Centralized Vs. Decentralized University Summer Session Programs:

Examining the Continuum

Karen K. Heikel
University of Minnesota-Duluth

Because of a continuing personal and professional interest in summer session administration and management, and because of observing and hearing anecdotally first hand the changes that summer programs were undergoing, I decided to further research the phenomenon of university summer sessions. A literature search revealed a dearth of writings or research studies which offered substantiating data about summer session programs at American colleges and universities, thus offering an additional impetus to provide a contribution to the field.

Funding

Preliminary research revealed that changes in funding practices in higher education programs at both the state and federal level were having a serious impact on higher education. This trend is predicted to continue. Annual research conducted by the North American Associa-

tion of Summer Sessions (NAASS) indicated a growing number of institutions reporting changes in the range of costs their summer sessions were expected to cover (Golden, Reisinger & Pusch, 1995). Financial exigencies and retrenchments combined with declining enrollments caused some institutions to consider organizational changes, reductions in programs and personnel, and an overall consolidation of functions (Young & McDougall, 1982). An on-going search for the "ideal" administrative model for the summer session has caused countless debates regarding centralization and decentralization.

Raising the Question

Specifically, the question addressed was: Does a centralized summer session program have different outcomes from a decentralized summer session program? For purposes of this study a centralized summer session program was one which operated within a single summer session office, was vested with decision-making authority, and existed as a distinct entity on campus. A decentralized summer session was one where summer session responsibilities and operations were distributed to individual collegiate or department units, all with individual autonomy. When classifying summer session programs as either centralized or decentralized in structure, it is important to exercise a degree of caution. Brooke (1984) warned researchers and those studying organizational structure that it was "not easy" to design a methodology which would match the complex concepts of centralization and decentralization. Even if this could be accomplished, he advised that researchers should not present educational institutions as one way or the other, advising that centralization and decentralization existed as more than simple dichotomies. Rather, Brooke promoted the use of a centralization scale that would produce a standard of comparison for the purposes of reviewing generalizations about the consequences of the degree of centralization or decentralization.

The purpose of this study was to add to the existing body of literature about university summer session programs and attempt to offer useful information about program outcomes which could be used by administrators when contemplating changes in a program's operation and/or structure. Unfortunately, little has been documented or written about what happens when a summer session program moves (or makes the transition) from being primarily decentralized to centralized or from centralized to decentralized in its overall operational structure.

Surveying

Because of a lack of research literature in the subject area chosen, a descriptive survey research design was selected. A mail-out survey procedure was utilized to gather the data, which proved to be relatively inexpensive compared to other types of data-gathering techniques. The anonymity of the survey approach was also considered an advantage because it reduced the risk of researcher or interviewer bias.

A survey instrument, the "Summer Session Organizational Survey," was designed by the researcher to answer the following questions:

1. How many colleges and universities sampled can be classified as administratively centralized or decentralized?
2. Does a centralized summer session program have different outcomes than a decentralized program?
3. Does either the institutional or summer session funding sources relate to a summer program's degree of centralization?
4. What are some changes that have occurred in university summer sessions over the past five years?
5. Is there a relationship between the size of the institution and its summer session being centralized or decentralized?
6. Is there a relationship between an institution's land grant status and its summer session being centralized or decentralized?
7. Do summer session directors perceive a shift towards more centralization or decentralization of their programs?
8. Is there a difference between the outcome indicators reported (enrollment and number of courses offered) and the "success rates" reported by summer session directors?
9. Is there a difference between the reported summer session organizational structure at an institution and its degree of centralization?

The researcher identified 17 indicators of centralized and decentralized summer session office functions along with university summer session outcome measures of program effectiveness. These included summer session headcount, number of summer session courses offered, and perceived success, both financially and in meeting student needs. Additional questions were asked to further separate the institutions by their land-grant status, size, and funding sources.

Validating

After being carefully constructed, critiqued, and validated by 12 experienced summer session directors, the final survey was reduced to a total of 39 items. Part I queried participants about their overall amount of control or influence over 17 key summer session functions. Part II requested information about the identified outcome indicators (headcount, number of courses taught, and success, both financially and in meeting student needs). Part III requested the administrators' perceptions about various aspects of their programs' centralization or decentralization. Part IV contained requests for demographic information about the institution.

