INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS: MANAGERS' PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS AND VIABILITY

by

JACQUELINE HOUSE PARRILL

(Under the Direction of Major Professor Erik C. Ness)

ABSTRACT

Increased demands to provide additional services coupled with shrinking state fiscal resources have left American institutions of public higher education to find creative ways to fulfill their roles. Institutions are looking for ways to become more efficient and cost-effective and are increasingly turning to inter-institutional collaboration as a way to "do more with less." This study explores the perspective of managers and directors working at higher education institutions engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership on this model of educational collaboration. The qualitative research technique of a case study was used for this research. Interviews with managers and directors working in a research university-community college partnership in the Midwest and related institutional documents such as strategic plans and cost-share agreements were used for the study. Participants were managers responsible for operational units at the institution such as financial aid, facilities, admissions, advising, etc. Their responses were recorded and transcribed and subsequently themes were drawn from their responses and matched against a framework of success characteristics. The participants' responses were analyzed and a discussion and implications for practice section were produced for each framework category.

INDEX WORDS: Institutional partnerships, collaborations, higher education partnerships

INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS: MANAGERS' PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS AND VIABILITY

by

JACQUELINE HOUSE PARRILL

B.S., Auburn University, 1985

M.B.A., Auburn University, 1998

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2013

INTER-INSTITUTIONAL PARTNERSHIPS: MANAGERS' PERCEPTIONS OF BENEFITS AND VIABILITY

by

JACQUELINE HOUSE PARRILL

Major Professor: Erik C. Ness

Committee: Timothy Reese Cain
Manuel González Canché

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2013

DEDICATION

To my family, who are always there for me. Thank you for all of the love, support, encouragement, and dedication. To my husband Greg who willingly took on more to keep our household running while I pursued my degree and who routinely banished me to the "hole" to work on this dissertation. To my children, Maddie and Matthew, each equally my pride and joy. To my mother Angie who believes I can do anything. To my big sisters, Karen and Sue, for setting the bar for strong, independent women. To my great grandmother Neville who served as a role model of working women for me. To my late Aunt Ann for her influence in my life early on about the importance of higher education. Finally, to my late father Hayward for passing on to me his dedication to and appreciation for life-long learning.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deep appreciation and gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Erik Ness, for the patient guidance he provided to me. Without his expert editorial guidance and depth of knowledge this document would have never come to fruition. Additionally, I would like to thank the remaining members of my committee, Dr. Tim Cain and Dr. Manuel Gonzalez Canche, for their guidance and support.

Thank you to my supervisors: Dr. Bonnie L. Coe, whose gentle push and encouragement initiated this doctoral journey, and who has been a constant source of support and sensible advice, and William L. MacDonald, who has offered his comprehensive knowledge and strategic insights throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Inter-institutional partnerships in higher education are becoming more and more prevalent. A quick search on the websites of various higher education publications like the *Chronicle of Higher Education* or *InsideHigherEd.com* reveals numerous articles about institutional partnerships, collaborations, and mergers. For example, last summer, Cornell and Columbia announced the expansion of their efforts to collaborate in the management of their libraries with a goal of saving money and improving services and, in June, the New Jersey legislature approved a plan that would form a partnership between Rutgers at Camden and Rowan University. Mergers of institutions also seem to be happening with more frequency. In the Georgia system alone, eight institutions were merged into four earlier this year. The number of partnerships between higher educational institutions has grown exponentially in the past decade and is expected to increase even more in the future (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007).

The advantages of inter-institutional collaborations can be considerable and their potential, enormous. If implemented effectively, these partnerships can dramatically improve an institution's operations and competitiveness, and advance its quality and breadth of services. For example, the curriculum and program offerings can be refined and expanded, and course redundancies can be eliminated. Faculty resources in a department or division can be strengthened to a depth not available in the separate colleges (Martin & Samels, 1994) and new services can be provided to communities (May & Smith, 1992).

The reasons colleges and universities establish inter-institutional partnerships are also varied. However, the primary motivating theme is economy and efficiency (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007; Lang, 2002; Martin & Samels, 1994; Stewart, 2003). Amid a global economic crisis that has greatly diminished resources available to colleges and universities, the demands from legislators and the public to improve affordability, increase completion rates, and become more accountable grow more insistent each day. Finding ways to be more efficient with the scarce resources is a key factor of institutional survival. If federal and state funding for higher education, particularly public higher education, continues to diminish, the need to "do more with less" will continue to increase. Colleges and universities will have to continue to seek alternate ways to address the increase in demand for services coupled with the reduction in appropriations. Inter-institutional partnerships will likely be one of those ways for many institutions (Amey, 2010; Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007; Baus & Ramsbottom, 1999; Forcier, 2011). A collection of forces such as technology needs, cost of providing a college education, and interest in international expansion will continue to draw more colleges and universities into multi-campus consortia, federations, affiliations, and mergers.

Whatever the reason for doing so, the fact remains that hundreds of colleges and universities have already established affiliations, collaborations, mergers, and other inter-institutional partnerships. In the future, academic quality may increasingly depend on an institution's linkages or newly federated structures (Martin & Samels, 1994).

Statement of Purpose

Higher education institutions are constantly challenged to find new ways to meet the educational needs of constituents and to maximize resources in order to achieve stated goals. One strategy becoming more popular in addressing these pressing needs is partnerships and other forms of inter-institutional collaboration. Inter-institutional arrangements can allow for resources sharing, creation of joint educational programs, technology enhancements, and workforce preparation. The growth in these partnership arrangements across the higher education landscape leads to a greater need for understanding the leadership required to effectively sustain them. Although inter-institutional partnerships are typically initiated by presidents or other senior administrators, it is the manager whose work enables the partnership to continue. This study aims to discover the perspective of managers and directors working for an institution engaged in a long-term inter-institutional arrangement on the effectiveness of the partnership and explore their experiences. The experience of these managers and directors[1] in their current institution in addition to areas of influence, opportunities, and barriers to success were of interest. What challenges and opportunities do these managers see as unique or significant?

This study aims to illuminate an important topic that is underrepresented in the literature and to provide insight to presidents, deans, and managers on the perceptions of managers and directors whose role is to support and sustain an inter-institutional partnership. These types of organizational arrangements are becoming more and more common in higher education (Amey, 2010; Harman & Meek, 2002) and the number of managers navigating in this complex environment is growing. The prevailing literature on institutional collaborations, although frequently addressed to governing boards and college and university presidents, fails to address the distinctive role managers and directors play in sustaining these arrangements. In fact, to date, I have found nothing that directly addresses the experiences of managers in inter-institutional

[1] This dissertation treats the terms "managers" and "directors" synonymously, and they are applied interchangeably. These terms are used to define operational managers and directors that are responsible for primary operational areas of the institution including such areas as financial aid, fees and deposits, accounting, facilities, public safety, purchasing, student life, disability services, advising, admissions, development, and information technology.

relationships. The literature (for example, Kotter and Cohen, 2002) suggests the importance of senior-level buy-in, as by college presidents. Yet in most academic organizations, senior leaders are not likely to be involved in actually implementing the partnership. It is equally likely that others within the institutions are leading the partnership and cultivating the support of those in more formal authority. Many partnerships are spearheaded by senior administrators, who then are sure to bring others on board, including lower-level administrators, to take on the daily implementation and decision making associated with the partnership. These managers and directors play a critical role in establishing and maintaining inter-institutional collaborations. The work environment and culture resulting from such collaborations most likely present unique challenges and opportunities to administrators working in these settings. My study explored the perspective of managers and directors who work at a college or university that is engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership and discusses their perceptions of this model of educational collaboration and of factors that affect the ongoing success of the collaboration. It is how these operational managers perceive their work environment that is the focus of my research.

Research Questions

Guided by characteristics of partnership success as identified in the literature, I explored the experiences of managers and directors working in a long-term inter-institutional partnership setting to better understand the context of their environment. For the purpose of this dissertation, I focused on the experiences of managers working within the partnership of The Ohio State University at Newark and Central Ohio Technical College (COTC). These two institutions are co-located and have operated using a partnership model of collaboration for over forty years. Co-location is an organizational model in Ohio where a technical college and a branch campus of a major state institution operate at the same physical plant. Ohio State's regional campus in Newark was established in 1966. Five years later when COTC was founded, it was established on the campus with Ohio State Newark. As partners, the two institutions share all buildings and general purpose classrooms in Newark, operating expenses, a number of capital equipment investments, over 120 staff employees, and many functional areas of operations. Shared departments include human resources, student life, facilities, development, business and finance, the library, marketing and public relations, information technology and athletics. Specifically the research questions I addressed were: Guided by the characteristics of partnership success, how do managers who work at a college or university engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership perceive this model of educational collaboration? What benefits do they perceive this model of organization provides to the institutions? What characteristics do they perceive as essential for sustaining the collaboration over time?

Conceptual Framework: Characteristics of Partnership Success

To guide my research and serve as a conceptual framework, I used the characteristics of successful partnerships synthesized from the literature that center around three broad themes: partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. Eight characteristics were used to guide my research: trust and respect, coordination, commitment, communication quality, information sharing, participation, joint problem solving, and avoidance of destructive conflict resolution tactics.

Using the conceptual framework of the characteristics of partnership success to guide me, I explored the role of managers working at a college or university engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership in sustaining the relationship. Specifically, I attempted to gain insight into this under-researched but expanding employee group to determine the degree to which the attributes of the partnership, aspects of communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques are foundational to sustaining a successful partnership in higher education. Then I examined each of the eight specific characteristics as they relate to these managers. I ascertained how these administrators perceive their environment in relation to coordination. I did likewise for the rest of the framework characteristics of commitment, respect and trust, communication quality, information sharing, participation, joint problem solving, and avoidance of destructive conflict resolution tactics.

Significance and Organization of Study

From all appearances, the proliferation of inter-institutional partnerships will not abate for the foreseeable future. If that is so, my research is both timely and relevant and it is made even more so because of the complete lack of attention to my topic in the professional literature. There are articles addressing inter-institutional partnerships, but the scholarship generally addresses the types of arrangements and institutional attributes that have been identified as necessary for partnership success. Articles written on leadership in institutional partnerships overwhelmingly focus on initiating the partnership and center on the president or senior management. Literature on the role of managers and directors in sustaining a long-term institutional partnership is virtually non-existent.

