

**From Self-Supported  
to State-Supported  
Administration  
of Summer Programs:  
*The California State University's  
Conversion to Year Round Education***

**Diana Demetrulias**  
*California State University, Stanislaus*

**Introduction**

Published studies of administrative and organizational models for summer sessions are minimal and yield equivocal results regarding organizational advantages and effectiveness of management practices when comparing self-support and state-supported summer schools. More typical are historical and recent studies that conceptualize the effectiveness of organizational structures defined as centralized or decentralized. While definitions vary, centralized models typically are defined as self-funded summer terms administered by an autonomous summer session office. Decentralized organizational structures are generally described as a more distributive model in which summer term functions are performed by various collegiate units with dispersed accountability and generally are state-funded. Hybrid organizational models are also described in the literature. These hybrid models typically are structured as centralized administration with decentralized academic functions.

A few recent examples follow: Martin (2003) summarized various

## •• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

myths associated with summer education and described the role of summer term as a catalyst for change, concluding that self-supported, revenue-sharing models have the highest success for attracting students and faculty—attributed primarily to an entrepreneurial, innovative spirit. Heikel (2000) studied the program effectiveness in centralized vs. decentralized administrative structures at four-year U.S. public research and doctoral institutions. Among the results were the conclusions that decentralized summer sessions were rated as less financially successful and more often found at larger universities while centralized models were rated as more successful in meeting student needs, more administratively efficient, and typically found at smaller universities. Funding models were highly varied ranging from self-generated income to allocation of funds to other permutations, but in general the self-support model was typical for centralized programs while decentralized programs were more reliant on funding allocations. Although data indicate a general ten-year trend for an increased number of decentralized programs, the change is slight, with the largest number of summer sessions continuing to be described as a centralized organizational structure. In studying the fiscal practices of doctoral research universities for characteristics of operating budgets, Johnson (2000) found that 57% of the universities used an allocation model, 38% were funded by self-generated income, and 5% used a decentralized approach in which revenue was directed to the college unit responsible for its generation.

Earlier studies by Young and McDougall (1985 and 1982) of both U.S. and Canadian institutions of higher education provided data about regional universities, master's only, and land grant universities. Their data of organizational structures, productivity measures, program creativity, leadership, and finance yielded significant differences associated with institutional size, among other demographic variables. Young and McDougall's 1991 study also provided normative information about summer session baseline data derived from one regional and four national studies and serves as a resource for the historical development, trends, issues, and evaluations of summer sessions. Saville and Master's (1989) survey of operational characteristics of summer programs at 107 U.S. land grant colleges and 15 private universities yielded mixed results regarding organizational advantages and management practices in comparing self-supporting and state-supported summer schools.

Heikel (2000) recommends that summer sessions be administratively centralized and programmatically decentralized. This hybrid model provides for curricular decisions and programmatic quality to be monitored by faculty, thereby controlling the curriculum, teaching faculty, student enrollments, and revenue sharing. It also allows for efficient

administrative operations by an extended education or summer term office, providing fiscal efficacy and managerial efficiency.

Likewise, Hentschel (1991) argues that the most effective organizational model is a hybrid: “academically integrated and administratively centralized.” This model retains the single organizational unit responsible for administrative support functions and community promotion. In its development and delivery of programs, the centralized unit does so in collaboration with the academic units that retain control of academic and faculty resources. The result is an entrepreneurial model with a higher level of integration of traditional continuing education programs into the university’s academic mission. In support of this hybrid model, Hentschel (1991) describes the benefits, categorized as “programmatically, administrative, public relations, and fiscal.”

Edelson (1995) describes the historical roots of centralization models for extended education, including summer sessions, and the cultural and fiscal forces that affect institutions of higher education. The author joins the debate of the superiority of centralization versus decentralization by describing the core issue as power (“...who controls adult and continuing education and its resources...”) and of “institutional self-interpretation.” While not referring to alternate models as hybrids, Edelson (1995) recognizes the necessity for diverse organizational models, including one that is described as “matrix organization”—the establishment of temporary or ad hoc organizational structures designed for specific programmatic delivery and then dismantled when goals are achieved.

