonstrate the merits of the course and why it should be offered for credit.

Extension program with regional community college.

Faculty member had a very innovative idea. The time was right and we worked together to have a very successful award-winning conference.

We developed a distance degree in Criminal Justice. We helped develop the proposals, provided justification data and have subsequently taken the lead on student recruitment and program marketing. We also provided seed money to start it. I believe it was successful because we handled the non-academic details and left the curriculum planning to the academic department. Also there was a strong need for the program.

Establishing an MS in Education off campus based on a cohort learning community concept. Successful because of regular pre-planning sessions and involvement of all players: department, CE, business office, etc.

Certificate program with Industrial Tech and community college designed to provide last two years of BA program in Industrial Management.

APPENDIX H

EXAMPLES OF FAILED COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS AND REASONS FOR FAILURE

Question 29. Name a collaborative activity between your CE department and an academic department on your campus conducted in the past three years that "never really got started" or fell apart. Why do you think the collaboration was not a success?

We've tried to develop a non-credit certificate that's currently on hold. We spent a lot of planning time with the department chair and committed seed money. But it's never been high on the priority list for faculty and we can't get the course developed.

Undergraduate BLS degree. Could not develop necessary market at the time.

Certificate program in applied organization development and training. Program did not carry graduate credit and was developed without a thorough understanding of target needs.

Continuing education for engineering alumni. Not a success because department was too much a closed system and it was everybody for themselves rather than a greater good.

Campus faculty are generally not interested in non-credit programs. Doesn't count towards promotion and tenure or merit, doesn't carry the status of credit teaching nor does it pay as well.

CE tried to propose a new degree program. A Bachelor of General Studies. Failed in the curriculum process after lengthy review and work. Faculty would not support, viewed it as lesser degree, not of sound academic quality, despite strong support from Provost and president.

Project to deliver a certificate program to a local business. Academic Department needed to focus on internal issues and accreditation. Local company didn't want to pay a higher price than campus students.

We have tried very hard to connect our CE unit with both the library and specific colleges in the creation of on-line courses. Only a few courses have emerged and been successful. Budget constraints and goals and conflict issues have been troubling.

We have been working with a department head that feels he is forced to use our services. He believes that he can provide these services alone, without regard for state laws and accounting practices. This puts me into a "cop" role, not one of assistance and program development.

Certification in the medical field. It didn't work because it was very expensive.

Summer study program in Italy between CE and the Language Department. The Italian section faculty didn't want to do the groundwork necessary. They wanted to travel and teach only.

Tried to do a collaborative credit certificate program with Business Department but it never got off the ground because they wanted all the revenue and benefits but none of the work or the costs, or the risks associated with the program,.

Off campus computer science courses never materialized in spite of providing funding for a faculty member to conduct a needs assessment. Don't think the computer science department ever felt it was important to do this in spite of the funding.

Weekend college struggles because departments have chosen not to support.

We tried to deliver a BS in Management to rural areas using ITV. Department would never commit to long range planning on specific courses so that students could plan.

On line courses, the major problem has to do with the institution making a commitment to the effort.

Developed a degree completion program with a 2-year college.

In general, efforts usually fell apart because the academic department didn't understand the finances and that the revenue had to be generated with reasonable non-credit fees. They also didn't understand markeing, logistical support, etc., and weren't willing to share in the losses and the gains.

Selected conferences: Lacked academic department commitment, lacked need assessment research, lacked understanding of customers.

We tried an asynchronous distance-learning course on AutoCAD Release 14. Basically the faculty was unable to deliver the content because he lacked internal college support and financial resources.

A Masters in Environmental Planning with the College of Architecture has not been successful. It has been too narrowly focused on a selected constituency that has not followed through. Faculty have been unwilling to move to teaching styles more suitable for distance courses. There have been many technical failures in course delivery.

Off campus doctoral program. Reasons for the program were not clear. Audience uncertain. What parties were to do was unclear.

Center for Collaborative Leadership. CE was not clear enough as to its goals. Faculty member that we hired as director not able to take hold.

Hotel Certificate Program (has since been revitalized). Former dean did not collaborate.

Non-credit programs with engineering extension. Poor needs assessment and market saturation of similar courses resulted in low enrollments. Core issue was lack of good communication and defined role for the two units.

School of Business and Economics and CE have planned a certificate program. It still is not operational because the school has been up for accreditation and they did not want to invest the resources to support the certificate. They now have accreditation and we are moving on implementation.

Collaborative efforts are not encouraged by the institution.

Internet based degree programs.

Insufficient commitment or misunderstanding on part of academic unit.

Program development not supported by Provost.

Most of ours have been successful.

Campus wide technology conference with faculty committee in charge. One time conference not repeated due to lack of leadership from academic side. CE assisted with pre-planning and conduction conference.

