

Annotated Bibliography

Bill would merge Washington state schools. (2004, February 16). *Community College Week*, 16, pp. 13. Retrieved October 26, 2008, from Professional Development Collection database.

In what appeared to be a political move, a State representative in Washington had sponsored legislation to merge a four-year-old community college with a 14-year-old branch campus of the University of Washington. This would have created a four-year comprehensive college in a northeast suburb of Seattle which she claimed would create more bachelor degrees and reduce administrative costs. Critics felt it was unnecessary and that the current setup was working well. The article spoke to the idea of branch campus evolution. The article is related to the Morrill and Beyers (1991) article as well as the Pennucci and Mayfield (2002) report.

Bird, C. (2008). Branch campus life. Personal blog: <http://branchcampus.blogspot.com/>

The Branch Campus Life blog describes, and offers a forum to discuss, practical information related to branch campuses and the administration of those campuses. Dr. Charles Bird, Vice Provost for University Outreach at Ohio University is the author. He has worked at or with branch campuses of two Ohio universities for over 30 years. The blog's purpose was described as providing a space for administrators of branch campuses, or others interested in branch campus administration, to share thoughts, ideas, and questions. Early blog entries presented potential definitions of various flavors of branch campuses. Typical branch issues were also described. A number of other works, particularly dissertations, have focused on the problems and perceptions between branch and main campus leaders (note Hill and Stahley, for example), but no other work has delved into branch campus practicalities as deeply. Several of the early entries were very relevant: "Characteristics of a Branch Campus" written on July 11, 2007; "Branch Campuses as Colonies of the Main Campus" dated August 22, 2007; and particularly "An Agenda for Branch Campus Research" from July 16, 2007.

Board of Governors, State of Florida. (2006). Process for approval of new state university branch campuses and instructional centers. Retrieved April 29, 2008, from Board of Governors, State of Florida Web site:

http://www.flbog.org/documents_meetings/0028_0081_0661_6.pdf

In Florida, the Board of Governors was responsible for establishing definitions, criteria, and requirements for an institution to be able to request and be granted authority to establish new branch campuses and sites. The process described listed the statutes and rules, adopted by the Board in 2003, that were utilized for this purpose and also provided a more thorough discussion of these statutes and rules. One of the rules provided definitions for three levels of branch campuses. It also defined centers and instructional sites.

Board of Regents of the University of Georgia System. (2009). *Establishing a Branch Campus* [Policy Document]. Georgia: Office of Academic Programs.

This document outlines the policies and procedures for establishing a branch campus in the state of Georgia. It gives clear parameters and establishes a sound protocol to follow as many traditionally two-year colleges move toward offering bachelor degrees. It delineates clearly what services need to be provided to be considered a branch campus.

Briscoe, F., & De Oliver M. (2006). Access to Higher Education. *Education and Urban Society*, 38(2), 204-227.

This case study researches the degree to which the location and services offered by a multi-campus university, geographically situated consistent with the commercial principles of a large mass-market enterprise, facilitate access for educationally underserved groups. First the necessity of democratizing educational access to an underprivileged population is contrasted against real estate market forces that regularly influence the positioning of such large municipal infrastructure to the detriment of the target population. Based on the site selected by the main campus and the degree of educational services offered by the later establishment of a branch campus, the costs of access for both privileged and underprivileged groups are compared, illustrating the continuing institutional marginalization of the underprivileged in the face of repeated attempts to equitably serve this population.

Burke, J. C. (1994, September). Unity and diversity: SUNY's challenge not its choice. In New perspectives on system and campus roles in a public multi-campus system. *Studies in Public Higher Education*, 5, 6-16.

Multi-campus systems for public higher education had become the standard in 41 states. Such systems had ten significant responsibilities; those that individual campuses would not, could not, and should not do. Systems also had six roles which were intended to achieve complete and best access for all students desiring public higher education in a state: leading, allocating, advocating, protecting, evaluating, and linking. Though centralization versus decentralization often became the main issue of administrative discussion, this failed to resolve the requirements of both campus autonomy and public accountability. The SUNY system had recognized the need to allow the individual campuses the autonomy to achieve goals as they saw fit while tightly controlling the goals as well as the evaluation of campus results. As interim Chancellor of the SUNY system, Dr. Burke spoke from a strong position of knowledge and experience. The concepts of autonomy and accountability stand out. This article and the article by Chen (1994) formed part of a four-piece report on State University of New York.