The experiences of the other universities as described in their various published reports enrich the review of the historical perspective of summer term models. Examples include the University of California’s (2002 and 2000) and the University of Washington’s (1997) descriptions of their multi-year conversion plan from a self-sustaining to a state-funded summer term.

Similarly, the California State University (CSU), the largest senior public university system in the United States, underwent a partial conversion from a self-supported to a state-supported summer term over the past three years. The CSU’s experiences provide another resource for other universities and contribute to the research literature regarding year-round operations in higher education.

### **Case Study of the California State University**

This research is a case study of the process and outcomes of the conversion of summer term from self-supported to state-supported year-round operations (YRO) as experienced by the California State Univer-

•• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

sity. The CSU is comprised of 23 comprehensive campuses throughout the state of California, served in 2003 by 44,000 faculty educating 422,904 students.

In 1999, the California legislative analyst office issued a report indicating that California could accommodate one-third more students and save billions of dollars by using existing instructional facilities during the summer for three educational segments: University of California, California State University, and California Community Colleges. The analyst also described YRO's anticipated impact on students, curriculum, and extra-curricular programs. The report criticized summer pricing practices for educating students in the summer, described as contradicting basic economic principles—that is, off-peak times for education in summer should result in lower costs, not higher costs as was the case with self-support summer programs (California Legislative Analyst, 1999).

Subsequently, in March 2000, the CSU Board of Trustees endorsed enrollment management principles that reflected the CSU's commitment to year-round operations and began the process for converting fully to state-supported summer terms (CSU, April 2000). With the Governor's fiscal year (FY) 2001/02 budget, the prospects for obtaining the necessary marginal cost funding for the converted full-time equivalent students (FTES) became sufficiently favorable to proceed with a system-wide expansion of state-supported summer terms. Ten campuses were expected to convert all summer self-support programs and courses for matriculated students to state-support. Self-supported special sessions (other than a summer session) that meet appropriate criteria were allowed to operate during the summer (CSU, February 2002). The ten converting campuses could not be certain of the availability of conversion funding until the Governor's budget was released in January 2001, only five and one-half months before the new summer terms were to begin. Although preliminary planning had been funded during the 2000-01 fiscal year, summer 2001 commitments could not be made prior to the determination that the Governor's budget had funded the conversion enrollment.

During the transition from self-supported to state-supported summer sessions, YRO campuses converting to state-supported summer operations received incremental enrollment funding for the equivalent of the self-support FTES served in summer 1999 or summer 2000. They also received implementation grants to defray the costs of revised information systems and other one-time conversion costs. The campuses that did not convert in summer 2001 during the initial transition summer received "buy-down" funding. Such funding was provided to ensure that students at the non-YRO campuses did not pay more for summer education than the established state university fees paid during the academic year. Buy-

down funding was provided by the state to implement the statutory Education Code requirement that matriculated students pay no more during the summer than during the academic year.

A key element of conversion with potentially negative consequences was the loss of revenue in the continuing education units previously administering summer term. While acknowledging that expanding state-supported summer terms may initially have the effect of decreasing the size and scope of self-support or extended education programs, the CSU administration affirmed its commitment to extended education as a valued component in the university's mission and indicated the expectation that the extended education units would continue and expand over time with a focus on the non-matriculated student (CSU, April 2000).

An essential component of YRO was the reduction of fees, relative to self-support fees, for students during the summer term. Higher fees for courses taken during the summer had been voiced as a complaint by students and voiced as a disincentive for summer enrollment. As such, YRO both accommodated this concern by lowering fees and by allowing campuses to charge summer fees based on a per unit fee schedule. Normally, in the traditional two-tier schedule, students pay a flat fee for course loads up to six units and another flat fee for course loads above six units. To further encourage summer enrollments, campuses also prorated or waived specified campus-based fees such as student union and health care fees.