Characteristics of partnership success identified in the literature provided a framework for discussion that enabled me to produce data that are current, relevant and grounded in solid practice. It is my hope that the answers to my research questions provide higher education practitioners with insight into the perceptions of mid-level administrators working in an institutional partnership about this complex work environment. Through a rich and detailed case study, institutional leaders can learn from the specific experience of a leading public research university and a technical college and apply the lessons from that experience to inform their own decision-making in the future.

In the succeeding chapter, Literature Review, I expanded on the definitions of the characteristics of partnership success that constitute the framework for my research and helped organize my exploration of managers'/directors' experience. Because my research focused on inter-institutional partnerships, I provided a brief history of higher education partnerships and an overview of motivating themes behind institutional collaborations. I tried to depict the diversity of inter-institutional partnerships by sharing a variety of taxonomies that have been used to describe these types of arrangements. In addition, I explored the literature around culture as it relates to inter-institutional partnerships development. These topics provided a firm basis of knowledge for my research.

Chapter 3 provides an in-depth explanation of the research methodology, data collection, and data analysis process. Using the case study method, I examined the experiences of managers employed at Central Ohio Technical College and The Ohio State University at Newark to better understand the context of their managerial work setting. These two institutions share a physical campus and have operated as partners since the establishment of the technical college in 1971. Data were collected using semi-structured, in-person interviews with key respondents and review of extent data received from the key respondents and archival documents provided by the institutions. Using the characteristics of partnership success synthesized from the literature as a framework, I attempted to determine how managers and directors perceive the effectiveness of the partnership and explored their experiences.

Chapter 4 narrates the research findings resulting from the data collected using the qualitative methodology discussed in Chapter 3 and reports results organized by five themes:

community expectations, leadership, identity, time, and complexity. These themes reveal a range of perceptions related to the partnership and are related to the a priori themes of successful collaboration characteristics identified in the literature and discussed in Chapter 2.

Chapter 5 provides an analysis and synthesis of the research findings from Chapter 4 and a discussion of how my examination of the experience of managers working for co-located, partnering institutions might apply to the other types of collaborations. Additionally, implications for practice and recommendations for future research are provided.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

In preparing to explore the work environment of directors at a college or university engaged in an inter-institutional partnership, a range of literature can sensitize the researcher to relevant issues.

This literature review explores key concepts related to inter-institutional-partnerships: (a) a brief history, (b) motivating themes behind inter-institutional cooperation, (c) types of inter-institutional arrangements in higher-education, and (d) the role that institutional culture plays in developing and sustaining inter-institutional partnership relationships in higher education. Additionally, the review explores the business and higher education literature surrounding the characteristics of successful partnerships.

Brief History of Inter-Institutional Collaborations

Cooperation between higher education institutions is not a new phenomenon, beginning at least as early as 1249 with Oxford's University College (Lang, 2002). In the United States, consortia have evolved since the founding of the Claremont Colleges in 1925, which marked the first formal, voluntary association of higher-education institutions linked for academic cooperation (Forcier, 2011). Four years later, the Atlanta University Center was established to share graduate programs among Atlanta University, Morehouse College, and Spelman College. Inter-institutional collaboration became relatively common and popular in America after World War II in the 1950s and 1960s, to address common issues, primarily concerned with student needs, and as pressures from the growing public-university sector led private colleges to provide a more comprehensive experience by sharing resources, and burgeoning library expenditures encouraged all institutions to seek efficiencies in information management (Baus & Ramsbottom,1999; Forcier, 2011; Lang 2002).

In the 1950s, Amherst College, Mount Holyoke College, Smith College, and the University of Massachusetts Amherst began sharing courses, faculty appointments, and library resources; a fifth institution, Hampshire College, opened in 1970. The resulting consortium, Five Colleges, Inc., is a leader in inter-institutional collaboration.

The Council on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) was established with a similar agenda in 1958 by the presidents of the Big Ten institutions with start-up funds from the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Recent CIC initiatives include launching global, multi-institutional "Big Science" projects and working with Google to digitize as many as 10 million volumes across all CIC library systems (Forcier, 2011).

The federal government also spurred the development of state and regional consortia in the 1960s through Title II and III funds. It established, for example, the New Hampshire College and University Council in 1966, which encompasses 17 public and private institutions throughout the state that was formed expressly to strengthen educational services and improve operating efficiencies (Forcier, 2011).

Today, more and more institutions are finding ways to partners. Martin, Samels, & Associates (1994) note that variations in format of inter-institutional collaborations run into the hundreds, even thousands, in public and private higher education systems. The Council for Inter-Institutional Leadership projects their number in the tens of thousands.

Motivating Themes for Inter-Institutional Partnerships

Many institutions pursue collaborative relationships in order to accomplish things they cannot do individually, usually because of a lack of resources. Throughout the literature the motivating themes for inter-institutional collaboration are economy and efficiency (Lang, 2002). Growing pressure on colleges and universities across the country to provide the highest quality education at the lowest responsibility cost will continue to challenge college executives and boards of trustees. Burton Clark, in his study of entrepreneurial universities, described the problem well with the succinct phrase, "demand overload" (Clark, 1998). "Demand overload" describes conditions in which the resources that support colleges and universities become more and more limited while the services demanded of them and their associated costs increase. Inter-institutional partnerships provide a mechanism for colleges and universities to address this phenomenon.

Financial necessity driven by the continual decline in state funding, budget cuts, and cutbacks has been the overwhelming reason that colleges and universities decide to engage in inter-institutional partnerships in the past (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007; Lang, 2002; Martin & Samels, 1994; Stewart, 2003). Given today's challenging economy, state support for higher education has been reduced to a point that many institutions are struggling to meet their financial obligations and they are using inter-institutional partnerships as a way to address their fiscal needs and to obtain financial resources.

Institutional efficiency is another reason that colleges and universities are attracted to inter-institutional collaborations. External pressures such as resource scarcity, state mandates, and institutional goals, frequently constitute a compelling reason for one institution to work with another (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007). The rise of information and communication technologies alone has increased pressures on institutions not only to be more competitive but to be more efficient. Board and community leaders expect that institutions will work together rather than compete unnecessarily and inefficiently (Baus & Ramsbottom, 1999). Such partnerships provide opportunities for facilities sharing; strengthening of academic offerings; eliminating redundancies, administrative efficiencies, economies of scale; and technology advancements (Amey, Eddy, and Ozaki, 2007; Stewart, 2003; Lang, 2002; Martin & Samels, 1994; Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994). Shared services models have consistently demonstrated process efficiency, cost reduction, process quality, data visibility, and improved service levels (Deloitte, 2011); and consortium arrangements have enabled increases in the variety of course work from which students may choose and the avoidance of expensive duplication (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994).

While many consortia initially were focused on the idea of improving efficiency through sharing physical resources, academic resources, or administrative service, the last few years have witnessed an increased emphasis on improving effectiveness by encouraging innovation through collaboration (Forcier, 2011).

Another motivating theme for the formation of inter-institutional partnerships is to gain competitive advantage in the marketplace (Bleeke and Ernst, 1991; Elmuti, Abebe, & Nicolosi, 2005; Powell, 1990). Partnership can afford a firm access to new technologies or markets; the ability to provide a wider range of products/service; economies of scale in joint research and/or production; access to knowledge beyond the firm’s boundaries; sharing of risks and access to complementary skills (Powell, 1987).

In some cases, some institutions have elected to use merges in an attempt to better serve their customers through expanded technical capacity, increased services, and a stronger human resource pool (Brueder, 1989). A recent example is the consolidation of four pairs of institutions in Georgia with the hopes of enabling the System to better serve students and areas of the state more efficiently and effectively (University System of Georgia, 2012).

Personal relationships are another reason that institutions partner. Partnerships can often be more important for the relationship they facilitate, the values they symbolize, and the political alliances that can be banked for future use than for the measurable outputs they produce, especially in the short run. Partnerships can directly contribute to the institution's mission and goal attainment in ways that reflect both quality and quantity that can lead to success in other realms (Amey, 2010).

Taxonomy of Inter-institutional Arrangements

Central to an informed understanding of higher education collaborations is a familiarity with basic models and terminology. In considering inter-institutional arrangements as an academic management strategy, college and university leaders should start by closely examining the range of structural alternatives. Institutional collaborations can take a variety of forms, varying by formality and differing considerably in regard to the amount of institutional autonomy that is given up as a result.

In 2002, Lang classified the variety of inter-institutional arrangements taking place in higher education. Lang's taxonomy identified six different types of collaborations: consortia; affiliation; management by contract; federation; subsidiaries and ancillaries; and true merger. Lang's taxonomy runs along a continuum based upon each form's impact on institutional autonomy, beginning with consortium that cedes the least institutional autonomy, and ending with true merger, the type of institutional combination that cedes the most (Lang, 2002).

In addition to the six types of relationships identified by Lang, I explored the role of "shared services" as it relates to inter-institutional collaborations.

Consortia

Consortia are formed when colleges and universities band together to create voluntary multi-campus cooperatives. Consortia provide the institutions with the opportunity to cooperate while maintaining the greatest level of institutional autonomy. Lang (2002) defines consortia as "formal organizations that exist apart from the institutions that constitute their membership" (p. 27). The purpose and membership of consortia vary a great deal. Although the broad goal of every consortium is to "achieve more, do something better, or reduce the cost of an activity" (Neal, 1988, p. 3), each consortium is unique. In the early 1970s, Lewis Patterson, working out of the Kansas City Regional Council of Higher Education, created a national network of academic consortia that is today called the Association for Consortium Leadership. Patterson (1970), a pioneer in the higher-education consortium movement, identified five distinct characteristics that academic consortia share: voluntary membership (not the result of regulatory or statutory mandate), multi-institutional, multifunctional, beneficiaries of long-term member support, and managed by a substantial professional staff.

Consortia are separately incorporated, have assets and liabilities, boards of directors, and by-laws (Lang, 2002). Members of consortia typically assume financial responsibility only for activities specified in the joint venture. Ordinarily, consortium membership does not imply financial support for broader institutional goals of other member colleges (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994).

One of the most fundamental and practical differences of consortium in comparison to some of the other types of institutional collaboration is that an institution can leave a consortium.

Although the frequency and consequences of departures from consortia differ depending on the latter's size, departure is an option for a consortium member.

If properly conceived and focused, this form of institutional collaboration can lead to more effective use of finite resources and the advocacy of common education and political positions. Initial incentives to form a consortium typically revolve around academic issues such as cross-registration, faculty exchange, or use of other academic resources (Amey, Eddy, & Ozaki, 2007). Since then consortia have been formed to provide research laboratories, computer facilities, libraries, faculty and student exchanges, programs abroad, conservatories, specialized research centers, and even broadcast facilities.