Chang, N. (1978). *Organizational structure in multi-campus community junior colleges/districts* [Research report]. Denver, CO: Community College of Denver. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED158795)

Analyzing the structure of administration at multi-campus community colleges to determine positive and negative characteristics was the purpose of the study described in

this article. One method utilized was to review literature regarding centralized administrative structures versus decentralized ones. Another was to survey fifteen multi-campus community colleges to gather information on the centralization/decentralization of specified tasks and functions. Though the intended audience was the Community College of Denver, the benefits and pitfalls of centralization and decentralization illuminated the topic of branch campus administration and the appropriate assignment of functions to the main or branch campuses. The author, as Vice President of Research and Development, was in a strong position to undertake this research on behalf of the college.

Chen, J. R. (1994, September). System or not? Governance and faculty voice at SUNY. In *New perspectives on system and campus roles in a public multi-campus system. Studies in Public Higher Education, 5*, 31-39.

The article addressed campus autonomy versus system control from the perspective of the University Faculty Senate. It noted that the governor of New York was the most important individual when it came to system resources and relations with the government. Meanwhile, the University Faculty Senate had been vested, through law, as the official agency by which faculty engaged in university governance. System vision, campus flexibility, access versus quality, and harmony versus a competitive environment were investigated relative to the relationship between faculty and the government. This article, along with the Burke (1994) article, formed two pieces of a four-piece report from State University of New York.

Cornfield, Jerry. New Branch Campus is Snohomish doesn't appear in UW's plans, but lawmakers say they haven't given up on pursuing the campus. (2008 07 19). *Everett Herald*.

This newspaper article explains the politics and economic issues faced when deciding where to locate a new branch campus. The development of a new branch campus was delayed over budgetary concerns as well as which constituency would earn the right to have the new branch campus location for their community.

Creswell, J. W., Roskens, R. W., & Henry, T. C. (1985). A typology of multicampus systems [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education, 56*, 26-37.

A multi-campus system of governance was differentiated from a multi-campus institution in that a system included two or more independent campuses, each led by a chancellor or president and having separate administrative organizations. The single governing board of a system, by definition, was flexible in its characteristics: public or private and either statewide or not fully statewide. In every case, systems were administered through a centralized system office. The derived typology, noted as exploratory, included four generic multi-campus system types: private, homogeneous public, heterogeneous public, and statewide. This typology represented one of the initial attempts to create such a definition and thus became literature upon which further study could be based. The authors, as professors and an associate dean, were qualified academically to undertake

such a study. Characteristics of multi-campus systems originated from research of literature only; no original research was involved.

Crismore, A. (1983). *The role of regional campus in Indiana, especially Indiana University-Purdue University at Fort Wayne*. University of Illinois, Center for the Study of Reading. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED227741)

A detailed description of the development of a regional campus in Fort Wayne, Indiana that served both Indiana University and Purdue University students was provided. Significant portions of the article were summaries of information derived from interviews with eight individuals associated with the development of the campus. History of the campus planning, beginning with the Indiana Plan for Postsecondary Education of 1972, was included. The benefits and struggles of creating such a shared campus were discussed. Viewpoints of administrative personnel, faculty, and students came to light in the commentary. All of the history and information provided were intended to reveal the role of regional campuses in Indiana. The author, a former student and employee at the campus, posited that more explicit planning and direction were needed when planning for a regional campus, particularly one that would be jointly shared. Due to the shared nature of the regional campus, most of the issues dealt with inconsistencies between the two schools or with state regulations.

Dengerink, H. A. (2001). Institutional identity and organizational structure in multi-campus universities. *Metropolitan – An International Forum*, 12(2), 20-29.

This article focused on institutions of higher education having both multiple campuses and an administrative system located at one primary, originating campus. It discussed the effects of role and mission on the remote campuses. Institutional identity was presented as critically important to the determination of appropriate organization and administration of the remote campuses. Thus, institutions needed to understand their distinctive and determine their core identity. Five levels of identity were described: organization type, business type, values and purpose, strategy, and tactics. Hybrid institutions, those having multiple institutional identities, such as a faith-based university, were specifically addressed. The author opined that such institutions had identity differences at the organization level with one role as a higher education institution and another as a religious institution. A primary take-away from the article was that if dual identities existed, then viability of the institution would be strengthened if one identity was of higher importance than the other or if the institution had been founded initially with dual identities and employees accepted both identities equally. In such cases, a centralized oversight of the remote campuses was defined as the most appropriate form of organization. The author's entire career had been at one university, encompassing roles as primary administrator at two separate remote campuses of that university.

Eduventures, LLC. (2006, December). *Strategies for organizing and managing regional campuses* (Learning Collaborative for Continuing and Professional Education Catalog No. 103CPECRR1206). Boston, MA: Eduventures, LLC.