Four primary goals of a state-supported summer term in the CSU guided the YRO conversion:

- ◆ To assist students in shortening their time-to-degree by offering a broad range of courses in summer with a particular emphasis on courses that are in high-demand during the academic year.
- ◆ To relieve program enrollment "impaction" conditions by offering combinations of courses and programs designed to increase the capacity of the CSU to serve the instructional demand in high-demand and strategic workforce disciplines.
- ◆ To avoid or defer construction costs for new instructional facilities by better utilizing existing facilities.
- ◆ To increase the total number of FTES served on an annual basis by reducing the cost of instruction to the student during the summer. (CSU, August 2001)

Within the CSU, five universities had state-supported summer terms

## •• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

prior to 2001 (four of these for over 30 years). Ten campuses converted to state-support in summer 2001, six were slated to convert in summer 2002, and two will convert to YRO as needed. However, the current California state budget limitations have delayed indefinitely the conversion of five of the six campuses scheduled to convert in summer 2002.

### **Research Methodology**

The population of the study is derived from one large multi-campus system, comprised of individual universities of various sizes, regional locations, and distinctive academic missions—although each is united in its commitment to teaching and learning. Further, the study design provided an opportunity to describe not only the outcomes, but also a brief description of key elements of the transitional process in shifting from a self- to state-supported summer term. This information is useful to universities considering possible changes in organizational structures, providing insights as to the structures used to achieve this transformation, as well as the results.

Three data sources were used to answer the research question—what are the processes and effects of conversion from a self-supported to a state-supported summer term as part of a year-round operation as perceived by university academic and extended education administrators?

First, enrollment and expenditure data were extracted from CSU system analytical studies reports for the college years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. Expenditure data included conversion costs for curricular planning/implementation, faculty salaries, project management, marketing, staff support, financial aid, information systems revisions, facility operations, and student support services.

A second data source was derived from the individual campus reports in which campuses identified issues regarding student enrollments and expenditures to the CSU system institutional research office in 2001 and 2002 for the purpose of legislative reporting and for assessing the degree of successful first- and second-year conversion. Campus YRO coordinators reported on such issues as academic instructional offerings, breadth and quality of instruction, instructional calendar, student services, faculty and staff compensation, employment issues, and success factors.

Complementing the synthesis of CSU data and campus reports were semi-structured interviews administered individually in college year 2002-2003 by the researcher with academic administrative officers and extended education administrators from the ten conversion campuses that began full implementation of YRO in 2001. Interview questions expanded those issues identified in the campus reports.

The interview protocol for academic administrators responsible for summer term was designed to identify key issues, challenges, and recommendations with regard to the conversion from a self- to state-supported summer term. The semi-structured interview protocol for academic administrators included the following common elements, modified as necessary for the unique perspectives of the ten CSU campuses:

1. Essential elements that led to the decision to convert to a state-supported summer term.
2. Key players involved in the conversion process and their roles prior, during, and after the conversion.
3. Administrative officer and unit responsible for summer term
4. Enrollment issues during summer and other terms.
5. Administrative issues during and after the conversion process.
6. Issues continued to be addressed as a result of a state-supported summer session.
7. Program offerings during the summer session.
8. Fiscal issues and effects.

Questions to the extended education administrators were similar to those of the academic administrators. Additional questions were designed to elicit their perceptions of the effects of YRO conversion on extended education and the methods they have employed to redefine and redirect their self-support organizational units. This interview protocol included the following elements:

1. Participation of the extended education administration in the conversion decision and process.
2. Current participation of extended education in the administration of summer term.
3. Effects of a state-supported summer term on extended education enrollments, program offerings, revenue.
4. Continuing issues.
5. Methods to redefine and redirect self-support organizational units.