One of the oldest and most successful consortia in higher education is the Associated Colleges of Central Kansas (ACCK). The ACCK consortium was established in 1966 by six small, independent Midwestern colleges to proactively address the high cost of IT while the computer revolution was in its formative stage. The ACCK represents one of the few consortia in which shared IT resources emerged as a central focus. Member colleges share a variety of academic programs, facilities and resources, and a vision of the future (Hassett, Cunningham, et. al., 2002).

Another distinguished example is Five Colleges, Inc., in Massachusetts, including the Amherst campus of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst College, Hampshire College, Mount Holyoke College, and Smith College. In this consortium, without relinquishing their individual identities, five institutions have opened up their resources to each other so that students at any one of the colleges may enroll in courses at the others without extra charge (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994).

Affiliations

A basic affiliation agreement typically involves a set of mutual promises and anticipated benefits. Affiliations are typically bilateral, involving only two institutions, agreements that do not affect the autonomy of participating institutions, nor involve any reallocation of physical or financial resources (Lang, 2002). These type of inter-institutional arrangements allow the participating institutions to preserve their respective identities and governance structures while combining their respective strengths to take advantage of market opportunities. They can promote creative, specific collaborations in areas of academic programming, administrative efficiency, and complementary growth (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994). In many cases, affiliation agreements serve as a period of collegial confidence and trust building in preparation for potentially more permanent educational partnerships between the institutions at some point in the future (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994).

Another form of affiliation is partnerships. Mohr and Specman (1994) define partnerships as purposive strategic relationships between independent firms who share compatible goals, strive for mutual benefit, and acknowledge a high level of interdependence. They join efforts to achieve goals that each firm, action alone, could not attain easily. The increase in the practice of partnership is based on the assumption that partnership not only enhances outcomes – whether qualitatively or quantitatively, but it also results in synergistic rewards, where the outcomes of the partnership as a whole are greater than the sum of what individual partners contribute (Brinkerhoff, 2002).

Based upon a review of the literature (Brinkerhoff, 2002), the ideal type of partnership can be defined as follows:

> Partnership is a dynamic relationship among diverse actors, based on mutually agreed objectives, pursued through a shared understanding of the most rational division of labor based on the respective comparative advantages of each partner. Partnership encompasses mutual influence, with a careful balance between synergy and respective autonomy, which incorporates mutual respect, equal participation in decision-making, mutual accountability, and transparency (Brinkerhoff, 2002, p. 216).

Affiliations are like a federation in the sense that the host institution is accountable for certain aspects – usually standards of quality – of the partner institution's performance. But unlike a federation, an affiliation involves institutions that do not begin with equivalent status, and have no legal or practical means of gaining such status. Like a consortium, an affiliation involves institutions in the delivery of a specialized program or service without compromising either institution's autonomy or franchise, each institution contributing in its own way and having equal access to the benefits of cooperation. Unlike a consortium, however, an affiliation does not lead to the creation of a new, separate corporate entity, nor does it lead to a participating institution's ceasing to offer a program or service in deference to the consortium (Lang, 2002).

Management by Contract

A relatively new approach to inter-organizational arrangements among public colleges and universities is management by contract. Management by contract entails the desire by government to delegate direct responsibility for a college or university, usually a small, highly specialized institution, to another, usually larger and comprehensive, institution. Under management by contract, institutional identity is not lost. Usually, the same degree of local autonomy is retained, but accountability shifts from a government agency to the larger "host" or "manager" university (Lang, 2002).

An example of a management by contract found in the United States is the Los Alamos National Laboratory, which is located in New Mexico. Under a management by contract arrangement, the laboratory was managed for the federal government by the University of California (UC). The laboratory and the contract with UC was established in 1942 as a result of the difficulties encountered in conducting preliminary studies on nuclear weapons at universities scattered across the country. The Los Alamos National Laboratory, located in isolated area on the mesa, was dedicated solely to that purpose. Due to the highly specialized nature of the facility and its dependence on leading scientists and researchers, its association with UC was a reasonable arrangement. It is noted, however, that in 2006, the University of California ended its sixty years of direct involvement in operating Los Alamos National Laboratory, and management control of the laboratory was taken over by Los Alamos National Security, LLC, of which UC is a limited partner.

Federation

Of the various forms of inter-institutional cooperation, federation has the longest history. In England, Oxford University, the University of London, and Cambridge University are federations and, in Canada, the University of Toronto became federated in the middle of the 19^{th} century (Lang, 2002). In the United States, the federation of all-male and all-female colleges was common until the interest in co-education reoccurred in the 1970s.

Institutions participating in federations remain autonomous. Each institution retains its assets and is fully responsible for its liabilities. The board of governors at each institution remains in place and each institution retains it authority to make academic appointments, admit students, and offer employment, however, the appointments must be mutually acceptable.

Another distinguishing feature of a federation is that it can be partial. Federations are usually formed around academic programs and academic services. While an institution may become a member of a federation with regard to academic programs and academic services, it may continue to operate services and activities on their own and apart from the federation. This is most often the case for student residences, food services, and sometimes libraries (Lang, 2002).

Subsidiaries and Ancillaries

Many colleges and universities have subsidiary operations or auxiliaries. Lang (2002) defines an ancillary as "a wholly-owned subsidiary of its host or parent institution" (p. 36). An auxiliary enterprise, as put forth by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO) is an entity that exists to furnish a service to students, faculty, staff or incidentally to the general public, and that charges a fee for the use of goods and services. The distinguishing characteristic of an auxiliary enterprise is that it is managed as an essentially self-supporting activity. In many cases, university presses and bookstores are operated as ancillaries. Conference centers, dining services, student residences, parking operations, child care centers, and inter-collegiate athletic programs are other examples of institutional functions that are often operated as auxiliaries. This type of institutional partnership is not examined more fully here given that these arrangements are more common and require less description.

Mergers

Mergers occur when two or more institutions legally join assets, liabilities, and other resources essentially under one-governing institution. Goedegebuure offers a literal definition of merger:

> A merger in higher education is the combination of two or more separate institutions into a single new organizational entity, in which control rests with a single governing body and a single chief executive body, and whereby all assets, liabilities and responsibilities of the former institutions are transferred to a single new institution (as cited in Lang, 2002, p. 23).

Mergers are the form of inter-institutional combination that most extensively subordinates institutional identity and independence. Under a merger, at least one of the participating institutions ceases to exist as a legal entity. Institutional autonomy is lost.

The most common forms of merger can be portrayed as voluntary and involuntary, consolidations and take-overs, single sector and cross-sectoral, twin partner and multi-partner, similar academic profile (horizontal) and different academic profile (vertical) mergers (Harman & Meek, 2002). Typical mergers are characterized by involuntary closings, financial insolvencies, forced reorganizations, and massive human and programmatic retrenchment.

Lang (2002) distinguishes between mergers depending upon whether the outcome is a new institution (consolidation) or the absorption of one of the partners by the other (acquisition). Consolidation is defined as joining together two institutions to form a new institution. Higher education consolidations involve two or more institutions that are collapsed into one new college or university, usually with a different name, mission, and scale of operation (Martin, Samels, & Associates 1994). The outcome is a melding of their features with new ones to form a genuinely new entity. In this model, an institution seeking to preserve its academic heritage might see potential in either a new or shared institutional name identification. Whatever the choice of nomenclature, consolidations are often motivated by many of the same academic quality, administrative efficiency, and demographic realities that impel pure mergers and often duplicate pure mergers once the respective campus cultures are fully integrated (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994).

In contrast, an acquisition occurs when one institution absorbs another without being substantially affected in the process. For example, the absorption of specialist institutions for agriculture, law or medicine into a major university could be described as acquisitions. In cases of pure acquisition, the aim is complete integration: the acquired organization will become a unit like any other of the acquiring institution. The acquiring institution emerges, increased in size or breadth, but fundamentally unchanged. In transformative acquisition, one partner absorbs the other but changes substantially as a result.

Martin, Samels, and Associates (1994) outline the potential in a new approach to college and university mergers: the mutual-growth strategy. In this model, mission-complementary institutions combine to enhance the vision and will of each. Unlike a typical merger, the mutual-growth strategy is based on the mutual growth and enhancement of the missions of both institutions. The mutual-growth strategy can stimulate the members of the combined faculty to new levels of professional development by peer example and increased institutional support.

In the United States, government-mandated mergers are usually on a state-wide basis, have historically been voluntary, and involve small, private-community colleges (Harman & Harman, 2003; Lang, 2001, Millett, 1976; Stephenson, 2011). However, this historical view of higher education mergers is rapidly changing. Mergers have occurred and are now occurring among a surprising number of institutions of differing size and prominence, some private and some public (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 1994, p. ix).

Some of the most prominent inter-institutional mergers that have occurred are Carnegie Mellon University, resulting from the consolidation of Carnegie Tech with the Mellon Institute, and Case Western Reserve University, which combined Western Reserve University and the Case Institute. Less well known are recent examples such as the merger of Tift College with Mercer University and the Delaware Law School, and Boston State College with the University of Massachusetts, Boston. The Williamsport Area Community College (WACC) in Pennsylvania is another example. WACC became a wholly owned subsidiary of The Corporation for Penn State and is known as the Pennsylvania College of Technology (PCT). In addition to enhanced service and efficiencies resulting from resources and operations, the WACC/Penn State merger resulted in significant benefits to all principal parties. Specifically, WACC was able to avoid a second sponsorship crisis and PSU was able to provide an improved technology transfer conduit between private sector corporations and higher education by combining PSU's proven research and development expertise with WACC's hands-on technology training and programming experience. Further, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania benefited since the merger complements and strengthens Pennsylvania's continuing commitment to economic development by providing advanced technology training to ensure availability of the work force necessary for existing and newly emerging business and industry (Brueder, 1989).

In an attempt to address funding concerns, several state governors have proposed mergers of institutions or entire systems within these states. A recent example is the proposal to merge the State of Vermont's "flagship" university with a regional college system, which consists of five distinct college systems. In Utah, the Board of Regents merged Utah State University with the College of Eastern Utah (Leonard, 2010). Another example is the administrative merger of the University of Toledo and the Medical University of Ohio. (Stephenson, 2011). More recently, the Georgia Board of Regents approved the recommendation to consolidate eight of the System's 35 colleges and universities. The schools being consolidated are: Gainesville State

College and North Georgia College & State University (Dahlonega); Middle Georgia College (Cochran) and Macon State College; Waycross College and South Georgia College (Douglas); and Augusta State University and Georgia Health Sciences University (Fain, 2012).