Off campus degree program offered 75 miles away in conventional format of faculty driving and teaching on weekends. Faculty got greedy ($), change of leadership at college and department level, lack of leadership to fulfill commitments.

On line course offered without an outside business providing the web access.

New Pre-operative nursing certification in conjunction with the school of Nursing. They were to design curriculum, we were to market and administer and share profits. They didn't value skills and expertise we bring to the table. They don't see the need to partner and want to do it all themselves and keep all revenue for themselves.

Sales and Customer Service Institute. Collaboration with College of Business and Economics, failed. Never gained alignment to objectives.

Lots of lost opportunities because of lack of incentives for academic colleges.

Distance Learning initiatives.

Communication problems.

College of Business/CE program for International Business borders in Mexico and South American to help facilitate NAFTA: Lack of flexibility of business faculty.

Launching a Master's Degree program in Washington D.C. in Information Security. The department lacks focus, something else came along to distract-lower priorities.

We attempted a Life Science Institute that "never got started" because of financial issues.

Collaboration with Business School. It is impossible to even sit down and talk with them.

VITA

Amy Hyams
7500 Cloudburst Ave. Las Vegas, NV 89128 (702) 869-2114

Career Objective

To assume a leadership position in higher education

Education

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Doctoral Student, Education Leadership
Completion, Fall 2000

Colorado State University
Educational Leadership Certificate Program
Professional Certification

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
M.S. Sport and Leisure Services
Research Focus: Barriers to Leisure Participation GPA: 4.0

National Recreation and Parks Association
CLP: Certified Leisure Professional

University of California, Santa Barbara
B.A. Pre-Law GPA: 3.2

Professional Experience

University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Program Coordinator, Special Programs
Duties: Identify community education needs and develop, implement, evaluate community education programs.
Supervisor: Dr. Paul Aizely, Dean Extended Education (702) 895-3394

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Faculty Lecturer
Duties: Design curriculum and teach undergraduate classes for the Department of Tourism and Convention
Supervisor: Dr. Patti Shock, Dean (702) 895-0875

Soaring Eagle Enterprises, Education Specialist
November 1996 - present
Duties: Develop and implement training and education programs for private and public clients and organizations
Supervisor: Tim Schneider, President 242-9080

Community College of Southern Nevada, Continuing Education,
Program Developer December 1994-November 1996
Duties: Identify community needs/interests, Program development, implementation and evaluation. Hire/supervise staff of over 200 instructors. Responsible for approximately $250,000 budget.
Supervisor: Ralph Goudy, Operations (702)651-5785

Clark County Department of Parks and Recreation, Recreation Programmer:
January 1994-December 1994
Duties: Develop and implement youth recreation programs. Supervise staff and activities for twelve county-wide summer camps.
Supervisor: Chris Stanfill, Superintendent of Recreation (702)455-7178

Clark County Department of Parks and Recreation
January 1994-January 1995
Developed/conducted county wide assessment of recreation services.
Supervisor: Pat Marchese, Asst Director of Parks and Recreation (702) 455-7178

University of Nevada, Las Vegas
Adjunct Instructor, Research Assistant September 1992 - August 1994
Supervisor: Dr. James Busser (702) 895-0942

Professional Recognition and Awards

1999 MPAEA Memorial Scholarship Winner
1997 Chamber of Commerce, Community Achievement Award, Education Nominee
1996 Chamber of Commerce, Community Achievement Award, Education Nominee
1996 Las Vegas Business Press: 40 Under 40 Nominee
1995 Future Scholar Award: National Recreation and Parks Association
1995-6 State Representative/Regional Liaison, LERN
1995-6 Continuing Education Advisory Board, AALR

Memberships

University Continuing Education Association
Mediators of Southern Nevada
American Society for Training and Development
Nevada Adult Education Association: Secretary
Mountain Plains Adult Education Association
American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Dance
Nevada Recreation and Parks Association
National Recreation and Parks Association
Resort and Commercial Recreation Association
American Association for Leisure and Research
Learning Resource Network
American Society for Curriculum Development

Campus and Community Service

UNLV Faculty Senate Reward and Tenure Committee
UNLV Orientation Committee:
UNLV Student Judicial Committee:
UNLV Campus Assessment Committee
UNLV Professional Staff Committee
UNLV Professional Staff Committee: Chair
UNLV Part Time Faculty Sub-Committee
UNLV Research Council
UNLV Home Away From Home
UNLV Mentor Program
UNLV Upward Bound
UNLV Substance Abuse Task Force
Clark County Neighborhood College
Member Liaison, American Parks and Recreation Society, Golf Management Division
Board Member: Nevada Senior Games, Inc.
Advisory Board Member: Clark County School District/Professional Development
Advisory Board, Chair: Senior Friends, Programs for Older Adults
Alliance Member: Southwest Wellness for Older Adults
Conference Committee: Nevada Parks and Recreation Society
Regional Representative: Association for Anorexia and Associated Disorders
Volunteer: Girl Scouts of America
NRPA, Leisure and Aging
Inner City Games

Teaching Activities

Leisure and Aging
Commercial Recreation
Social Psychology of Leisure
Programming for Recreation and Leisure Services
Leadership in Recreation
Eating Disorders Workshop

Publications and Presentations

Carruthers, C., Jake, L., and Hyams, A. (2000). Treatment of Eating Disorders through Therapeutic Recreation. Presentation., NRPA National Conference Presentation. Phoenix, October 2000.