## **Response Rate**

The ten CSU campuses participating in the study were Dominguez Hills, Fullerton, Long Beach, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose, San Marcos, and Stanislaus. Eight are semester calendar campuses; one is a quarter calendar campus and one employs a modified (4-1-4) semester calendar. For the ten participating campuses,

## •• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

the mean college year annualized FTES enrollments for 2002-2003 were 19,524, with a range from 6,110 to 28,474. Sixty percent of the campuses' FTES enrollments exceed 22,000.

Twenty-eight administrators were interviewed: eleven campus deans or associate deans/directors for extended or continuing education; ten campus vice presidents/associate vice presidents for academic affairs; three campus vice presidents/associate vice presidents for business/finance, and four from the system office (academic affairs, business/information management, and extended education).

### **Results and Discussion**

The results described below are limited to selected elements that were viewed by the administrators as most important or that the researcher concluded illustrated the greatest disparity of responses between the academic affairs and extended education administrators. Other elements contained in the interviews and in the campus narrative and fiscal reports are omitted from discussion. Data are reported in the aggregate without identification of individual campuses.

### **The Conversion Process and Timeline**

The extremely short conversion timeline was cited by academic affairs administrators as a most challenging administrative issue during conversion. Most campuses had five months or fewer from the time of notification to conversion. While challenging for the campus administration, it was also a shocking transition for extended education administration. In summer 2000, six of the ten campuses offered selected programs on a pilot partial state-supported summer. Pilot programs allowed campuses to offer selected majors during the summer under state support while simultaneously offering the remainder of the programs under self-supported extended education administration. The mean term summer FTES for the pilot YRO summer was 272 with a range from 68 to 703. Campus academic administrators described the pilot summer as an important element in the conversion process, having provided an identification of key processes necessary for conversion and problems associated with a full conversion. It also provided a trial test to determine student participation and enrollment demands.

While three campuses contracted with their extended education units to administer summer term during the year of conversion only, and two campuses continue to contract with their extended education units for summer administration, the other extended education units found a

major source of revenue removed, with little lead time, when all summer term functions were moved to state administration.

Although one campus appointed the extended education dean as co-chair of the conversion process, the other extended education administrators reported that they had little, if any, participation in the decision-making process for conversion and generally were not involved in the conversion process itself. They identified two key factors affecting the decision to convert: fiscal incentives provided by the state legislature (base funding in addition to one-time conversion cost funding) and political pressure to increase student access by lowering student fees. Two of these administrators expressed the view that the extended education administrators should have anticipated this decision for at least two years prior to conversion but instead were “in denial” and their inaction interfered with prudent planning and assertive action. Seven extended education administrators expressed disappointment with the suddenness of the decision and the lack of consultation and thoughtfulness regarding the implications of a conversion.

A second key issue identified at the time of conversion was the importance of communication to campuses to ensure a common understanding of issues, processes, and changes necessitated by the conversion. Most campuses appointed an academic administrator the responsibility for coordinating the YRO conversion with the expectation that summer term would be administered through infrastructure support similar to the other terms. As a result, most YRO coordinators served as the contact person for problem solving and reporting as needed, but their time commitment had been reduced substantially from the first year of conversion. The academic administrators reported that the successful conversion in a breathtakingly short timeframe occurred because of effective communication processes and the establishment of teams of staff who worked together to create and implement conversion systems. Some campuses formed formal conversion task forces or conversion committees while others used more informal and smaller teams of staff. Whatever the structure, the teams generally included senior administrators, second-level managers, faculty leadership, staff, and students. Eight of the campuses reported that these ad hoc teams were no longer needed and have been disbanded.

### **Faculty Compensation**

Both academic and extended education administrators cited faculty compensation as a key conversion issue. Campuses were to abide by all provisions of the collective bargaining agreements (and other, campus-

•• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

specific, approved memoranda of understanding) in developing summer staffing, pay scales, workload assignments, overload allowances, and other work practices. Faculty members were generally compensated on the basis of extra pay for extra work, at the pay rate they received during the traditional academic year. Under the collective bargaining agreement as interpreted by CSU administration, faculty teaching (voluntarily) in state-supported summer terms receives compensation computed per unit of instruction as 1/30 of their regular academic year salary. However, a dispute over the methodology for faculty compensation (1/24, rather than 1/30) remains an issue subject to contract negotiation and grievance settlement (CSU, February 2002).