Shared Services

Shared services are an important component of any collaboration. Whether an institution is engaged in a consortia or a full merger, the sharing of services is a common theme central to the arrangement. Shared services is defined as the practice of shifting support processes out of a company's business units or divisions and into a separate service-focused organization (Deloitte, 2011). Although shared service arrangements are typically seen in the more established transactional services like Finance, Human Resources (HR), and Information Technology (IT), shared service centers (SSC) continue to expand into more non-traditional functions such as supply chain, real estate, marketing and legal (Deloitte, 2011). Shared services arrangements can take place within the boundary of a single organization (intra-organizational shared services); inter-organizationally, involving two or more organizations sharing common services; or be provided by a separate organizational entity (Miskon, Sureva et al, 2011).

Deloitte's 2011 Global Shared Services Survey indicates that organizations are shifting away from single function centers to multi-functional as their SSCs mature and that executives are proactively blending shared services and outsourcing to achieve the most cost efficient and flexible service delivery model for their organization. Organizations frequently shift processes first to shared services in order to stabilize the linkage with the business prior to outsourcing and are continuing to deliver value through expanding across geographies and business units. Shared services in higher education is relatively new and novel; however, anecdotal evidence suggests universities are good candidates for shared services (Dove, 2004; Yee et al., 2009). The comparatively homogenous business requirements of universities combined with strong impetus to respond to a raft of common influences across the higher education sector worldwide, suggest potential for the sharing of related activities and resources via shared services. In higher education, universities are considering and have begun cooperating or sharing in a wide range of areas, in order to achieve sought after cost savings and improvements in performance.

Shared services in higher education can often take place within a large university or among institutions within the same system. For example, in 2011, the SUNY Board of Trustees adopted a resolution directing the SUNY campus presidents and System Administration to work collaboratively to develop and implement regional SUNY Campus Alliance Networks. It is intended that cost savings generated by administrative reorganization will be redirected toward academic instruction and other student-support services. The extent to which services will be shared among alliance partners is expected to vary by campus and region (Hook, 2011).

Culture and Inter-Institutional Arrangements

The culture and traditions of higher education have emphasized strict institutional autonomy. Most faculty are rewarded for independent effort, and colleges have focused on what distinguishes them form one another rather than on shared characteristics and needs (Baus & Ramsbottom, 1999).

Experience shows that inter-institutional collaborations do not form and survive easily. Although these relationships may be a very effective strategy for colleges and universities to broaden outreach and build the capacity to achieve stated organizational goals, especially when resources are tight and learner needs are growing, they can be enormously challenging and riddled with drawbacks and hazards (Amey, 2010; Amy, Eddy, & Campbell, 2010; Harman &

Harman, 2003; Lang, 2002; Martin & Samels, 1994; Millett, 1976; Stephenson, 2011; Stewart, 2003; Trim, 2003).

Despite perceived initial benefits, higher education collaborations are often difficult and almost always more complicated then they may first appear. These arrangements may be accompanied with increased complexity, loss of autonomy, and information asymmetry (Provan, 1984; Williamson, 1975). In many cases, partnerships are not successful because they fail to obtain desired results, cannot be sustained for long periods of time, or cease to benefit both parties (Eddy, 2007; Fear et al., 2004). For example, battles can rage as the two institutions negotiate over such items as which programs will be reduced and which enlarged, the size of faculty and administrator severance packages, the disposition of surplus revenues, the use of the two endowments, the ranks and tenure situations of all faculty, the need for new buildings, the size and composition of the new board of trustees, new promotion criteria, and combined academic governance mechanisms (Martin & Samels, 1994). Many collaborations and mergers have failed as the result of an underestimation of the differences in culture and of constituents' fierce loyalty to one institution or the other, where compromise or collaboration are not seen as a reasonable alternative to independence.

To fully leverage the value of inter-institutional collaboration, the power of organizational culture cannot be underestimated or ignored. Pettigrew (1979) defines organizational culture as "the amalgam of beliefs, ideology, language, ritual, and myth" (1979, p. 572). Pettigrew argues that an organization is a continuing social system and the elements of culture exert a powerful control over the behavior of those within it. Organizational culture induces purpose, commitment, and order; provides meaning and social cohesion; and clarifies and explains behavioral expectations. Culture influences an organization through the people within it (Masland, 1985).

The strength of institutional culture depends on several factors (Clark, 1980). Primary among them is the scale of the organization. Small organizations tend to have stronger cultures than do large organizations. Second is the tightness of the organization. Colleges with highly interdependent parts have stronger cultures than those with autonomous parts. Third is the age of the organization. Culture develops over time and an institution with a long history simply has a larger foundation upon which to build its culture. Finally, the institution's founding influences the strength of its culture. A traumatic birth or transformation, like a long history, provides a stronger base upon which to build cultural values and beliefs. In colleges with stronger cultures there is greater coherence among beliefs, language, ritual, and myth. Weak cultures lack this coherence.

Clark (1970) refers to the long-standing characteristics that determine the distinctiveness of an organization as forming an "organizational saga." As Clark (1970) puts it: An institutional saga may be found in many forms, through mottoes, traditions, and ethos. It might consist of long-standing practices or unique roles played by an institution, or even in the images held in the minds (and hearts) of students, faculty, and alumni. Sagas can provide a sense of romance and even mystery that turn a cold organization into a beloved social institution, capturing the allegiance of its members and even defining the identity of its communities (p. 235). Learning the sagas of a particular college or university is a way to understand its culture and values, not simply its history.

Peter Drucker, who has been know as a father of modern management theory states: "the greatest change in corporate culture - and the way business is being conducted - may be the accelerated growth of relationships based... on partnership" (Drucker, 1996). Generating a broader base of commitment in personnel, resources, time, and motivation is required for long-term viability (Amey, Eddy, & Campbell, 2010). The literature notes the influence of organizational culture on the merger process. For example, Harman (2002) highlights the particularly entrenched nature of academic cultures, which can pose considerable problems for the process of organizational change and integration and, in the report on college mergers in 2000, the FEFC identified cultural differences as posing difficulties for the merger process (2000, p. 11). Mergers are usually complex, presenting socio-economic or socio-cultural nuances that are unforeseen (Harman & Harman, 2003; Millett, 1976; Stephenson, 2011). Harman and Harman (2003) note that “sensitivity to human and cultural factors and effective leadership are of utmost importance in achieving success in mergers” (p. 29).

Stephenson’s (2011) study shows that mergers between public institutions are more riddled with expressed political cynicism than those between private institutions, but private institutions are also concerned with the nuanced expressions and discourses related to culture and governance. Universities are communities of people working together and sharing in the common mission of the organization; hence, a broad-based “buy-in” for the merger is necessary—every stake-holder must be on board. Stephenson’s (2011) study shows it is necessary for political leaders and state decision-makers to understand how their decisions affect the institutions’ unique history and culture, as well as the leadership of the institution. Decision-makers and leaders must contemplate mergers in concert with the unique mission of their education institutions.

According to Amey (2010), inter-institutional arrangements rely on the interplay of numerous actors with their own motivations and goals. They do not just happen because policy makers, boards of trustees, or even institutional presidents mandate they will occur. In the early stages of a partnership, Amey contends relationships are the key to getting the program going. Leaders play a central role in how these relationships are cultivated, structured and operated. However, those leading or championing the cause need to recognize that their own roles within the group process will evolve as well as the partnership develops from coordinated to collaborative. Initially, as with any group, it is sometimes necessary for leaders to be more leader-centered, using top-down management controls. Yet, over time as the partnership evolves, stabilizes, and becomes more institutionalized, ownership of the idea and involvement of others must be expanded into forms of distributed leadership (Amey & Brown, 2004). As Amey (2010) states,

> Without this shift in role and responsibility, the partnership stays too closely associated with the single leaders, and investment over time will have to be coerced more than it will be freely given. Leaders need to help others find their voice in speaking for and framing partnerships as roles change and champions emerge. Passing on credibility for leading is part of the shift necessary for institutionalizing and sustaining partnerships (p. 19).

Leader-centered partnerships are often less likely to be sustained over time than those that have become more inclusive. Therefore, leaders need to know when and how to broaden commitment and involvement and to step aside so that other champions can continue implementation of the partnership (Amey, 2010). As with most features of academic organizations, those that continue over time become part of the culture and are built into administrative processes of the organization. This affords a greater degree of stability than the interpersonal dynamics associated with being too closely tied to a single individual within the organization (Amey, Eddy, Ozaki, 2007). Sustainable partnerships are based on being flexible to new inputs and adjusting accordingly.

Characteristics of Successful Collaborations

Inter-institutional collaborations are complex and challenging, and a significant amount of literature is devoted to defining characteristics of effective partnerships (e.g., Anderson and Narus, 1990; Bracken, 2007; Day and Klein, 1987; Dent, 2006; Dwyer, Schurr, and Oh, 1987; Frazier, Spekman, and O'Neal, 1988; Mohr and Spekman, 1994; Russell & Flynn, 2000; Salmond and Spekman, 1986).

In their examination of the relationship between computer dealers and suppliers, Mohr and Spekman (1994) identified trust, the willingness to coordinate activities, the ability to convey a sense of commitment to the relationship, communication strategies used by the trading parties, and the importance of joint problem solving as a conflict resolution mechanism as key elements in partnership success. Their research found that as these variables are present in greater amounts, the success of the partnership is likely to be greater.

Whipple and Frankel (2000) surveyed business leaders in the food, and health and personal care industries regarding their conceptions of alliance success factors. Of a list of 18 factors generated from an extensive literature review, they found general consensus around five. These five factors were: trust, senior management support, ability to meet performance expectations, clear goals, and partner compatibility. Whipple and Frankel (2000) also note that conflict is an additional factor which merits examination. Elmuti, et al. (2005) cite the results of a 1999 survey by Technology Associates and Alliances in which 450 CEOs ranked the importance of certain success factors for strategic alliances. The respondents identified partner selection, senior management commitment, clearly understood roles, and communication between partners as essential components of alliance success. Baker's (1993) and Tushnet's (1993) research produced similar results, finding a shared vision, clearly defined goals, a focus on real problems, an institutionalized decision-making structure, and local decision making as common factors in successful collaborations. Similarly, Czajkowski (2006) identified six key collaboration success factors that were synthesized from existing collaboration literature from business and higher education research: mutual respect and trust, common purpose and attainable goals, shared governance and joint decision-making, clear roles and responsibilities, open and frequent communication, and adequate financial and human resources. Interestingly, Czajkowski's (2006) research supported only five of the six categories as important for inter-institutional collaboration in higher education. Shared governance and joint decision-making was not supported by the data.