The Eduventures Continuing and Professional Education (CPE) Collaborative consisted of more than 100 higher education institutions. Five of these member institutions participated in research designed to identify regional campus organization and management best practices. This research delved into models of organization, reporting structures, regional versus main campus task responsibilities, faculty and administrative staffing, program planning, financing, and revenue sharing. Regional campuses associated with these institutions differed in levels of autonomy and main campus integration. Three key reasons for developing and integrating regional campuses were discussed, the reasons being to increase responsiveness to local communities, extend the service area of the institution, and increase institutional revenue. Best practice information was then combined with these key reasons to aid member institutions in determining how they might best approach the development of their regional campuses. Information in the report was significantly related to the topic of branch campus administration and organization.

Eduventures, LLC. (2008, March). *Regional campus management best-practices study* (Learning Collaborative for Continuing and Professional Education Catalog No. 255CPECRR0308). Boston, MA: Eduventures, LLC.

Seven institutions that had one or more regional campuses were interviewed to gather demographic and business case information, as well as the institution's history, for offering full degree programs at the regional campuses. The number of regional campuses ranged from one to 136. Institutional practices associated with regional campus/main campus administration relationships, management of regional campus programming, strategies to increase regional faculty participation, operational support for full-degree programs, funding and revenue-sharing models, and marketing of full-degree programs were summarized. Benefits and challenges of offering full-degree programs at regional campuses were presented. Eduventures, as the coordinator of the Continuing and Professional Education cooperative and a consultancy organization specializing in higher education, was well-qualified to undertake this study on behalf of one of the members of the cooperative.

Guthrie, J. W., Plecki, M., Hayward, G. C., Koppich, J. E., Ramirez, R., Webb, F. R., et al. (1990). *The challenge of change in the San Francisco Community College District: An organizational and educational plan for the future*. San Francisco: San Francisco Community College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED316273)

Due to increasing enrollment, changes in expectations of citizens and state funding, and additions to the laws of California, the San Francisco Community College District engaged an outside consultant in 1970 to assess the existing administrative and organizational structures. For several decades the district had included two primary components, City College of San Francisco and the former adult education arm of the

Unified School District, jointly governed by a central District Administration. Strengths and future challenges were noted in the report. In addition, the pros and cons of four potential organizational structures were presented. These structures included keeping the status quo, creating two separate and independent but parallel structures, forming a multi-campus community college district with multiple broad-service institutions, and developing a single integrated system. The authors were all part of the consultant project team and thus, closely related to the material.

Healy, P. (1997, March 28). Penn State's expansion worries competitors [Electronic version]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 43, pp. A44.

Pennsylvania State University planned to expand fourteen of its seventeen branch campuses by offering baccalaureate degrees at the campuses beginning July 1997. The university reasoned that they had too many students at their main campus and that too few of the students at the two-year branches who began pursuing a baccalaureate degree were not completing the degree. Other four-year colleges in the state, as well as some legislators, were concerned that this expansion would create frenzied competition for enrollment of students and could cause some small colleges to fail. The potential move had set off discussions in the state regarding the need for a higher education coordinating board. This brief article was intended for general audiences. The author was a reporter writing from a news perspective.

Hermanson, D. R. (1993). *A revalidation of Dunlap's survey to determine the profile and critical issues of lower division branch campuses of four-year institutions* [Research report]. Grand Forks: University of North Dakota. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED358897)

A 1989 study by Dr. William Dunlap surveyed the membership of the Council of Two-Year Colleges of Four-Year Institutions. The survey described in this report basically duplicated and revalidated the findings of the 1989 survey but also added questions that gathered information regarding the most pressing concerns between the branch and main campuses. This latest survey also uncovered 29 branch campuses that were unknown at the time of the 1989 survey. Both studies focused on the profiles of the branch campuses including size, function, services, faculty and student characteristics, and governance while the latest also examined the expressed concerns. This focus fell directly in line with the desired topic of branch campus administration and organization. The author utilized this research to test a survey instrument which was to later be utilized for a dissertation.

Hermanson, D. R. (1995). *Inter-campus relations as perceived by branch campus and main campus administrators* (Doctoral dissertation: University of North Dakota, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 57(03), 1044A. (UMI No. 9623659)

This dissertation study was a follow-up to the research completed by Hermanson (1993) two years earlier. Again, the focus was on two-year colleges that were tied to public four-year universities. A history of two-year colleges and branch campuses was provided. Two purposes for further study were stated. The first was to compare the perceptions of

administrators at the branch and main campus with regard to interaction and communication. Identifying what contributed both negatively and positively to the relationship between these administrators was the second purpose. From the previous study, the author had surmised that the greatest desire of branch campus administrators was for more cooperation, more support, more respect, and equal treatment from the main campus. Fifty-one campuses responded to an initial quantitative survey. Then seven main and seven branch campus administrators participated in a qualitative follow-up to help verify the survey information. As part of the study, the author attempted to define branch and regional campuses as well as extension and satellite centers. The historical information, as well as the survey data regarding organization and administration of the two-year colleges, significantly illuminates the topic of branch campus administration and organization.