Currently, faculty salary for summer teaching under state-support is substantially higher than the compensation received under the extended education compensation schedule. This has led to an increased number of faculty requesting to teach during summer term. By means of separate formal agreements with the local chapters of the faculty union, faculty on only three of the CSU YRO campuses can “spread” their regular academic year workload over the entire college year. However, faculty are eligible to substitute the summer term for one of their regular academic year terms (for example, teaching in summer rather than the fall or spring semester) provided that such an assignment does not exceed the contractual 180 workday limit and has the authorization of the university president. Administrators reported that the faculty providing instruction during the summer were a subset of the same faculty that provide instruction during other terms with a comparable mix of tenured, tenure-track, visiting lecturers, and part-time faculty.

The major continuing problem cited by academic administrators is faculty compensation—both from the perspective of method of calculation and the high cost of instruction. Campuses reported an increased pressure from faculty to increase the rate of compensation from 1/30 to 1/24. Half of the campuses also reported increased faculty requests to offer courses through extended education at the lower extended education salary schedule when the class size is below state minimums for course offerings. About half of the campuses indicated faculty requests to meet their teaching obligations by substituting summer teaching for another semester or by distributing their teaching load over the semesters, including summer term. Also of concern is the mix of full-time to part-time faculty, along with seniority issues of entitlement to first-rights of refusal for teaching during summer term. The summer salary compensation and workload options remain subject to collective bargaining, and therefore these issues may change over time.

## **Fiscal Impact on Extended Education**

The most contentious impact of summer state-support conversion is the negative fiscal impact on self-support extended education units in the CSU. For seven of the ten campuses, the extended education administrators described the loss of summer session revenue as devastating, leading to administrative and staff layoffs, severe reduction of operating expenses, loss of venture capital for new program development, and an increase in student fees for other self-support programs. It was estimated that 60%-79% of the extended education revenue was generated by summer term. When this source of revenue was removed by conversion to a state-supported term, the fiscal effect was significant.

The three campuses that did not describe a catastrophic effect on extended education operations were two large campuses and one smaller new campus with a diversified portfolio of program offerings and less dependency on summer revenue for operations. They indicated that summer term administration was rather straight forward, with systems established to reduce the amount of staff time devoted to its delivery. As a result, they retained and redirected their staff to more lucrative ventures including international programs and special session programs for specific audiences (such as executive MBA, computer engineering, and applied master's degrees). These extended education administrators also noted that many of their academic departments have become more entrepreneurial and receptive to new ideas for program delivery through extended education now that departmental faculty has lost summer session revenue for their special projects.

Extended education administrators on six of the YRO campuses reported a massive anxiety as to the future, seeing a bleak outlook made even more onerous given the poor financial economy of the state of California and the concomitant ability of business and industry to contract with CSU campuses. These administrators described the necessity of analyzing each program on the basis of cost-center profitability at the expense of "butchering" or eliminating community service programs that met their mission and promoted goodwill but were not fiscally profitable. When asked about the future plans, the extended education administrators reported a redirection of staff time and investment in non-credit contract extension, special sessions with academic departments, and new markets for international program delivery, academic certificate programs, and technology. They indicated the need to reposition staff—aggressively—for the training and education function for businesses, military contracts, workforce development, and in-house corporate training.

## •• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

In addition, the extended education administrators cited the loss of summer term revenue as venture capital as a key factor for future success. With loss of flexibility to offer innovative, experimental programs that may take two to three years to earn excess revenues and less time to incubate programs, fewer administrators are willing to mount new programs. They are now being asked to increase risk-taking, but with budgets spiraling downwards on most campuses there is a tendency to become more cautious and less experimental. Extended education administrators described the situation they face as ironic—being told to be risk-takers and innovative while their research and development funds for programmatic investment were removed.