Dodourova's study (2009) found that behavioral characteristics, such as commitment, coordination and communication among others, are found to play a more significant role in explaining overall partnership success compared with organizational characteristics such as structure and control mechanisms. The existence of these attributes implies that both partners acknowledge their mutual dependence and their willingness to work for the survival of the relationship. Should one party act opportunistically, the relationship will suffer and both will feel the negative consequences.

The table below provides a summary of the characteristics of successful collaborations as identified in the literature:

Table 1

Characteristics of Successful Collaborations from Selected Studies

Baker (1993) & Tushet (1993)
• shared vision
• clearly defined goals
• focus on real problems
• institutional decision-making structure
• local decision making
	Czajkowski (2006)
	• mutual respect and trust
	• common purpose and attainable goals
	• clear roles and responsibilities
	• open and frequent communication
	• adequate financial and human resources
		Dodourova (2009)
		• behavioral characteristics:
		  ○ commitment
		  ○ coordination
		  ○ communication

Elmuti, et al. (2005) • partner selection • senior management commitment • clearly understood roles • communication between partners	Mohr & Spekman (1994) • trust • willingness to coordinate activities • ability to convey a sense of commitment to the relationship • communication strategies • conflict resolution techniques	Whipple & Frankel (2000) • trust • senior management support • ability to met performance expectations • clear goals • partner compatibility • conflict

The research suggests that successful collaborations require a focus on change management elements such as communication, training, and executive alignment, and are contingent upon the development of effective interpersonal relationships of the individuals working in the partnership rather than just the structure of the organizational arrangement. Connecting key players, allowing them the freedom and opportunity to develop innovative ideas, and overcoming institutional loyalties and cultural and organizational differences by concentrating on the benefits to be gained through shared results are skills that are important to college and university leaders seeking inter-institutional cooperation (Forcier, 2011). The challenge, however, lies in developing a management philosophy or corporate culture in which independent and autonomous trading parties can relinquish some sovereignty and control, while also engaging in planning and organizing which takes into account the needs of the other party (Mohr & Spekman, 1994).

In synthesizing the literature, a common core of factors associated with successful partnerships is quickly identified. These characteristics center around three broad themes—partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. Trust and respect, coordination, commitment, communication quality, information sharing, participation, joint problem solving, and avoidance of destructive conflict resolution tactics all serve to better align partners' expectations, goals, and objectives and all contribute to partnership success.

Partnership Attributes

Mohr and Spekman's (1994) research identified three attributes linked to partnership success: commitment, coordination, and trust. Commitment refers to the willingness of trading partners to exert effort on behalf of the relationship (Porter et al., 1974). A high level of commitment provides the context in which both parties can achieve individual and joint goals without raising the specter of opportunistic behavior.

Coordination is related to boundary definition and reflects the set of tasks each party expects the other to perform. Without high levels of coordination, "just-in-time" processes fail, production stops, and any planned mutual advantage cannot be achieved.

Trust is the belief that a party's word is reliable and that a party will fulfill its obligations in an exchange. Pruitt (1981) indicates that trust is highly related to firms' desires to collaborate. Building trust among players is paramount (Leveille, 2006) and negotiating the relationship needs to come more from a mutual-gains perspective if there is any hope the partnership will be retained over time. Williamson (1985) states that, other things being equal, exchange relationships featuring trust will be able to manage greater stress and will display greater adaptability. Trust can be based on either the character or the competence of participating individuals and organizations (Gabarro, 1987) and is different than confidence. Trust is voluntary, linked to shared values, and is distinct from and potentially incompatible with confidence (Tonkiss & Passey, 1999). Contrary to an ethical basis, confidence is based on rational expectations, typically grounded in institutional arrangements, such as contracts, regulations, and standard operating procedures (Luhmann, 1988). Specific partners may have a particular preference for confidence over trust-based mechanisms. Presumably, that preference may change with time and repeated interaction among partners, as they accumulate experience demonstrating partner dependability and trustworthiness (Ostrom, 1990). In fact, Handy (1988) measures the level of trust in a partnership by the inverse variable of level of control, as indicated, for example, by reporting and approval requirements (quoted in Malena, 1995, 12). The more trust there is at the beginning of and throughout the relationship, the more likely it is that partners will be flexible with one another in ways that lead to persistence thorough difficult times within the collaboration (Amey, Eddy, & Campbell, 2010).

Communication Behavior

An open communication system is a critical element of any partnership process (Bracken, 2007). An organization must learn to communicate with its partners, using self-disclosure skills to articulate its needs (Dent, 2006). Members need to understand the motivation behind and benefits of the partnership (Amey, 2010). Effective and consistent communication helps establish the context, clarifies goals and objectives, and creates common vocabulary and understandings. It also takes into account the perspectives partners bring to the relationships, helping keep members informed and focused on the future and helping them solve problems more effectively (Gray, 1989).

Mohr and Spekman's (1994) research outlined three aspects of communication behavior that are significant to partnership success—communication quality, extent of information sharing between partners, and participation in planning and goal setting. Communication quality includes such aspects as the accuracy, timeliness, adequacy, and credibility of information exchanged. Timely, accurate, and relevant information is essential if the goals of the partnership are to be achieved (Mohr & Spekman, 1994).

Information sharing refers to the extent to which critical, often proprietary, information is communicated to one's partner (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). Huber and Daft (1987) report that closer ties result in more frequent and more relevant information exchanges between high performing partners. By sharing information and by being knowledgeable about each other's business, partners are able to act independently in maintaining the relationship over time. Information sharing not only enhances the functioning of the partnership but also increases the quality of the outcome (Dent, 2006).

Participation refers to the extent to which partners engage jointly in planning and goal setting (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). Because partnerships almost always draw on existing educational resources, members need to see the partnership as value-added and not drawing off other institutional priorities. Knowing how they will benefit is a prime motivator for participants. If the age old question, "What's in it for my organization?" is clearly communicated by senior leaders or champions located elsewhere in the institution, commitment is higher, motivations is sustained, and creative strategies for accomplishing goals are developed rather than members engaging in defensive posturing and "turf protection." (Amey, 2010).

Lodish and Weitz (1987) and Swyer and Oh (1988) suggest that input into decisions and goal formulation are important aspects of participation that help partnerships succeed.

Conflict Resolution Techniques

Conflict often exists in inter-institutional relationships due to the inherent interdependencies between parties. Given that a certain amount of conflict is expected, an understanding of how such conflict is resolved is important and has implications for partnership success. The organization must build agreements that are mutually beneficial while working through the conflict that collaboration, by its very nature, causes (Dent, 2006). Desiring to win conflicts can doom a partnership to failure (Dent, 2006). When parties engage in joint problem solving, whereby grievances are aired and the underlying issues are brought to the surface, a mutually satisfactory solution may be reached, thereby enhancing partnership success (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). The partners' ability to take the other's perspective and attempt to reconcile differences improves problem solving (Mohr & Spekman, 1994).

Avoiding the use of smoothing over problems or severe resolution tactics were also linked to partnership success (Mohr & Spekman, 1994). These conflict resolution techniques are somewhat at odds with the norms and values espoused in more successful strategic partnerships and do not fit with the more proactive tone of a partnership in which problems of one party become problems affective both parties. As a result, smoothing or avoiding fails to go to the root cause of the conflict and tends to undermine the partnership's goal of mutual gain.

The literature provides insight into the characteristics of successful partnerships in both business and higher education (Amey, 2010; Amey, Eddy, & Campbell, 2010; Dent, 2006; Gabarro, 1987; Gray, 1989; Huber and Daft, 1987; Leveille, 2006; Lodish & Weitz, 1987; Luhmann, 1988; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Ostrom, 1990; Pruitt, 1981; Swyer & Oh, 1988;

Tonkiss & Passey, 1999; Williamson, 1985). Although there are a number of studies, a core group of characteristics emerge from the literature as key to partnership success:

Theme	Characteristic
Partnership attributes	• coordination • commitment • trust and respect
Communication behavior	• communication quality • information sharing • participation
Conflict resolution techniques	• joint problem solving • avoidance of destructive conflict resolution tactics (i.e. domination, harsh words, smoothing over/avoiding problems)

I used these frequently cited characteristics of successful partnerships to guide my research and serve as a conceptual framework.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODS

Introduction

This chapter details how I explored the experience of managers working at a college or university engaged in an inter-institutional partnership. I wanted to better understand the context of their environment guided by the characteristics of partnership success described in the previous chapters. Specifically, my research questions are: Guided by the characteristics of partnership success, how do managers who work at a college or university engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership perceive this model of educational collaboration? What benefits do they perceive this model of organization provides to the institutions? What factors do they perceive as essential for sustaining the collaboration over time?

Research Design

Case Study Method

Case studies in qualitative research are investigations of "bounded systems" with the focus being either the case or an issue illustrated by the case(s) (Stake, 1995). The general design of a case study can be represented by a funnel (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998). The start of the study is the wide end. As Bogdan and Biklen (1998) describe, researchers look for possible places and categories or groups of people that might be the subject or source of data, find the location they think they want to study and then search widely trying to judge the feasibility of the site or data source for their purposes. They look for clues on how they might proceed and what might be feasible to do. They begin to collect data, simultaneously reviewing them, and making decisions about where to go with the research. They decide how to distribute their time, whom to interview, and what to explore in depth. Researchers may discard old ideas and plans and develop new ones based on their preliminary work. They continually modify the design and chose procedures as they learn more about the topic of study. In time, they make specific decisions on what aspect of the setting, subject, or data source they will study. Their work finally develops a focus. Research and interview questions are formulated. The data collection and research activities narrow to particular sites, subjects, materials, topics, questions and themes. From broad exploratory beginnings, the case study process moves to more directed data collection and analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1998).

The defining feature of a case study is its holistic approach—it aims to capture all of the details of a particular individual or group that are relevant to the purpose of the study, within a real life context. The study can be explanatory, exploratory, or descriptive (Gall, et al., 2007; Yin, 2003). My case study is primarily exploratory and descriptive.