Hill, R. A. (1985). Multicampus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems (Doctoral dissertation: Florida State University, 1985). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 46(04), 858A. (UMI No. 8513377)

A lengthy survey was utilized to gather information on the organizational structure of branch campuses as well as administrative problems that occurred between the branch and main campus in this dissertation study. The study pursued three objectives: identify patterns of organizational structure at multi-campus universities, determine the major issues encountered in the administration of branch campuses and in dealing with the main campus, and assess to what degree the issues are associated with the characteristics of organizational structure. One hundred twenty-five surveys were mailed to main and branch campus administrators at 42 universities throughout the United States. Of these, 84 responses were received. In association with organizational theory, patterns of organization structure were identified, major issues were categorized, and the sources of these issues were investigated.

Jaschik, S. (2009, April). Scrutiny and Standards for Branch Campuses. *Inside Higher Education*, Retrieved 06/22/09, from www.insidehighered.com/layout/set/print/news/2009/04/09/branch

This article examines the development of branch campuses of American Universities abroad. It asserts that establishing branch campuses in foreign lands erodes the academic quality of the institutions and undercuts the rights of faculty. It suggests that higher education organizations should “think twice” before moving its operations abroad.

Jefferson, C. F. (1986, March). *How does a multi-site institution plan effectively?* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED271185)

For a multi-campus institution to respond effectively toward environmental change and continue to provide services and educational programs of high quality it must have systems for planning and evaluation already in place. This presentation paper outlined the institutional standards, processes of communication, and leadership vision necessary to

accomplish such response. It also delved into the elements required of a planning process to make it effective. These elements included some of the administrative components necessary to make this type of planning work and thus demonstrated a level of relevancy to the topic of branch campus administration and organization. Information in the presentation was aimed at a general audience of educators and administrators. The author was Provost of a community college and thus able to provide a meaningful presentation on the institution's planning process.

Johnstone, D. B. (n.d.). Role, scope, mission, and purposes of multicampus systems. Retrieved April 20, 2008, from University of Buffalo, State University of New York, Graduate School of Education Web site: <http://www.gse.buffalo.edu/FAS/Johnston/systems.htm>

Written in the late 1990s, the author discussed the beginnings and various forms of multi-campus systems of academic governance existing in the United States. Positive and potentially negative aspects of membership in a system were described. Nine essential functions of public multi-campus systems were spelled out. With regard to a single campus, the degree of autonomy from an existing central system administration or governing board may determine whether the association helped or hindered the site. Branch and multi-site institutions were noted as resembling a system in some aspects but also being very different in governance characteristics. The article appeared to be similar to and possibly even a follow-up to the Burke (1994) article referenced earlier in that it discussed the idea of systems from the point of view of State University of New York.

Kerka, S. (1998). *Extension today and tomorrow: Trends and issues alerts*. Columbus, OH: ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED425335)

This ERIC Clearinghouse document consisted of several short write-ups on new people and institutions involved in federal Cooperative Extension Service extension locations, new delivery methods being utilized, and new ways to work and learn. It included a list, with short description, of numerous resource books available. Similar in nature to branch campuses, extensions help increase access to education for underserved communities.

Kinser, K. (2005). A profile of regionally accredited for-profit institutions of higher education [Electronic version]. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 129, 69-83.

Written for a general education audience, this article provides a basic overview of for-profit institutions that have received regional accreditation. To gather the information, a study of institutional web sites was undertaken. This information was then utilized to check on regional accreditation. The author pointed out that most literature on for-profits have focused on the national giants such as University of Phoenix, DeVry, and a few others. These huge institutions skewed the profile of for-profits in general and were not representative of the larger field of for-profit institutions. Regional accreditation was described and assessed for importance. Programmatic aspects and organizational structures were defined.

Lloyd, M. G., & Griffiths, C. (2008). A review of the methods of delivering HE programmes in an FE college and an evaluation of the impact this will have on learning outcomes and student progression [Electronic version]. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 32(1), 15-25.

With recent government policies that promoted lifelong learning concepts and greater higher education participation, institutions in England were being pressed to expand their course offerings. As a result, higher education courses were being offered increasingly at remote campuses which were smaller and closer to more non-traditional students. The article described a study of several new degree programs that were built with adult learning characteristics in mind and delivered at a remote campus. Teaching and learning approaches were discussed and an evaluation of course success was provided. The authors, who were directors of the courses being offered, had the appropriate position and experience to undertake this study.