In contrast, the academic administration generally did not describe the conversion as a devastating blow to their extended education units. While neither cavalier nor insensitive in their responses, most of the academic administrators indicated that summer term revenue had camouflaged the general lack of entrepreneurial and self-support mission of extended education. Generally, the academic administrators expressed the belief that the full costs of offering summer term through extended education had not been borne by extended education. Because many fixed and variable costs for summer term were subsidized by the state, there was the illusion of greater efficiency and earned revenues by extended education. Though acknowledging the sudden loss of revenue, they noted that extended education administrators now had an opportunity to pursue the CSU's mission more vigorously and without the encumbrances of a summer term. They expressed confidence that extended education units will demonstrate creativity and entrepreneurial actions that lead them genuinely to be self-supporting and responsive to both the external community and the campus community, working more closely with faculty to enrich programmatic offerings of the university.

Academic administrators stated that the extended education units on their campuses have begun to streamline their operations, improve program quality and effectiveness, analyze fiscal opportunities, enhance marketing research, and focus on program distinctiveness, thus strengthening responsiveness to the external community.

### **Budgeting Processes for State-Supported Summer Term**

Academic administrators reported various approaches related to the budgetary structures for summer term. Some campuses allocated college year FTES to colleges/departments with no differentiation of FTES or corresponding budget for summer term. Others segregated budgets for summer term and made separate allocations for covering costs through

a central budgeting process. A few made separate FTES targets for summer term, but did not differentiate the budget associated with terms. No discernable differences were apparent in superiority of budgetary systems.

## **Facilities**

Facilities usage was another important factor of YRO. With legislative concurrence, the CSU established a threshold for capital expansion that included summer term targets. For example, campuses are expected to achieve over time summer term FTES enrollments that approximate a stated percentage of their fall term enrollments: 40% for urban campuses and 25% for rural campuses.

Academic administrators indicated that concerns about the possible negative impact of increased summer enrollments on other academic terms generally were not realized. Most campuses reported an increase in enrollments in all terms, some campuses were at enrollment capacity for all terms, and others wished to see more of a shift of enrollments to summer from fall and spring so they may accommodate growth.

## **Student Access/Enrollments**

Overall, summer enrollments indicate an increase in both headcount and FTES on the ten conversion campuses. A comparison of summer term enrollments in the first two years of conversion indicate a growth of 13.79% in FTES summer term enrollments from 2001-2002 and an approximate growth rate of 11.1% from 2002-2003.

Campus FTES term enrollments in summer 2001, the first year of conversion, showed a mean of 1,994 and a range from 452 to 3,207. Campus FTES term enrollments in summer 2002, the second year of conversion, were a mean of 2,269 and a range from 667 to 3,604.

A key difference in the responses of extended education and academic administrators was the perspective of enhanced student access. The academic administrators reported that summer term afforded a greater number of students access to more and varied courses than were offered under self-support. During summer term most campuses attempted to satisfy demand for courses often closed because of high enrollments during the academic year, offered concise designed courses for targeted programs (e.g., teacher education, nursing), and for special populations such as students who needed to fulfill remediation requirements.

In contrast to academic administrators, extended education administrators identified the loss, not gain, of student access in that the state

## •• *From Self-Supported to State-Supported* ••

---

can offer only a finite number of courses given FTES allocations and state funding and at maximum class sizes. Under extended education, courses with lower enrollments could be offered with accompanying lower faculty salaries. This was no longer possible after conversion given state expectations and CSU system regulations. Access of international students to CSU programs was also cited as a key issue as international students under a state-supported summer term must pay non-resident tuition, substantially higher than the fees paid for summer under a fixed cost per unit for both residents and non-residents when offered through self-support. Related are concerns about offering courses that are compensated on a per student headcount, such as student teaching, internships, individual study, and graduate thesis research. Academic administrators reported the prohibition or severe restriction of the number of course offerings of this type because of the high cost for summer offering.