Hyams, A. (2000). Learning Leadership Over the Phone. Professional Presentation. State of Nevada Summer Teaching Institute. Elko, Nevada.

Hyams, A. (2000). Peace Through Play: Promoting Peace Between the Generations. Clark County Parks and Recreation: Community Conference Presentation. January 2000.

Hyams, A., and Pearson-Call, K. (1999) Intergenerational Links through Leisure. NRPA National Conference Presentation. Nashville, TN. October 1999.

Hyams, A. (1998.) F.I.L.L. in the GAP: Forming Intergenerational Links through Leisure. NRPA National Conference Presentation. Miami, Fla. September 1998.

Hyams, A. (1998.) Safekey Program: Benefits and Impact. Nevada Parks and Recreation Magazine. Fall 1998.

Hyams, A., Steedman, C., Tate, A., Tollenson, B., Baker, M., and Tupper, P. (1998.) Empowering Non-Traditional Students. NACADA Conference Presentation. March 1998. Las Vegas, Nevada.

Carruthers, C., Hyams, A., and Busser, J. (1997.) A Qualitative Analysis of Program Leaders at the Boys and Girls Club. Poster Presentation, NRPA National Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Busser, J., Carruthers, C., and Hyams, A. (1997.) Individual and team sport participation: The role of gender and race. Poster Presentation. North American Society for Sport Management.

Busser, J., Hyams, A., and Carruthers, C. (1996.) Differences in adolescent activity participation by gender, grade and ethnicity. *Journal of Parks and Recreation Administration, 14*, (4). pp. 1-20

Hyams, A. (1996). Community colleges, continuing education and aging population. *The Catalyst, 25 (2).*

Hyams, A. (1996). Educational opportunities for legal professionals and administrators. Oral Communication Presentation, Association for Legal Administrators.

Hyams, A. (1996). Educational opportunities for older adults. Oral Communication Presentation, Las Vegas Senior Center.

Hyams, A. (1996). Community colleges as leisure service providers for older adults. *Nevada Parks and Recreation Society Magazine*, Fall 1996.

Busser, J., Carruthers, C., Hyams, A., and Tandy, R. (1996). Preferences of high school students in leisure activities. Oral Communication, NRPA Conference, Kansas City.

Busser, J., Hyams, A., and Carruthers, C. (1995). Differences in Adolescent Leisure Participation by gender, grade and race. Poster Presentation, AAPHERD National Convention.

Busser, J., and Hyams, A. (1995). Adolescent participation in leisure activity. Research Consortium, California Parks and Recreation Convention.

Busser, J., Hyams, A., Carruthers, C., and Tandy, R. (1995). Differences in Adolescent Leisure Participation by gender, grade and race. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport Abstracts Supplement.*

Hyams, A., and Busser, J. (1995). Leisure Interests of Adolescents. Poster Presentation: MPEA 1995 Conference.

Hyams, A., Carruthers, C., Busser, J., and Tandy, R. (1995). The influence of perceived competence, activity importance and perception of barriers on adolescent leisure participation. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport Abstracts Supplement.*

Hyams, A., Carruthers, C. Busser, J., and Tandy, R. (1995). The influence of perceived competence, activity importance and perception of barriers on adolescent leisure participation. Poster Presentation: AAPHERD National Convention.

Tandy, R., and Hyams, A. (1995). Evaluation and grading in physical education. Oral Communication. SWAAHPERD Conference, Hawaii.

Hyams, A. (1994). The influence of perceived competence, activity importance and barrier perceptions on adolescent leisure: Exploring the potential for Negotiation. *Masters Thesis,* University of Nevada, Las Vegas.

Hyams, A. (1994). Understanding and removing barriers to participation. *Nevada Recreation and Parks Society, Summer.*

Hyams, A., and Busser, J. (1994). *Leisure Interests and Participation of Youth:* A needs assessment survey for Clark County Department of Recreation.

Hyams, A., and Busser. J. (1994). Leisure Needs and Interests of Adolescents: Results from a Community Survey. *NAAPHERD: The Journal,* 10, (1).