Stake (2000) points out that when illuminating the purpose of a case study, the researchers should be sure to answer the question, why would a constituent population want a particular remedy or body of knowledge derived from the research? This refers to why this research would be of interest to the target audience. My research is important for two broad reasons. There are multiple stakeholders who could benefit from this research and the conditions that exist in higher education will likely increase the size of the environment in which results of this research could be transferred. The stakeholders of this issue are many and varied. They include the colleges and universities themselves and higher education in general. Additionally, there is no indication in the higher education literature, or from my daily observation of the higher education environment, to suggest any increase in the public support of higher education.

Therefore, any best practices recommended by this research will enjoy an ever-growing audience over time.

Site Selection

In Ohio, three of the major state institutions have partnership arrangements between one or more of their extended or branch campuses and a two-year college. These branch campuses are co-located with and have some level of collaboration with a technical college. Co-located campuses, an organizational model where a technical college and a branch campus of the university operate at the same campus physical plant, came into being in Ohio during the early 1960s, when the state failed to pass legislation creating a comprehensive community college system (Katsinas, Colon, Johnson, Sanders, & Thompson, 1999). The four regional campuses of The Ohio State University, the two regional campuses of Ohio University, and one of Kent State University's regional campuses all share their campuses with a separate technical college (Ohio Board of Regents, 2004).

The Ohio State University is one of the largest universities in the nation (63,964 students) and is the flagship institution in Ohio. Founded in 1870 as the state's land-grant institution, The Ohio State University consistently ranks among our nation's top public research universities, integrating teaching and learning with research and community service. Ohio State has multiple locations throughout Ohio: the main campus in Columbus; regional campuses in Lima, Mansfield, Marion, and Newark; and, the Agricultural Technical Institute and Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center in Wooster. *U.S News & World Report* ranks Ohio State 19th among the nation's public universities. The National Science Foundation places Ohio State seventh nationally among public research universities based on the amount of its research expenditures, which now stand at some $720 million annually. The *Washington Monthly* college rankings, which evaluate contributions to society based on factors of social mobility, cutting-edge research, and service to the country by their graduates, place Ohio State 12th in the nation and 10th among public universities (Ohio State University Profile, 2012).

The four regional campuses of The Ohio State University and each campus's partner technical college are identified below along with general demographic information about each of the institutions.

Table 2

Demographics of Ohio State's Regional Campuses & Technical College Partners

Co-located Institutions	
The Ohio State University at Lima Total Enrollment = 1,530 Expenses = $16,553,459 Total Employees = 113 Total Full-Time Faculty = 41	James A. Rhodes State College Total Enrollment = 4,281 Expenses = $31,111,370 Total Employees = 223 Total Full-Time Faculty = 112
The Ohio State University at Mansfield Total Enrollment = 1,405 Expenses = $18,294,574 Total Employees = 119 Total Full-Time Faculty = 43	North Central State College Total Enrollment = 3,635 Expenses = $25,838,573 Total Employees = 193 Total Full-Time Faculty = 67
The Ohio State University at Marion Total Enrollment = 1,816 Expenses = $18,450,190 Total Employees = 119 Total Full-Time Faculty = 38	Marion Technical College Total Enrollment = 2,764 Expenses = $17,050,740 Total Employees = 126 Total Full-Time Faculty = 46
The Ohio State University at Newark Total Enrollment = 2,562 Expenses = $23,168,574 Total Employees = 152 Total Full-Time Faculty = 56	Central Ohio Technical College Total Enrollment = 4,508 Expenses = $33,221,092 Total Employees = 199 Total Full-Time Faculty = 61

Source: 2010 IPEDS

Each of Ohio State's regional campuses was established in the late 1960s and each of their respective, co-located technical colleges was established in the late 1960s or early 1970s. Each of the co-located institutional pairs is governed independently and each maintains its individual mission, faculty, curriculum, and students. All of the campuses have some shared facilities. For example, Ohio State Mansfield and North Central State College share their student engagement center and there recreation center. Ohio State Marion and Marion Technical College share their library and the student center and Marion Technical College holds a few classes in Morrill Hall, Ohio State classroom building. All of the institutional pairs share staff in some areas. For instance, Ohio State Mansfield and North Central State College share staff costs for employees in the areas of facilities, grounds, maintenance, public safety, and student life. Ohio State Marion and Ohio State Lima share staff costs for maintenance, grounds, and housekeeping with their respective co-located technical college partner.

Although there are many similarities, the relationship with the co-located two-year institution differs among Ohio State's four regional campuses (Freeman, MacDonald, Rose, & Snyder, 2008). These partnerships have all been in existence for decades; however, the depth and breadth of the sharing taking place at the paired institutions are not consistent. Based upon conversations with the human resource professionals (HRPs) at each of the Ohio State extended campuses (W. Clark, K. Stimpert, & Mundey, personal communication, December 7, 2012), the cooperative arrangements between Ohio State Marion, Ohio State Mansfield, and Ohio State Lima with their respective co-located technical colleges seem to be more reflective of management by contract than of the affiliation or partnership type of collaboration. At these campuses, the technical colleges have contracted with Ohio State to provide specified services, such as maintenance, grounds, and public safety. The employees see themselves as Ohio State employees only and do not consider themselves to be affiliated with or accountable to the technical colleges. Further, the HRPs at Marion and Lima indicated that the relationship between the senior leader on their campuses and the president of their respective technical college is strained. There is a lack of trust and limited interest on the part of the technical college presidents to further the sharing relationship.

In contrast, Ohio State Newark and its co-located technical college, Central Ohio Technical College (COTC), functions more as an affiliation or partnership. These two institutions share substantially more functional areas of operations than the other institutional pairs and the institutional leaders are strongly committed to their partnership. They share a 175-acre campus, all buildings and general purpose classrooms in Newark, over 120 staff employees, operating expenses and a number of capital equipment investments. Shared departments include human resources, student life, facilities, development, business and finance, the library, marketing and public relations, information technology and athletics. Both institutions maintain separate operating budgets which included, in fiscal year 2010, over $11 million of "shared" expenses. As a further demonstration of the depth of the partnership, all COTC faculty and staff have access to Ohio State's medical and health benefits.

Number of Staff at COTC & Ohio State Newark		
Ohio State Newark Only	Shared	COTC Only
51	125 (59 OSU-paid and 66 COTC-paid)	64

Source: COTC & Ohio State Newark Office of Human Resources, January 2013

I conducted my research at The Ohio State University at Newark and Central Ohio Technical College (COTC). The sharing between these two institutions is extensive and their commitment to the ongoing relationship seems apparent based on the survival of the partnership for more than 40 years. Further, senior managements' dedication to the partnership is broadly and publically documented in each of the institution's strategic plan documents. As stated by the former chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents, Eric Fingerhut, and cited in *Celebrating the Journey* (Wulfhorst, et. al., 2011),

> The benefits of this cost-sharing system are significant and the efficiencies gained are impressive. Equally impressive is that this agreement has been sustained for over forty years. While many institutions struggle with merely being good neighbors, they view their ongoing partnership as an opportunity to better serve their community. The value that they place on this relationship is evidenced in their daily interactions and is noted in their strategic plans. The strong partnership between COTC and Ohio State Newark serves as a mode in the state (p. 156).

I selected the Newark campus as the focus of my study. Yin (2003) describes several circumstances under which the single-case study is an appropriate design. My single case selection is guided by one of Yin's rationales for single-case designs—*extreme* or *unique case*. The Newark campus represents a rare case of a substantial, long-standing partnership between a large research institution and a technical college that is worth documenting and analyzing. The high level of cooperation and collaboration between the two institutions has resulted in the partnership being viewed as a model in the state. My aim is to illuminate this particular situation to get a close, in-depth understanding of it. I chose the single case design due to the depth and breadth of the partnership on the Newark campus. Although the other Ohio State campuses have relationships with their technical college campus partners, their collaborations are significantly different from and appear to be much more limited in scope than the partnership on the Newark campus.

Data Collection

The use of the case study allowed me to delve deep into the world of managers in a long-term inter-institutional partnership to learn about their experiences. I collected data from interviews with managers working at the partnering institutions and from relevant documents and archival materials. This section outlines the identification of interviewees, and the interview protocol, and the collection of archival materials and documents.

Identification of interview respondents. Qualitative research interviews are necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them (Merriam, 2009). They allow you to understand something from the subjects' point of view and to uncover the meaning of their experiences. They are conversations with structure and purpose that are defined and controlled by the researcher yet they are based on the conversations of everyday life. They allow people to convey to others a situation from their own perspective and in their own words. Therefore, the purpose of interviewing is to allow us to enter into the other person's perspective (Patton, 2002, pp. 340-341). Although the research interview may not lead to objective information, it captures many of the subjects' views on something. That is why the basic subject matter is not object data, but consists of meaningful relations to be interpreted.

The goal of this project was to provide insight to presidents, deans, and managers on the perceptions of administrators whose role is to support and sustain the inter-institutional partnership. My research explored the perception of managers and directors engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership and discuss their perceptions of the work environment and of factors that affect the ongoing success of the collaborations. My study involved a preliminary descriptive examination of the attitudes and perceptions of full-time managers and directors employed at the institutional pair in order to uncover significant factors characteristic of the successful partnership. Interviews were used as my primary data source. I conducted semi-structured interviews were conducted with twelve key managers and administrators.

I used both the unique and snowball purposeful sampling techniques to select a small group of individuals who could respond knowledgeably about the partnership. Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the researcher wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned (Merriam, 2009). It involves selecting subjects who I determine possess the characteristics I seek. A unique sample is based on unique, atypical attributes of the phenomenon (Merriam, 2009). The snowball sampling strategy involves locating a few key participants who easily meet the criteria for participating in the study and as these early key participants are interviewed, they are asked to refer the researcher to other participants. In my research this meant identifying managers/supervisors meeting the parameters I selected and asking respondents for people who might see things differently.