### **Summary**

The results of this exploratory study should be viewed as preliminary, recognizing the complexity of discerning the impact of state-supported summer term within the context of several possible confounding variables such as simultaneous changes in fiscal support and organizational structure. The findings may also have been affected in that the CSU experienced overall increases in FTES in summer, as well as other terms. Enrollments at the five non-YRO campuses were slightly lower, but not statistically significant, in comparison to the ten YRO campuses. Further, the indicators of success and accountability measures for the four stated goals (student access, instructional/curricular offerings, facilities, and cost of instruction) were in the early stages of development during the conduct of this study.

The changing economic context for the YRO conversion is important for understanding the findings. At the time of YRO conversion in summer 2001, the California state budget was robust with no indication of darker days to follow. Student demand for higher education was and continues to be high with CSU FTES enrollments increasing at a growth rate of 8.9% from 2000-2002 (from 290,554 to 316,396). Forecast for the next decade from the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC) is an increase of 129,681 or 37.07% growth in full-time equivalent students for the CSU (CPEC, April 2001).

Unfortunately, one year later in 2002-2003, the CSU faced legislatively mandated budget reductions of \$125 million, about 5% of its budget. Additionally, the CSU campuses faced in 2003-2004 new fiscal reductions of \$304 million, about 13.7% of the CSU \$2.6 general fund budget—

further decreasing its ability to respond to continuing student enrollment demands. Simultaneously, extended education units faced an external market in which business, industry, K-16 education, social services, and government were significantly restricted in their ability to invest in employee training and other programs.

Given this context, about 70% of the extended education administrators in this study expressed the view that it may have been more fiscally prudent to retain summer term as a self-support function, given the poor economic climate now facing California and the invalidity of the financial assumptions of strong economic times for summer term conversion. Yet for students' educational access, political commitment, facility utilization, and organizational efficacy, almost all of the academic administrators affirmed the importance for the CSU to continue its commitment to full conversion to YRO. The conversion of the CSU to state-supported summer terms has been a significant undertaking and is a critical component in the CSU strategy to serve the growing demand for access to higher education in the state of California.

After three years offering of summer term under a state-supported model, academic administrators reported overall success in terms of administrative structures and integration of processes into regular campus operations. Their key advice to others, considering conversion, is to proceed with sufficient lead-time for careful planning, consultation, communication, and implementation.

Conversely, the advice from extended education administrators to other state universities: do not convert! Their collective, but not unanimous, view was that a centralized, self-support administrative structure for summer term provides flexibility, agility, innovation, and responsiveness to student needs and changing markets—particularly evident when states face fluctuations in budgetary support for education. They suggested campuses consider elements beyond the fiscal impact: the loss of experimentation, entrepreneurship and investment in new programs, and reduced community service as a result of YRO conversion.

Preliminary assessment of the degree to which the conversion to a state-supported YRO summer term for a large multi-campus system as the CSU has achieved its four-stated goals (student access, instructional/curricular offerings, facilities, and cost of instruction) suggests a successful conversion, with continuing progress toward full conversion. A multi-year analytical study is underway of the effects of YRO for the CSU students, faculty, administration, staff, and community.

## **Postscript**

The budget crises facing California intensified after the completion of this research study. As a result, during the summer 2004, the Chancellor of the CSU system authorized campus presidents to establish a special session summer term—only for summer 2004 and only if necessary to meet expectations for student access/enrollments and budgetary reductions. For summer 2004, six of the ten YRO campuses in this study reverted to a self-supported fiscal model for summer term 2004. For the CSU system overall, the 23 campuses funded summer terms as follows: 12 self-supported, seven state-supported, and one mixed/hybrid model (three offered no summer term).