Selecting

Current summer session administrators were the population of interest in this study. In order to reduce the number of confounding variables within the sample population, only public institutions were selected that were classified as either Research I or II or Doctoral I or II institutions. The National Center for Higher Education Measurement (NCHEMS) provided a mailing list of 144 public institutions that met the stated criteria. With 94 of 144 returns, the response rate was 65.3 percent.

Processing

Returned surveys were processed in a uniform manner and a coding system was developed to assist the researcher with data entry and interpretation. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used to process the data and statistical information. The p-value for statistical significance of .05 was used for all statistical analysis.

Findings

Demographics of Respondents

All participants in the study represented four-year public colleges and universities. The size of the participating institutions through the reporting of fall 1997 headcount, ranged from 3,100 to 49,000, with a mean of 21,033 and a mode of 25,000. Summer session size as measured by summer 1997 headcount ranged from 350 to 20,000, with a mean of 7,655 and a mode of 8000.

The number of structured fall 1997 credit courses ranged from 75 to

9,999, with a mean of 3,307 and a mode of 1000. Structured summer 1997 credit course numbers ranged from 110 to 4,000, with a mean of 785 and a mode of 500.

Results were fairly comparable regarding land grant status among the participating institutions. Forty-eight (55.8 percent) held the land grant designation while thirty-eight (44.2 percent) did not.

When asked about the percent of the institution's annual operating income derived from tuition, 30.8 percent responded at the 0-25 percent level, 44.9 percent at the 26-50 percent level, 20.5 percent at the 51-75 percent level, and 3.8 percent responded at the 76-100 percent level.

Research Question 1:
Classification of participants as having centralized, decentralized, or mid-range (hybrid) summer session programs.

The data required to answer the first research question was taken from survey questionnaire items 1-17. Subject responses of "very high" or "high" were assigned a numerical value of 1. "Moderate" responses were assigned a value of 2, and "low" or "very low" responses were assigned a value of 3. "Not applicable" responses were coded at 0 because it could not be determined from the data if subjects did not perform the stated function, if the function was performed elsewhere, or if the item truly did not apply. Blank or missing responses were replaced with the group mean for the particular question. Based on the survey construction, a value of 1 indicated a high degree of centralization for that function, indicating that the directors or their staffs had a high amount of control or influence over the particular summer session function. A value of 3 indicated a high degree of decentralization for that function, indicating that the directors or their staffs had a low amount of control or influence over the particular summer session function. A value of 2 indicated a mid-range or moderate amount of control or influence. Thus respondents could obtain a summed score of between 17-51 on the first 17 items. Response values on the 17 variables ranged from a total of 17, indicating a high degree of centralization, to 46, indicating a high degree of decentralization. When determining a summer program's degree of centralization or decentralization for this study, the researcher noted that only one of the institutions responded to the 17 influence or control questions in Part I of the "Summer Session Organizational Survey" in a uniformly centralized manner (by selecting a coded "1" response for all questions). No respondents came close to selecting all coded "3" responses to indicate a totally decentralized program.

The reader would at this point be asking, "what well-known

institution's summer programs would be identified by this researcher as centralized, decentralized or hybrid? The answer to that question is not as readily supplied as might be imagined because the specific administrative summer session functions are not apparent to the institutional consumer. Rather, they are covert functions of the machinery of the institutions. Hence without breaking the security of the survey participants, it could not be said, for instance, that the University of Minnesota is centralized, decentralized, or hybrid. Survey participants were guaranteed anonymity with all data being reported in the aggregate.

Three groups emerged when responses for the first 17 survey questions were summed. Of the 87 valid participants, 35 (40 percent) were classified by the researcher as centralized, 38 (44 percent) as mid-range or hybrid programs, and 14 (16 percnt) as decentralized programs.

Research Question 2:
Differences in summer session program outcomes—
student enrollment.

Revealing no statistical significance at the .05 level (p-value .5892), the statistical analysis indicated that centralized summer session programs did not enroll a significantly greater number of students than either mid-range or decentralized programs. An additional test comparing the number of students enrolled in the summer term as a percentage of those enrolled in the fall term also showed no significant difference at the .05 level (p value .4411).

Research Question 2:
Differences in summer session program outcomes—
number of credit courses offered .