Lombardi, J. V., Craig, D. D., Capaldi, E. D., & Gater, D. S. (2002). *University organization, governance, and competitiveness* (The Center for Measuring University Performance 2002 Annual Report). Retrieved March 30, 2008, from <http://mup.asu.edu/UniversityOrganization.pdf>

Research universities, typically the largest and most renowned of academic institutions, have grown and expanded in recent history. University administration and organizational structures, as well as governance structures, were discussed. The report noted that words such as school, college, and campus, all of which have meaning at research universities, each had taken on multiple meanings. Financing principles of higher education institutions were also introduced in the report and endowment equivalents were calculated by institution. Several governance structures were found to be common among educational institutions whether the institution was public or private. These structures were called single governing board – single research university, single governing board – multiple institutions with local trustee boards, and single governing board – multiple institutions with no local board. Branch campuses were defined in the context of single universities, regardless of the governance structure in place. The information provided regarding branch campuses, though limited, was relevant to the topic of branch campus administration and organization. The authors, all executives of research universities, served as staff for The Center. They were well-qualified to undertake this yearly study on university performance.

Marx, S. (2005). Improving the Use of Technology in a Small Campus Community. *Technology in Higher Education Journal*, 32 (6), p.21.

This article discusses how faculty use technology at a branch campus of a large state university. It poses questions and suggestions on the various challenges faculty face when they try to integrate technology into their teaching and also when they try to use technology for the main platform for course delivery. The program to enhance technology and the ability of faculty to use technology to teach provides insight into how other branch campuses may assist their faculty in providing instruction using up-to-date

technologies. It discusses the training and incentives used to motivate and support faculty.

Meek, L. (1992). The management of multicampus institutions: Some conceptual issues in historical and social context. *Journal of Tertiary Education Administration*, 14(1), 11-28.

The article focused on the Australian higher education market which had seen numerous mergers of institutions in the previous four years. This amalgamation of institutions had been driven by significant changes in higher education policy and process at the national government level. Funding of higher education institutions depended on size, so non-related entities were merging to form larger ones. Typically, the larger entity was named after the largest of the multiple institutions that formed the new entity. Pressures dictated that these new entities created an administrative structure and organization similar to a common American multi-campus university. Included in the article were definitions and categorizations of structure, organization, and function which were relevant to the topic of branch campus administration and organization. The intended audience was higher education administrators. Author Meek was a faculty member at a college of advanced education which had formed an amalgamation of the University of New England, another advanced education college, and an agricultural college.

Morrill, R., & Beyers, W. (1991). Locating branch campuses for the University of Washington. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, 15, 161-171. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database.

A study of unmet educational needs among underserved metropolitan areas in western Washington led to a decision to establish two branch campuses. As the population around Seattle and throughout northwest Washington expanded, many potential students found themselves place-bound, unable to get to a 4-year institution to finish college. In addition, many adults could not afford to leave their jobs and homes to relocate to places where institutions of higher education had been established years earlier. The article discussed both the unmet need and the ideal demand for college education, assuming that the Washington populace should strive to meet the national average in college participation. As the economy of the region flourished, this need continued to increase. Determining where to locate the new branch campuses was the primary focus of the article. The authors, as academics in the department of geography, were well-suited to discuss the analysis of placement.

National Center for Higher Education Management Systems. (October, 2007). *Feasibility and Demand Study for the State of Arizona* [Research Report]. Tucson Arizona.

In 2007, the governing board for Arizona's Universities commissioned a study of public higher education. Out of the study came the recommendations that the Universities expand their offerings to the citizens of the state of Arizona. One way in which the study suggests this happening is to develop new branch campuses and expand their partnerships with the community colleges. The study provides statistical data linked to education focused on job market demands.

Nickerson, M., & Schaefer, S. (2001). Autonomy and anonymity: Characteristics of branch campus faculty. *Metropolitan Universities – An International Forum*, 12(2), 49-59.

Dr. Nickerson co-authored a survey of branch campus administrators in the late 1990's in order to identify key characteristics of branch campuses, define a branch campus typology, and gather branch campus administrator views on students, faculty, organization, resources, and institutional relations. Since the body of literature contained little related to branch campuses, this article attempted to define branch campuses and promote a basic level of understanding of these entities. Data from the 269 valid survey responses were used to define six common branch campus characteristics as well as a typology consisting of seven variations of campuses. Branch campus faculty characteristics related to teaching and learning were described. The relationship between autonomy and isolation was analyzed relative to these faculty members and implications of working at a branch campus were noted. Six critical issues derived from the study of branch campus faculty opened up many significant questions related to organization and administration of branch campuses.

Orange County College. (1998). *The Need for a Southern Branch Campus of Ocean County College* (1st ed.) [Policy Document]. Toms River, NJ: Office of Institutional Research.