To ensure future quality, access, and affordability, the California State University Chancellor and the University of California President negotiated a Higher Education Compact with the new governor. Effective 2005-2006, the compact is expected to lead to sufficient funding for enrollment growth, thus allowing summer terms to resume as state-supported offerings.

## **Note**

This research was supported in part by the Research Consortium for the Theresa Neil Memorial Research Fund. The Fund is financed by the Association of University Summer Sessions, North American Association of Summer Sessions, North Central Conference on Summer Schools, and the Western Association of Summer Session Administrators.

## **References**

- California Legislative Analyst's Office. June 2002. Analysis of the 2002-03 budget bill, funding higher education capital outlay. [http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis\\_2002/cap\\_outlay/co\\_04\\_cc\\_funding\\_highered\\_an102.htm](http://www.lao.ca.gov/analysis_2002/cap_outlay/co_04_cc_funding_highered_an102.htm)
- California Legislative Analyst's Office. February 1999. Report on year-round operation in higher education. [http://www.lao.ca.gov/1999/021299\\_year\\_round.html](http://www.lao.ca.gov/1999/021299_year_round.html)
- California Post-Secondary Education Commission. April 2001. Executive director's report. [http://www.cpec.ca.gov/commission/agenda0104/tab\\_03.pdf](http://www.cpec.ca.gov/commission/agenda0104/tab_03.pdf)
- California State University. April 2000. Feasibility study on year-round operations, a report to the joint legislative budget committee. [http://www.calstate.edu/YearRoundOps/April\\_2000FinalReport.pdf](http://www.calstate.edu/YearRoundOps/April_2000FinalReport.pdf)
- California State University. August 2001. Implementation guidelines for the system-wide expansion of state-supported summer terms. <http://www.calstate.edu/YearRoundOps/>

- California State University. February 2002. Year-round operations (YRO) five-year plan. <http://www.calstate.edu/YearRoundOps/CSUFiveYearYROPlan.pdf>
- Edelson, P.J. Fall 1995. Historical and cultural perspectives in centralization/ decentralization in continuing education. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, vol 59, no. 3, 143-156.
- Heikel, K. 2000. Centralized vs. decentralized university summer session programs: Examining the continuum. *Summer Academe, A Journal of Higher Education*, 3:25-42.
- Hentschel, D. Fall 1991. The Hybrid model for implementing the continuing education mission. *Continuing Higher Education Review*, vol 55, no. 3, 155-167.
- Johnson, J. K. 2000. The Economic management of summer session: Fiscal practices at research universities. *Summer Academe, A Journal of Higher Education*, 2:7-24.
- Martin, H. 2003. Summer at North American universities and colleges: Impacts and influences. *Summer Academe, A Journal of Higher Education*, 4:31-38.
- Saville, A., and N. Master. 1989. A survey of summer session operations of *land grant universities and selected private universities in the United States*. ERIC, ED 317139.
- Young, R. J., & W. P. McDougall. 1985. Recent changes in summer sessions of U.S. and Canadian colleges and universities. North American Association of Summer Sessions. St. Louis, MO, ERIC, ED 279264.
- Young, R. J., & W. P. McDougall, eds. 1982. Relationships of selected factors to summer session organizational structure. Washington State University, Pullman, ERIC, ED 235734. North American Association of Summer Sessions and Western Association of Summer Session Administrators
- Young, R. J., & W. P. McDougall, eds. 1991. Summer sessions in colleges and universities: Perspectives, practices, problems, and prospects. North American Association of Summer Sessions. St. Louis, MO, ERIC, ED 370493.
- University of Washington. May 1997. 1997 Summer quarter committee report. [www.washington.edu/reports/summer/](http://www.washington.edu/reports/summer/)
- University of California. June 2001. Policies, regulations, and expectations for state-supported summer instruction (rules of the game). [www.ucop.edu/planning](http://www.ucop.edu/planning)
- University of California. April 2000. The feasibility of year-round instruction within the University of California. <http://www.ucop.edu/planning/yearroundreport2000.pdf>