The statistical analysis revealed no significant difference at the .05 level (p-value .8383), indicating that centralized summer session programs did not offer a significantly greater number of credit courses than either mid-range or decentralized programs. An additional test which compared the number of courses taught in the summer term as a percentage of those taught in the fall term also showed no significant difference at the .05 level (p value .5602).

Research Question 2:
Differences in summer session program outcomes—
financial success.

The statistical analysis revealed a significant difference at the .05 level (p-value .0020), with decentralized summer session programs

significantly different from centralized and mid-range programs. Decentralized programs reported lower levels of financial success.

Research Question 2:
Differences in summer session program outcomes—success in meeting student needs.

The statistical analysis revealed a significant difference at the .05 level (p value .0001) with centralized summer session programs significantly different from mid-range and decentralized programs in meeting student needs. Centralized programs reported a higher level of success in meeting student needs.

Research Question 3:
Differences in institutional or summer session funding sources and degree of centralization.

The statistical analysis indicated that centralized summer session program funding is primarily self-generated. Funding for mid-range and decentralized summer session program income is primarily on an allocation basis. The definition of budget allocation was determined by the researcher to mean that the summer session functioned as a budgeted unit within the institution and was allocated a set amount of money to administer and operate the program. Tuition revenues were not controlled by the summer session. The finding was significant at the $p<.0001$ level.

Research Question 4:
Changes in university summer sessions over the past five years comparing 1992 with 1997—operating costs.

Results of this analysis revealed a significant p-value of .0048 indicating that, overall, summer programs are being required to cover a greater percentage of their costs in 1997 than they did in 1992. A further analysis which compared the three groups indicated a significant change (p value .0290) only between centralized and decentralized programs in the amount of operating costs the programs were expected to recover. The analysis concluded that centralized programs were being required by their institutions to cover more of their total costs.

Research Question 4:
Changes in university summer sessions in the past five years comparing 1992 with 1997—number of summer session credit classes taught.

Among the three groups there was no significant change noted in the number of credit courses offered between 1992 and 1997.

Research Question 4:
Changes in university summer sessions in the past five years comparing 1992 with 1997—number of students enrolled in summer session.

Among the three groups there was no significant change noted in the number of students enrolled in the summer session between 1992 and 1997.

Research Question 5:
Relationship between institutional size and the summer session's degree of centralization.

There was no significant difference noted (p-value .2410), indicating centralization not to be related to an institution's size.

Research Question 6:
Relationship between land grant status and the summer session's degree of centralization.

A p-value .9752 indicated no significant relationship between an institution's land grant status and its summer session's degree of centralization or decentralization.

Research Question 7:
Perceived shift towards more centralization or decentralization over the past five years.

Among survey respondents ranking their program as predominately centralized, 34.8 percent rated their program as centralized in 1992, 33 percent rated their program as currently centralized, and 32 percent predicted their programs would be centralized in five years. This indicated a general downward trend of centralized summer programs. Among survey respondents ranking their program as predominately decentralized, 16.7 percent rated their program as decentralized in 1992, 28.7 percent rated their program as currently decentralized, and 28.2 percnet predicted their programs would be centralized in five years. This indicates a general upward trend towards decentralized programs.

Research Question 7:

Pressure to become more centralized or decentralized.

A p-value of .3968 indicated no difference among the three groups with most survey respondents reporting they had experienced no administrative pressure to change the summer session from either a centralized to a decentralized, or a decentralized to centralized model.

Research Question 8:

Difference between outcome indicators and the "success rates" reported—financial success and summer enrollment.

No significant difference was found (p value .9609), indicating no relationship between how financially successful a summer program was rated on a 7-point Likert scale and its summer enrollment.

Research Question 8:

Financial success and number of summer courses.

No significant difference was found (p value .7843), between financial success and the number of summer courses. This indicated no relationship between how financially successful a summer program was rated and the number of summer courses offered.

Research Question 8:

Success in meeting student needs and summer enrollment.

No significant difference was found (p value .8948), indicating no relationship between a program's success in meeting student needs and its summer enrollment.

Research Question 8:

Success in meeting student needs and number of summer courses.

No significant difference was found (p value .7379), indicating no relationship between a program's success in meeting student needs and the number of summer courses offered.

Research Question 9:

Difference between summer session organizational structure and its degree of centralization.