This is a feasibility study that looks at what factors create the need for the development of a branch campus in Ocean County, New Jersey. It takes into account demographics such as land area and dispersion, economic trends, population trends. Information regarding the elementary, secondary and higher education opportunities in the area; the history and future of the county, and public opinions were studied and presented. It showed that more people would participate in higher education if there was a branch campus developed in Ocean County, New Jersey.

Pennucci, A., & Mayfield, J. (2002). *Higher education branch campuses in Washington state* (Document ID 02-12-2302). Olympia, WA: Washington State Institute for Public Policy. Retrieved November 9, 2008, from <http://www.wsipp.wa.gov/rptfiles/BranchCampusInterim.pdf>

This Power Point document is a visual presentation that condenses a study conducted by the Washington State Institute for Public Policy. It gives clear and concise information about the mission of the state's branch campuses and determines that the campuses were meeting those missions. It also examines the evolution of the branch campuses and gives explicit budgetary/ funding information. The presentation also goes into depth regarding the legislative directions that were provided to the branch campuses at that time in Washington.

Five new branch campuses had been created in 1989 by the Washington state legislature. Two branches were assigned to the University of Washington and three to Washington State University. A 2002 legislature bill directed the public policy institute to review

these branch campuses. This interim report reviewed the extent to which these branch campuses were meeting their original mission as well as how much the key factors that lead to their creation had changed. These original factors were to provide increased access to higher education for place-bound students and to help stimulate regional economic development. Existing factors affecting the branches, such as branch autonomy, program and student mix, costs, research, and community relations, were considered. Opportunities for legislative direction were noted. Autonomy and branch authority, both of which are relative to the topic of branch campus administration, were discussed. This report is directly related to the Morrill and Beyers (2001) article.

Sammartino, P. (1964). Multiple-campus colleges [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education*, 35, 503-506.

The author, who at the time was President of Farleigh Dickinson University, wrote from the experience of having helped to initiate four remote university campuses. He purposely omitted university systems and professional branch campuses, focusing on the emerging growth of branch campuses among American universities. Half of the article focused on reasons for developing branches and the other half on problems or issues faced by institutions as they created those branches. Availability of up-to-date library facilities was considered a major drawback to providing full services to students at branch locations. Unity among the branches of an institution, both philosophically and structurally, was noted as critical. Though dated, discussion of the reasons for developing branch campuses was found to be relevant to a modern-day multi-campus institution topic.

Schindler, C. M. (1952). Stepchild of the college campus [Electronic version]. *Journal of Higher Education*, 23, 191-197+227-228.

Following World War II, universities scrambled to handle the large number of veterans desiring a college education. As a result, many off-campus locations were established to house undergraduate divisions. Characteristics of these locations included having limited access to founding institution facilities due to distance, offering at least one program giving credits toward the Bachelor degree level, and requiring a local administrator. Based on research data from 72 of these divisions, the author found that although every institution claimed that their off-campus divisions were integral parts of the university, through actions and attitudes most did not treat the administrators, faculty, employees or students of those divisions equally with their on-campus counterparts. The article focuses on numerous issues related to the handling of the remote campuses and calls for founding institutions to examine their selves with an eye toward achieving policy consistency. A number of the issues mentioned in the article continue to have relevance today when considering the establishment and administration of branches of multi-campus institutions.

Schmidt, P. (1998, June 12). Rogers University in Tulsa will be replaced by a new branch of Oklahoma State University. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44, pp. 33-34. Retrieved October 26, 2008, from Lexis Nexis Academic database.

This short news article describes the political situation that caused Oklahoma lawmakers to establish Rogers University in Tulsa in 1996 as well as the situation two years later which forced them to reassess how to best provide an educational establishment in that city. Administrative headaches due to the structure of the university, power struggles among other colleges providing programs for the university, limited academic choices for students, and continuing pressure from business leaders to house a research-level university in Tulsa resulted in the reassessment. The determination to expand Oklahoma State University, developing a new branch campus in Tulsa and to create a new Rogers State University in nearby Claremore was a compromise that appeared to solve many of the issues. As a reporter of the news, the author may or may not have had any true experience related to the story.

Scott, G., Grebennikov, L., & Johnston, K. (2007). *Study of Australian multi-campus universities*. Manuscript submitted for publication. Retrieved September 15, 2008, from University of Western Sydney Web site:
http://www.uws.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0020/7175/MultiCampus_Universities_study_Jan2007.pdf

Beginning with the restructuring of tertiary education in Australia in 1989-90, when 88 institutions were reformed into 36 universities, three types of university organizational structures had emerged: single-campus, main campus plus at least one small satellite campus, and multiple campuses that were geographically dispersed. Universities with the third structure, the multi-campus university, were the focus of a study to determine if they were distinctive from the other structural forms in student profile, funding, expenditures, and teaching and learning outcomes. Ten multi-campus universities were compared to 28 other universities with one of the other two organizational structures. The authors were part of a planning and quality department at a multi-campus university and they undertook the study within the context of the university. This article was related to the Meek (1992) article in that it focused on the effects resulting from the educational restructuring.