Individuals who are key to sustaining the campus's inter-institutional relationship and who can offer either a historical or contemporary perspective were invited to participate in the study. I was interested in talking with those individuals who hold director- or manager-level positions who are responsible for key core functions of the institution(s). To capture the perceptions of managers from the partnering institutions, both shared managers and administrators who are employees of the single institutions were invited to participate in the study. I interviewed three managers from each institution who are employees of the single institutions and six shared employees. As discussed in Chapter 2, shared services are an important component of any collaboration. As such, I selected participants who are working in shared roles. Interview respondents working in shared roles included the director of student life, the superintendent of facilities and operations, the director of the library, the director of information and technology services, the bursar, and the director of financial aid. In areas that are not shared, such as admissions, advising and learning support, I invited the individuals that hold comparable positions at each of the two institutions to participate. Participants included the director of enrollment management, the director of advising, the director of the writing center, the director of Gateway operations, the Gateway manager of advising, and the director of the center for academic success. See Table 3 for a distribution of study participants by institutional affiliation. Respondents for this study must have worked at the campus for three (3) years in their respective leadership roles. Participants were invited by emails describing the research and requesting their involvement.

Table 3

Interviews by Institution

Affiliation	# of Participants
Shared	6
Central Ohio Technical College Only	3
The Ohio State University at Newark Only	3

Interview Protocol. Using semi-structured interviews as the primary data source, I employed a qualitative study of the attitudes and perceptions of managers and directors employed at the partnering institutions. My semi-structured questioning was framed by the factors synthesized from the literature. I used an interview protocol that examined the manager's perception of cooperation, collaboration, commitment, respect, trust, communication behavior, and conflict resolution approaches and techniques. The general strategy for the interviews was to start off with broad questions and follow up on the interviewee's responses to capture her or his meanings and to avoid imposing my meanings on the interviewee. I asked participants questions using a semi-structured interview script (Appendix A) to control for researcher bias. The interview protocol prompted the study participants to share their perceptions of the effectiveness, benefits, challenges, limitations of this inter-institutional collaboration model, Often, with only an occasional question from me for clarification, the respondents talked about a wide variety of topics throughout an extended interview. Each respondent allowed tape-recording of the interview and each person who agreed to interview was asked to read and sign an informed consent form prior to participating and was promised complete anonymity. The interviews ranged from 35 to 95 minutes with an average of 60 minutes.

I collected field notes in conjunction with the interviews, follow-up interviews, observations, and casual encounters with participants. I also wrote memoranda while listening to taped interviews, typing transcripts, and reflecting upon a particular interview. In addition to the interviews and follow-up interviews, I obtained other data throughout the study, such as documents or other materials subjects cared to give to me, and ongoing literature review.

Documents. Publically available institutional documents were used as my second data source. Prior to the onset of interviews, I conducted a thorough examination of archival documents to guide the development of interview protocol. Documents included the Collaboration Agreements between The Ohio State University and Central Ohio Technical College; reports, such as the Cost-Share Agreement Comparison for OSU Regional Campuses and the Results through Productivity report; the strategic plans of both COTC and Ohio State's regional campuses; speeches and public comments; letters and memos, and websites. This research, coupled with the intense review of the relevant literature summarized in Chapter 2, provided me with a deep understanding of the inter-institutional relationship, enabling me to ask informed questions of the interview subjects.

Data Analysis/Coding Techniques

The analysis phase of a case study, like most qualitative methods, is not linear and generally occurs in several, overlapping phases (Leedy, 1997). Ongoing data analysis took place throughout the study and I employed both inductive and deductive analysis. All interviews were transcribed and all of the taped interviews, memoranda, and field notes have been retained and form the case-study database.

My deductive analysis included comparing the findings from the interviews and extant data to the themes and characteristics for successful inter-institutional collaborations synthesized from the literature in Chapter 2. The primary themes for successful inter-institutional collaborations found in the literature include attributes of the partnership including trust, respect, commitment and coordination; effective communication behaviors such as sharing information, participating, and high quality communications; and techniques used to effectively manage conflict such as joint problem solving and avoiding the use of destructive conflict resolution tactics such as domination, harsh works, and/or smoothing over or avoiding problems.

For the inductive approach, I used the constant comparative method of data analysis that was developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). The constant comparative method begins with a particular incident from an interview, field notes, or documents and compares it with another incident in the same set of data or in another set. These comparisons lead to tentative categories that are then compared to each other and to other instances. Comparisons are constantly made within and between levels of conceptualization until a theory can be formulated (Merriam, 2009).

Statements from each transcribed interview were read and coded by the researcher. Coding is a progressive process of sorting and defining collected data and putting like-minded pieces together into data clumps to create an organizational framework (Glesne & Peshkin, 1992). I began coding with the initial a priori themes, but I also used the constant comparative method to identify additional emergent themes. Individual interview transcripts were coded using general keywords like leadership, culture, complexity, communication, community, respect, mission, pride, and history that were used by the respondents that fit the collaboration success factor categories identified in the literature. This method was used to generate codes first for one interview, and then for the next. With each subsequent interview, additional codes emerged and were added to the code list. When all interviews were coded, I returned to the first interview and recode all interviews using the full range of codes on the list. I then read through coded responses again to verify accuracy of the codes initially assigned. Connections between categories and themes were used to further my understanding of the shared employee's world and to shape the organization of the data for portrayal in my final document. These codes were sorted to identify "major codes" or categories. Each major code or category became a central concept or idea. Ultimately, I distilled these inductive and deductive themes into five main themes: community expectations, leadership, identity, time, and complexity.

Trustworthiness

Validity, reliability, and ethics are of major concerns in any research study. It is important that researchers, especially qualitative researchers, convey the steps they will take to check for the accuracy and credibility of their findings (Creswell, 2003; Gall et. al., 2007; Merriam, 1988). These checks help determine if the findings are accurate from the standpoint of the researcher, the participant or the readers of an account. How well this is accomplished lends an air of trustworthiness and authenticity to the study (Creswell, 2003). *Triangulation* was used to enhance the trustworthiness of the findings. By using multiple sources of data, such as interviews, observations, and documents, the credibility of the study is strengthened. In addition, redundancy of data gathering will be considered to help clarify meaning and verify the repeatability or saturation of an interpretation (Creswell, 2003; Gall et. al., 2007; Stake, 2000).

Case study research is interpretative research, with the inquirer typically involved in a sustained and intensive experience with participants (Creswell, 2003). My specific role was of participant-observer (McMillan & Schumacher, 2001). However, as a shared employee of Central Ohio Technical College and Ohio State Newark, I am not a disinterested observer. I have considerable experience working at the campus with responsibility for institutional planning, human resources, and marketing and public relations. My duties as administrator require me to engage with other managers/supervisors and faculty and staff at all levels at a shared site. I periodically visit different regional campuses and interact with faculty and staff of other co-located institutions. This relationship introduced a range of strategic, ethical and personal issues in to the qualitative research process.

As the primary “measuring instrument’ (Gall et. al., 2007) in this case study, my professional and practitioner perspective of a shared campus was invaluable. Being a member of the campus community provided easier access to study participants, many of whom felt more comfortable accepting the invitation to participate in the study due to our working relationship. My professional relationship with the interview participants allowed me to instantly build rapport with them, enabling them to give good insight into their perspectives of the partnership. However, my close relationship with the topic and the research subjects may have drawbacks. Creswell (2003) warns that “backyard” research is fraught with difficulty. For instance, since the study participants see me as a colleague, they may be less likely to offer negative perspectives on the institutions and the partnership. With these concerns in mind, I explicitly identified my biases, values and personal interests about the research topic and process (Creswell, 2003) and used appropriate measures to develop trustworthiness and credibility. Techniques employed to enhance the trustworthiness of my study included using a peer debriefer, providing a thick description of interview data to let the reader decide, and seeking rival explanations in my analysis. The use of these techniques served to mitigate the inherent biases I have as a participant-observer.

Since I am an administrator at the campus under study, being a "detached observer" was difficult. Therefore, in order to increase reliability and validity, I employed a peer debriefer to talk through themes and comment on emerging findings. I used peer debriefing to enhance credibility and to assist with the progress of the research during data gathering, analysis, and writing. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985), peer debriefing can fulfill multiple functions:

> …the debriefer is essentially a noninvolved professional peer with whom the inquirer(s) can have a no-holds-barred conversation at periodic intervals. The purposes of the debriefing are multiple: to ask the difficult questions that the inquirer might otherwise avoid ("to keep the inquirer honest"), to explore methodological next steps with someone who has no axe to grind, and to provide sympathetic listening point for personal catharsis. (p. 283)

In this study, the peer debriefer helped me to see trends "from a distance," give thoughtful reflection on methodological issues, suggest relevant books and articles, and help me to "keep on track." I meet on a regular basis with a fellow doctoral candidate, who is at approximately the same point in his qualitative research project.

The communication of the findings is a critical phase of case study research. The case study final report generally takes the form of a rich, descriptive narrative that attempts to reconstruct the respondents' reality and enhances the authenticity of the research. The presentation style of my findings should draw the reader closely into the respondents' world and give the discussion the feel of shared experiences (Creswell, 2003; Gall, et. al., 2007; Stake, 2000).

Finally, in order to further enhance the credibility of my research findings, I examined rival explanations. During the interview and data analysis process, I engaged in a systematic search for alternative themes and divergent patterns (Patton, 2002). I looked for other ways to organize data and thought about other possible ways of seeing the data. The aim was to look for data that supported other explanations or ways of seeing and understanding the setting of study and the data collected that were in contrast to my predisposition as a member of the campus community.

Summary

Using the case study method, I examined the experiences of managers employed at a college or university engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership. I wanted to better understand the context of their managerial work setting. Using the characteristics of partnership success synthesized from the literature as a framework, I attempted to determine how managers and directors perceive the effectiveness of the partnership and explored their experiences. From this effort I am hopeful that my findings produced a clearer picture of the inter-institutional collaborative environment that higher-education institutions can establish to enhance these relationships at their campuses.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

Introduction

The findings described in this chapter were a result of research data collected using the qualitative methodology discussed in Chapter 3. Data were collected using semi-structured, in-person interviews with key respondents and review of extent data received from the key respondents and archival documents provided by the institutions. In the following section, I examine the managers' perceptions of and experiences in the shared campus environment to answer the outlined research questions. The qualitative findings of this study are organized by five themes: community expectations, leadership, identity, time, and complexity. These themes reveal a range of perceptions related to the partnership and are related to the a priori themes of successful collaboration characteristics identified in the literature and discussed in Chapter 2. For example, the leadership theme aligns closely with the success characteristics of senior management support and commitment; while the time theme emerged from the a priori themes of coordination, trust, and communication.

Community Expectation

The expectations of the communities served by the institutions were a common topic in my interviews with both shared managers and those participants who worked for only one of the institutions. The expectations of the community serve to reinforcement the partnership model. Managers perceive that the community sees the partnership as an important asset to the community and that the community *expects* the two institutions to collaborate in this way for increased efficiency with scarce resources. The study participants believe that the uniqueness of the partnership powerfully appeals to community members and results in stronger investiture by the community in both financial support and connection to the campus.