A p-value of .7598 indicated no relationship between how summer programs were organized and placed within the university or college administrative hierarchy and if they were centralized or decentralized.

Research Question 9:
Difference between summer session being viewed as an integral part or a separate entity and its degree of centralization.

A p-value of .1632 indicated no relationship between how summer session program administration was viewed within the university structure and if it was centralized or decentralized.

Conclusions and Discussion

A number of conclusions were drawn from the significant findings as a result of the data analysis and are presented in this section. Differences among centralized and decentralized summer session programs appeared to cluster around success factors (both financial success and success in meeting student needs) and budgetary issues. Some general trends were also noted that were also supported by the literature.

u Decentralized summer session programs were significantly different from centralized or mid-range programs in that they were rated as less financially successful. In writings about university continuing education and summer session programs, a number of authors (Piper, 1996; Edelson, 1995; and Hentschel, 1991) promoted the value of a centralized program from a financial standpoint. Referring to a "stewardship of resources" (p. 30), Piper believed centralized programs could be more effective in capturing efficiencies that would have been lost through a decentralized operation. Among organizational literature this view was echoed by Kochen & Deutsch (1973). Citing economies of scale, Edelson (1995) advised that centralized administrative functions led to less duplication of effort through the need for only single marketing, advertising, and publication efforts as opposed to each department or collegiate unit held responsible for promoting their own summer offerings. McLoughlin, Samson, & Scarboro (1991) offered another possible contributor to the greater financial success of centralized summer programs. A centralized budgeting process was more likely to direct that funds allocated to the summer term actually be spent on summer activities and not diverted or reassigned for use elsewhere on campus. The only financial winners within a decentralized program would have been those academic departments that operated successful summer sessions, generated a revenue surplus, and then kept it for use elsewhere in the department. It must be stated that continued financial success among centralized summer programs could pose a challenge for the summer administrator. In times of shrinking budgets, programs that are financially successful could attract attention and run the risk of being co-

opted. Within the ebb and flow of administrative restructuring that has been and continues to be a constant part of our American educational system, summer programs risk losing structurally the centralization which allowed them to be successful in the first place.

u Centralized summer session programs were significantly different from mid-range or decentralized programs because they were rated as more successful in meeting student needs. This finding supported Edelson's (1995) comments about the inherent logic of program centralization when viewed from a quality control standpoint. Hentschel (1991) discussed the importance of having a centralized administration to promote and manage the "big picture," thus rendering programs more flexible in responding to student or programmatic needs. Even those who supported decentralization (Kreps, 1996) cautioned that such a structure operating within complex organizations such as education could place authority in the hands of individuals unaware of the "big picture." These individuals might have the potential for far reaching negative impact on the rest of the organization. In an earlier work about continuing education programs, Gordon (1980) agreed with Hentschel's assertion that the interdisciplinary nature of a centralized office tended to place the learner's needs over faculty interests. Summer session program directors McLoughlin, Samson, & Scarboro (1991) promoted the idea that course selection and programmatic decisions should drive the summer instruction with curriculum determining staffing needs, not the reverse. They considered this to be critical to the creation of a summer term that would be attractive to students. Centralized coordination and course scheduling and sequencing could benefit students by providing greater ease in planning and access to needed programs and courses. In addition, information about policy and procedures, special events, and other issues of importance to the summer student could be more accurately and efficiently handled through a single point of contact such as the summer session office.

u There is a significant difference in how centralized and decentralized summer session programs were funded within the university or college systems. Centralized programs primarily generated their own funds while decentralized programs were funded primarily through an allocation basis. According to Smith (1972), "Perhaps no program in higher education is organized and funded in a greater variety of ways than is the summer school or summer session" (p. 2). The survey bears out Smith's observation. An "other" category was offered as an optional response to this question in addition to the choices of "allocation" and "self-generated income" which also allowed options for additional writ-

ten information. It was interesting to note the myriad of responses that were offered within these three choices: thirty-seven responses for "allocation," fifteen responses for "self-generated income," and fourteen responses for "other." The responses were so varied, and in some cases, similar across the three categories that the researcher could only concur with Smith's 1972 assessment. Discussions between the researcher and summer session deans and directors also confirmed this view.