Smart, J. C., Kuh, G. D., & Tierney, W. G. (1997). The roles of institutional cultures and decision approaches in promoting organizational effectiveness in two-year colleges [Electronic version]. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 68, 256-281.

Determining relationships among culture of the institution, effectiveness of the organization, and the approach to decision making at two-year public colleges was the purpose of this study. A dominant culture type was established for each of the 30 public two-year colleges involved and effectiveness was calculated through the analysis of a number of exogenous variables/dimensions. These included size, financial and enrollment health, transfer emphases, career emphasis, continuing education emphasis, and unionization of faculty. Study results indicated that organizational effectiveness was

a function of the blending of institutional culture, the external environment, and a preferred approach to decision-making. All three authors had published at least twice previously, either in the area of effectiveness or culture, so they were well-suited to take on this study.

Stahley, M. (2002). Multicampus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems: An iteration and expansion of Hill (Doctoral dissertation: Florida Atlantic University, 2002). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 63(05), 1659A. (UMI No. 3054607)

This doctoral study was a replication of the study by Hill (1985) with the additional objective to determine how significantly communication technology had influenced intercampus problems and multi-campus university organizational structures since the earlier study. The study design was built directly from the conceptual framework of Hill. Research included historical development of the concepts of branch and regional campuses as well as multi-campus systems. It also examined typical organization structures utilized by multi-campus universities to manage branch campuses. A total of 152 individuals from 36 universities were surveyed and 60 completed surveys were returned.

Substantive Change for Accredited Institutions of the Commission on Colleges. (2007). Decatur, Georgia: Southern Association Commission on Colleges and Schools.

This document outlines procedures for Colleges in Georgia in regard to changing the structure or design of their colleges in the areas of developing branch campuses and other academic changes that expand the availability of programs to the citizens of the state of Georgia.

Timberlake, G. R. (2004). Decision making in multicampus institutions of higher learning (Doctoral dissertation: Alliant International University, 2004). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 65(04), 1450A. (UMI No. 3129998)

Common decision-making issues within multi-campus institutions and how design of the organization might help reduce those issues were the focus of this study. Personal experience of the author at two multi-campus institutions was stated as the reason for interest in this topic. Relationship and needs management have grown more complex as institutions have developed locations at a distance. Technology has often been employed to increase communication but has sometimes created more tension due to lack of non-verbal cues and misunderstandings caused by distance. Organizational structure has been a complicating factor at times. Leadership and organizational culture have also contributed to the issues. Eight administrators with experience at six different multi-campus schools were interviewed for their perspectives on decision-making. Perspectives that were gathered through the interviews were themed and discussed.

University of Arizona. (2006). *Community College Relationships and Distance Education Programs at the University of Arizona* [Policy and Procedure Document]. Tucson, Arizona: Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost.

This document describes the efforts of the University of Arizona in relationship to the community colleges to serve transfer students. It examines transfer course articulation and the various mechanisms and organizations that support articulation of courses that can be transferred into various majors, the internal and external offices that support the community college partnerships, and the rate of transfer students entering the University. It discusses the various programs and activities that the University facilitates to support transfer students. The budgets for these transfer programs are also delineated.

Verbick, L. (Winter 2007). International Branch Campus: Models and Trends. *International Higher Education*, (Number 46)

This article provides several different types of models that are presently being used in the development of branch campuses internationally. The models are based in the funding mechanisms that are used by various institutions and also looks at the facilities that the campuses are established in and how they are managed and developed.

Washington State University. (1987-1991). *Branch Campus Site Studies 1987-1991* (Washington State University Library Archives # 245) Vice Provost for Extended University Services.

This internal document of Washington State University is from the archives and special collections of the WSU Library. It contains all of the correspondence, policy and practice information and publicity documents in relation to branch campuses of the Washington State University system between 1987 and 1991. The compilation gives great insight to some of the issues and challenges facing branch campuses in the state of Washington during that time period.