u A significant change has occurred in the past five years in the range of operating costs summer session programs were expected to cover. All three groups were required to cover a greater percentage of their costs. Supported in the literature, this finding illustrated a growing trend cited in a yearly survey conducted by the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS). The NAASS survey reported that by 1995 a majority of institutions reported that summer sessions were expected to recover all costs for instruction, summer session administration, and some overhead (Golden, Reisinger & Pusch, 1995). Lisner & Taylor (1994) stated that funding, in general, for higher education at both the state and federal level has declined for the past several decades. Other authors (Leslie & Fretwell, 1996 and Cook, 1997) also have written about less robust spending for higher education.

u When viewed over a ten-year span of time (past, present, future) a general downward trend in centralization was noted, with fewer centralized programs projected to be in existence five years from now. During the same ten-year time period, a general upward trend was noted for decentralized programs. It is important to note that while trends were pointed in specific directions, the rate of decrease projected over a ten-year span in the number of centralized programs (34.8 percent, 33 percent, and 32 percent), and the rate of increase projected in the number of decentralized programs (16.7 percent, 28.7 percent, 28.2 percent) was slight. Even so, these trends supported Hentschel (1991), who in writing about continuing education programs (which included the summer term at many institutions), observed a growing trend towards decentralization. He promoted that institutions were using administrative structural change within continuing education and summer session programs as an alternative by which revenue could be generated to bolster shrinking institutional allocations. This contrasted with an earlier finding of this study which concluded that programs rated as centralized were more financially successful than those that were rated as decentralized. Another possible motivating factor towards more decentralization might be the changing summer student, now increasingly a regular term student attending the summer session (Edelson, 1995).

u The majority of summer session directors related no administrative pressure to change their summer session programs from being administratively centralized to decentralized, or from decentralized to centralized. This finding was interesting to the researcher because it contradicted many anecdotal reports from summer session directors prior to and during the research project. Because this is an area of great interest and discussion, and is frequently revisited through various presentations at summer session conferences, it was surprising that the majority of directors from all three groups (centralized, mid-range and decentralized) did not report they were under pressure from their institutions to change the summer session structure. Among the three groups, this study found that equal numbers (11.8 percent) of currently centralized programs reported pressure to change from centralized to decentralized or vice versa. Among the currently mid-range programs, equal numbers (16.2 percent) reported pressure to change from centralized to decentralized or vice versa. Among the currently decentralized programs, 21.4 percent reported pressure to remain decentralized and 28.6 percent reported pressure to centralize. Colleges and universities, much like organizations of all types and sizes are continually searching for the perfect administrative model. Considering the changes that postsecondary educational systems have faced in terms of funding and accountability issues, it was not surprising that institutions were searching for new ways to meet new demands on the system. Such actions have been reported on in the literature by Young and McDougall (1982, 1985), Hentschel (1991), Gordon (1980), King and Lerner (1987), Piper (1996), Kops (1998), and others.

u While size (headcount) of the college or university did not present a significant difference among summer programs that were rated as centralized, mid-range or decentralized, it did appear from a review of the means that centralized programs were more frequently found at smaller institutions. While overall institutional size among the survey respondents ranged from 3,100 to 49,000, the mean for centralized programs was 18,907 while the mean for decentralized programs was 21,755. Several authors (Mansfield, 1973; Edelson, 1995; and McLoughlin, Samson & Scarboro, 1991) wrote that decentralized programs were more likely to be found among the larger universities where it was more difficult to confine programs within rigid organizational structure due to potentially greater complexity. Centralized programs were easier to justify and were found more frequently at smaller schools.

Up to this point, emphasis has been on comparing decentralized and centralized summer programs. However, the research also provided

insight into a critical function: the role of the summer session director. While much has changed in the operation of the summer session, much has also remained the same. The role of the summer session director has not significantly changed. In determining the level of centralization or decentralization of summer programs for this study, responses to questions about responsibilities and sphere of influence over specific functions paralleled the finding of a study conducted by Heidenreich in 1965 (as cited in Young & McDougall, 1982 and 1991). In reviewing the functions and powers of summer directors, administrators responded to questions about their specific duties. Duties were concentrated in administrative and programmatic areas. It appeared from the findings that summer directors reported they "always" had control over items such as publicity and public relations (65 percent), the bulletin (82 percent), and autonomy in budget expenditures (53 percent). When survey items moved to more programmatic areas dealing with classroom instructional and faculty issues, the level of control or influence of the summer director declined. Survey respondents indicated that they "never" had responsibility to determine faculty salaries (47 percent), or to monitor student attendance and discipline (41 percent). When items 1-17 on the "Summer Session Organizational Survey" were reviewed, it appeared that the span of responsibilities of the summer session director has remained somewhat constant. Administrative questions about planning (87%) and implementing (84 percent) marketing strategies, and the design of the summer session catalog (73 percent) were rated the highest overall by participants in terms of their control over the function. This pattern also was in evidence with questions regarding the budget. Allocating funds (80 percent), preparing the budget (83 percnt), and allocating funds to the collegiate units and departments (79 percent) were controlled or influenced by the summer director or summer session office.

When questions became more programmatic in nature, selecting summer session courses (33 percent), determining faculty to teach in the summer session (12 percent), coordinating campus activities in the summer (16 percent), or monitoring quality of the summer courses (27 percent), the level of control of influence of the summer director or program declined significantly. Nelson's study (1972) found similar disparities between administrative functions and those that were more programmatic and curricular. Even among programs that were classified as centralized or decentralized by responses on the survey used in this research, it appeared that most summer session programs operated along a centralization-decentralization continuum, performing set functions in ways that pull the administrative structure towards one end or the other of the continuum. While summer directors might have less

influence or control over certain functions, as Edelson (1995) implied, even without total control, the summer director performed a monitoring or oversight function, thus indicating a consultative component. Young and McDougall (1985) also characterized the role of the summer session director as one who would coordinate and provide for the overall management of summer session functions such as budget, publications, and publicity.

Implications for Practice

This study attempted to determine the level of centralization or decentralization and measure programmatic outcomes from among a select group of public colleges and universities. The reader may be aided in understanding practice implications by recalling that:

Decentralized programs were:
- less financially successful
- funded primarily through allocation
- required to cover a greater amount of the total costs of the operation
- increasing in number
- more frequently found at larger institutions

Centralized programs were:
- more efficient
- more successful in meeting student needs
- funded primarily through self-generated funds
- required to cover a greater amount of the total costs of the operation
- decreasing in number
- more frequently found at smaller institutions

When reviewing this study, the researcher offers the following recommendations that may assist summer session directors and university administrators with their summer program's operation and structure.

First, summer session programs should be administratively centralized and programmatically decentralized. Kochen and Deutsch (1973) among others, advocated the position that centralized structures promoted greater efficiencies, but decentralized programs provide greater participation in decision-making. This has caused others (Piper, 1996; Houle, 1980; Kreps, 1986; Edelson, 1995; and Hentschel, 1991) to call for a more balanced approach to summer session and continuing education operations within the centralization-decentralization dynamic, most particularly advocating for administratively centralized and programmatically decentralized programs.

Administrative centralization and control of budgetary and fiscal operations could potentially maximize cost effectiveness and income

production for the summer session. This supported the researcher's finding which indicated that more administratively centralized programs reported greater financial success. In addition, administrative control of promotion, advertising, and marketing through a centralized summer administration could offer not only greater efficiencies but also more consistency and accuracy of information provided to students and the greater university community. Scheduling of courses in the summer term through one administrative area that considers a wider range of types of student needs could lessen time conflicts and could assist students who registered for courses across disciplines. Also administratively centralized control of the budget increased the likelihood that programs and services would be offered to a greater variety of students. If summer programs become totally decentralized, there runs the risk of academic departments becoming overly parochial by focusing exclusively on the needs of their own immediate students and not offering courses or programs of interest or need to students in other majors or programs. In a decentralized environment, academic departments were more concerned with their own bottom line. This would lead to the elimination and reduction of quality programs that would be necessary to meet the needs of various types of students. A centralized coordination of functions with a "big picture" focus would offer greater assurance that even the smaller programs which serve a variety of students, those from different majors, different institutions, diverse backgrounds, and with more specific interests, would be offered. These factors supported the researcher's finding which indicated that more administratively centralized programs reported greater success in meeting student needs.