Winchester, H. P. M., & Sterk, B. F. (2006, July). *Multi-campus university management: Lessons from AUQA audit reports*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the Fifth Australian Universities Quality Forum, Perth, Australia. Retrieved September 12, 2008, from Australian Universities Quality Agency Web site:
http://www.auqa.edu.au/auqf/2006/program/paper/paper_a5.pdf

An examination of multi-campus university audit reports, which had been created by the Australian Universities Quality Agency, was the basis for this paper. Multi-campus universities had become the norm in Australia ever since the restructuring of higher education in the country in 1988-89. The authors divided the universities represented in the audit reports into four models: lost in space, planets in alignment, satellite, and birth of a new star. Categorization was dependent on the reported performance in areas of strategic planning, communications, leadership, support, and quality systems. A total of 21 universities with multiple campuses were represented in the audit reports. Characteristics of the four models were described and specific examples provided. This paper was related to the Meek (1992) article.

Wolfe, J. R., & Strange, C. C. (2003). Academic life at the franchise: Faculty culture in a rural two-year branch campus [Electronic version]. *Review of Higher Education*, 26, 343-362.

A qualitative study was conducted among seven faculty members who taught at a remote campus of a smaller rural, Midwest university. A brief description of campus characteristics was provided. This information was of some value relative to branch campus administration and organization. Four primary themes of daily campus faculty life emerged from the study. These themes were: the institution's provincial culture and conservative nature, the small size of the institution and resulting effect on faculty, perspectives of the role of faculty, and influences on the implementation of faculty roles. A major issue associated with the culture and nature of the campus was the role and treatment of women. One of the authors was a faculty member at this remote campus. Thus, the authors were completely qualified to undertake this study.

Yates, E., & Wright, S. (1999, June 14). North Carolina abolishes one college, creates multi-campus school. *Community College Week*, 11, pp. 23-25. Retrieved September 11, 2008, from Academic Search Premier database.

One community college in North Carolina has been serving two counties for over 30 years. However, one of the two counties, the larger, desired their own college. Political maneuvering, competing interests, and self-centeredness brought about a situation that could not be settled by county commissioners. Finally, the North Carolina Legislature stepped in and settled the situation. Their decision was to shut down the existing college and create a new college with dual branches, one in each county. The decision appeared to have been well-accepted. Authors of the article are believed to be reporters for the newspaper so their authority is suspect.

RESEARCH

Dissertations about branch campus topics/issues:

1. Bailey, N. I. (2002). *The relationship between organizational climate and job satisfaction as reported by branch campus executive officers in multicampus community college systems*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida.
2. Hermanson, D. R. (1995). *Inter-campus relations as perceived by branch campus and main campus administrators*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota.
3. Hill, R. A. (1985). *Multicampus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University.
4. Horan, K.P. (2006). *The impact of the branch campus on student satisfaction and student involvement*. Unpublished dissertation, Saint Mary's College of California.
5. Lee, M. O. (2007). *A comparative case study of four partnership campuses: Origin, administration, academics and student services*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Dakota.
6. Lewis-Campbell, W. (2003). *Determining connectedness of resident students from the satellite campus to the main campus*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.
7. Merzer, M. (2008). *Perceptions of inter-campus relations by branch campus and main campus student affairs administrators in multicampus public universities in Florida*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida Atlantic University.
8. Stahley, M. (2002). *Multicampus university organizational structure and branch campus administrative problems: An iterative and expansion of Hill (Rosalie A. Hill)*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida.

II. Articles and Reports on branch campuses:

1. Blocker, C. E., & Campbell, Jr., H. A. (1963). *Administrative practices in university extension centers and branch colleges*. (The University of South Carolina Libraries, Thomas Cooper Library) Austin: University of Texas.
2. Cardozier, V. R. (1984). Upper level colleges yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Educational Record*, 65(3), 30-35.
3. Catell, N. O. (1971). The branch campus role in community-based education. *The Educational Record*, 2(7), 368-370.
4. Clinebell, S., & Shadwick, G. (2005). The importance of organizational context on employees' attitudes: An examination of working in main offices versus branch offices. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, 11(2), 89-100. Retrieved March 16, 2005, from <http://findgalegroup.com>
5. Konrad, A. G. (April 4, 1982). Full partner or stepchild: Extending functions of a university through a branch campus. Paper presented at the meeting of the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. St. Louis, MO.

6. Windham, P., Perkins, G. R., & Rogers, J. (2001). Concurrent-use campuses: Part of the new definition of access. *Community College Review*, 29(3), 39-55.

III. Books on branch or multicampus institutions:

1. Floyd, D. L., Skolnick, M. L., & Walker, K. P. (Eds.). (2005). *The Community College Baccalaureate*. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus Publishing.
2. Gaither, G. H. (Ed.). (1999). *The Multicampus System: Perspectives on Practice and Prospects*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.
3. Lee, E. C., & Bowen, F. M. (1971). *The Multicampus University*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
4. Lee, E. C., & Bowen, F. M. (1975). *Managing multicampus systems: Effective administration in an unsteady state*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Reference list compiled by Marion Merzer, FAU Broward and Darla Brown, University of Arizona South.