Programmatic decentralization, with curricular decisions and monitoring for academic program quality made at the collegiate or department level, provided a broader base of program planning and decision making and would aid in integrating and aligning the summer program with the institution's strengths and mission. Academic units for the most part were best at deciding what kinds of curricula should be offered, who should teach the courses, and the type of students who should enroll. Curricular planning at the college level has become more important now that a majority of students attending during the summer term are actually regular students continuing from the regular academic year who are now using the summer session to progress towards degree completion.

Implement administrative centralization and programmatic decentralization and after that, consider a funding allocation formula that rewards departments for past performance and allows them to retain a percentage of the previous year's profits should be implemented. By

permitting academic departments to retain all or a percentage of their profits over the prior year's performance, the summer session office provided additional incentive to encourage departments and collegiate units to spend time considering the wants and needs of all students enrolled in the summer term. Budgetary allocations based on past performance, while retaining overall fiscal control within the summer session office, should be separated from programmatic development and quality control at the college or department level. This separation of functions would yield an effective and complete feedback loop to aid in on-going decision making between both parties and would enhance the overall quality and success of the summer term.

References

Brooke, M. (1984). *Centralization and autonomy: a study in organizational behaviour*. New York: Praeger.

Cook, B. (1997). Fund raising and the college presidency in an era of uncertainty: from 1975 to the present. *Journal of Higher Education, 68*, 53-86.

Edelson, P.J. (1995). Historical and cultural perspectives on centralization/ decentralization in continuing education. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 59*(3), 143-155.

Golden, L., Reisinger, J. & Pusch, E. (1995). *Summer sessions associations' twentieth joint statistical report.* Portland, OR: University of Portland.

Gordon, M. (1980). The management of continuing education. In P.E. Frandson (Ed.), *Power and conflict in continuing education* (pp. 170-200). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Hentschel, D. (1991). The hybrid model for implementing the continuing education mission. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 55*(3), 155-157.

Houle, C.O. (1980). *Continuing learning in the professions*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

King, B.K. & Lerner, A.W. (1987). Organizational structure and performance dynamics in continuing education administration. *Continuing Higher Education Review, 51*(3), 21-28.

Kochen, M. & Deutsch, K. (1973). Toward a rational theory of decentralization: some implications of a mathematical approach. In W.V. Heydebrand (Ed.), *Comparative organizations* (pp. 355-377). New York: Prentice-Hall.

Kops, W. (1998). Summer session administration: factors influencing decisions to change organizational models. Paper presented at the Forty-Ninth Annual North Central Conference on Summer Sessions, Chicago, IL.

Kreps, G. (1986). *Organizational communication—theory and practice.* New York: Longman.

Leslie, D. & Fretwell, E. Jr. (1996). *Wise moves in hard times: creating and managing resilient colleges and universities*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lisner, S. & Taylor, A. (1996). Financial stress and the need for change. *New*

Directions for Higher Education, 94, 3-8.
Mansfield, R. (1973). Bureaucracy and centralization: an examination of organizational structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 18*(4), 77-88.
McLoughlin, W.M., Samson, H.E., & Scarboro, D. (1991). Organizing for success: alternatives for organization and structure. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, 28,* 14-18.
Nelson, M.U. (1972). *A survey of summer session administration: a sample of 189 universities.* St.Louis, MO: A research report for the Association of University Summer Sessions.
Piper, D.L. (1996). A comparison of centralized vs. decentralized modes of summer administration. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of the North American Association of Summer Sessions, 33,* 29-31.
Smith, C.R. (1972). *Higher education in the summer: a comparison of thirty-two summer sessions*. A Research Report for the National Association of Summer Sessions.
Young, R., & McDougall, W. (1982). *Relationships of selected factors to summer session organizational structure.* Pullman, WA: The Washington State University.
Young, R., & McDougall, W. (1985). *Recent changes in summer sessions of U.S. and Canadian colleges and universities*. St. Louis, MO: North American Association of Summer Sessions.
Young, R., & McDougall, W. (1988). Trends in university summer sessions. *Journal of Higher Education, 59*(1) 39-53.
Young, R., & McDougall, W. (1991). *Summer sessions in colleges and universities: perspectives, practices, problems, and prospects*. St. Louis, MO: North American Association of Summer Sessions.

Karen L. Heikel is Program Director of University College and Summer Session at the University of Minnesota-Duluth. She can be reached at 403 Darland Administration Building, 10 University Drive, Duluth, MN 55812-2496.