Many of the study participants talked about the importance of the partnership to the community. Participants expressed their belief that the partnership benefits both institutions as well as the community. They cited not only the advantages from an institutional perspective like the cost savings that are realized from operating the shared campus in terms of overhead, personnel, and resources, but also the benefits from a community perspective as well. From a community perspective, the partnership is powerful. Having the partnership between a four-year regional campus of a large research institution and a two-year technical college enables the institutions to send a strong message when they are out in the community. The institutions are able to promote the partnership as a campus that is able to provide multiple pathways that students can take to realize their educational aspirations (OSU, 2012). Via the partnership, students have more opportunities that might not be available otherwise. One participant cited free tutoring and dorms on campus as amenities available to COTC students that most likely would not be afforded to technical college students if the institution was standing alone. The partnership enables the institutions to serve students in many ways. One respondent stated, “if it’s not a good fit for an Ohio State student then we have an alternative for them right here. That’s a good thing.”

The uniqueness of the partnership is very appealing to community members and has resulted in strong philanthropic support from the community. Study participants believe that the community financially supports both institutions more readily then they would a single institution because they appreciate the efficiencies that the shared campus provides. One participant commented, “I’m not sure that the money for anything has ever come from one place versus another so much; a lot of it has been pooled and a lot of it has been donated by the community because we have always been this kind of cool animal of being a dual function campus.” Through the review of the existing data and interviews with participants, it is clear that the campus enjoys strong financial support from the community. One of the shared managers commented on the importance the community places on the campus functioning as a whole, rather than two separate institutions, stating, “The community supports the campus as a whole, I think. I’m saying there are people that give to each institution but I think they see us as a whole. When a community sees you as a whole unit, then that contributes to that whole unit. I think the people in the community see it as a campus of two colleges and not Ohio State and COTC separately.” Community members are more likely to financial support the campus if they feel it is a good investment. One manager commented, “The local community really appreciates [the campus] …and I think they have a good understanding of what an asset we are in the community, and how efficient we are. We were already being held up as a model in the state and other places as this is how you can really operate efficiently. So there was a lot of investiture in that.” Respondents perceive that members of the community expect the institutions to maximize their resources and believe that sharing these resources is more efficient and a better investment for their philanthropic support.

Additionally, study participants perceive that members of the community have a strong connection to the campus and believe that the community has ownership in the campus. Participants from both institutions voiced their belief that the historical foundation of the campus is key to the partnership’s long-term sustainability. When the technical colleges were established in Ohio in the early 1970s, the decision was made at the state level to locate them on the branch campuses of the universities (Katsinas et al., 1999). Many of my study participants indicated that local community members played a critical role in getting Ohio State to locate one of its smaller campuses in Licking County and in bringing COTC to the campus five years later. When COTC opened its doors in 1971, it was established on the campus with Ohio State Newark. From the beginning, the boards of trustees for both institutions were committed to a relationship that went beyond just sharing a physical campus. Consistent with the initial agreement between the two institutions (OSU, 1971), the study participants talked about the institutional leaders having a shared vision when they established COTC that the two institutions would work together, and a sharing formula for the institutions was developed at the onset. As a result, study participants perceive that the institutions' commitment to the relationship has been embedded into the foundation and groundwork of the partnership. Since the partnership has been in existence for over 40 years, many of the study participants stated that "this is how this [the partnership] was originated with the founders. It was started off together and that continues. It is all we've known and we support it."

Leadership

Study participants attributed much of the long-term success of the collaboration between Ohio State Newark and COTC to leadership. The partnership model of inter-institutional collaboration provides for each institution to maintain its own chief executive officer. At COTC, the institutional leader is the president. At Ohio State Newark, it is the dean and director. The Ohio State Newark dean and director is a tenured faculty member that reports to the university provost located on the Columbus campus. The COTC president reports to a fiduciary board. The Ohio State Newark dean and director is a 49 year-old male and the COTC president is a 66 year-old female. Respondents indicated that the attitudes and behaviors of the two institutional leaders serve as strong indicators of their commitment to the partnership. Their actions, such as physically sharing space and frequently being seen together, visibly demonstrate the leaders' commitment to the partnership and serve to reinforce their spoken words. One participant's comments captured the sentiments expressed by both shared and non-shared managers about the importance of leadership to the success of the partnership:

> I think it [the sustainability of the partnership] comes from the leadership. They had a shared vision. Even from, you know, this was from before I was even born, but when they established COTC, the thought had always been that the two institutions would work together. And they've held onto that, that vision of two campuses. We have two very different missions, but we have a shared goal of educating students. We have a shared goal of serving the community. And I think between the way the campuses were established, what the original purpose was, and the ongoing leadership, that we've been able to continue that mission forward. It's really helped with our success.

Managers perceive that the high level of cooperation between Ohio State Newark and COTC is a result of the behavior of the two institutional leaders. Participants perceive that the professional management and attitudes of upper administration have a lot to do with the institutions' ability to work things out and fully collaborate. As different as the institutions are, there is no appearance of strife or vying for position. The leaders conduct themselves professionally which includes always thinking about the other institution, not just the COTC side thinking about COTC's welfare or the OSU side thinking about OSU's welfare. One respondent commented that, "The passion that they have for working together, the teamwork. I mean it's just that camaraderie and everything that really brings people together." Another respondent described this behavior as "goodwill," stating, "I think goodwill is kind of a uniform institutional value on both sides of the house and I have to think that that comes from the individuals too. It's a matter again of professional conduct, to not share your doubts, or your misgivings or your stints or your fits or your conflicts. But I think it's good judgment."

Institutional leaders are committed to the partnership and want it to be successful. One manager aptly described the feelings of many of the study participants by stating, "The partnership is successful because we have people in place who think it should be successful." Participants perceive that there is a very strong commitment from the institutional leaders that "we're gonna make this [the partnership] work" and that is the expectation that flows down through the ranks of the organization. Campus leaders' commitment to the partnership's effectiveness is somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophecy. Their ongoing demonstration of commitment to the partnership reinforces their expectation that faculty and staff make the partnership a priority, giving the partnership a greater chance of long-term sustainability.

Interview respondents talked extensively about the role leaders plays in maintaining the partnership over the long-term. They indicated that the executive leaders are strongly committed to the partnership and demonstrate their commitment in a variety of ways. According to many respondents, one of the most effective ways in which they demonstrate their commitment to the partnership is visually. The two leaders intentionally find ways to *show* that they are partners. Almost all of the study participants commented that the two leaders physically share space. The executive offices are located in the same suite. This physical sharing of space symbolizes the importance of the partnership. One participant shared that he perceived that the physical sharing of the executive suite "symbolized connectivity, a sharing arrangement, an expectation, a modeling perspective."

Respondents noted that in addition to sharing an office suite, the two leaders make a point to be seen together. There are a number of campus meetings and events each year at which employees from both institutions participate. During these meetings, the two leaders are often in front of the group together and are interacting collectively. At many community events, they are often seen together or are seated at the same table. Being seen together is perceived by the study participants as one way in which the leaders demonstrate their ongoing commitment to the partnership between the two institutions.

On issues that impact both institutions, there are many times when the two leaders speak collectively with a single voice. One respondent noted, "You don't usually hear one perspective from one leader and a different perspective form the other leaders and then have to make some kind of sense from all that. It is usually more unified." Another participant noted their collective voice in written communications. Several of the managers noted that, many times, if an issue impacts both institutions and the campus as a whole, the leaders are very intentional in putting out a joint communication that includes both of their signatures.

Additionally, the two institutional leaders support each other. Study participants voiced their belief that each of the leaders has a genuine interest in the other's work, even on those matters that are not shared. The leaders not only participate together on events that impact both institutions but they also support each other's independent efforts. One respondent noted, "Any time there is anything on campus, they go to each other's things."

The leaders are effective in creating a culture that nurtures the partnership and the leaders model behavior that supports both institutions. Study participants perceive the leaders to be genuine in their commitment to and support of the partnership and their respect for each other. A number of participants commented that they had never heard either of the leaders talk in a negative way about the partnership or about one or the other of the institutions. One respondent said, "I really do think you get the walk and the talk. It's not one where the leadership espouses

’yes, the partnership is really important‘ and then behind it, they talk down about it in some sort of way. That doesn’t seem to happen.” Further, leaders insist on positive conduct and behavior in regard to the partnership and do not tolerate behavior that is not supportive of the relationship. One respondent recounted a situation in which she expressed her displeasure with a situation with the other institution whereby the leader immediately challenged her comments:

> One time, I had one of those emotional bleed-throughs that you try to keep under control at all times but every now and then and so I was and it was one of those times when I kind of felt that [the other institution] was poaching a little bit and I was talking to [my manager] and I just outright complained. You know, I didn’t present it as a problem to be solved, but I don’t know why I did it, I just I went in and we were talking about a number of issues and I just, I got a little angry and he was not patient with me about that, he said you know, he said that’s not the case. Here’s what is the case, very succinctly not betraying anybody’s confidence in any way and it was clear that he was not happy. And you know if we are going to have emotional bleed-throughs we can expect to be dealt with frankly. And he just, he could have just let it go because no one was in the office, there was no paper or anything, I had just had enough, but nope, not going to indulge, gave me the explanation I was entitled to and no more.

Another way the leaders create a culture that nurtures the partnership is by emphasizing the importance of the relationship between the two institutions. Both institutions publicly proclaim their commitment to the partnership in their respective strategic plans. In its strategic plan, Securing the future 2009-2013, COTC includes “Foster and advance mutually-beneficial, unique relationships with The Ohio State University and its Newark campus” as one of its seven strategic goals, with the objective of optimizing the relationship and efficiencies with The Ohio

State University at Newark. The strategic plan for the Regional Campus Cluster of The Ohio State University (2013), which includes Ohio State Newark, also references the unique relationship with the technical colleges:

> Each of Ohio State's four smaller campuses is co-located with one or more of Ohio's two-year colleges. The co-located institutions share resources and connect programs to provide multiple pathways for student education. These partnerships extend the available range of educational offerings from certificates and associate degrees at the two-year colleges to associate's, bachelor's, and graduate degrees at Ohio State. This creates more opportunities for students, reduces resource redundancy, and promotes the effective use of state fiscal, physical, and personnel resources.

As part of the planning process, Ohio State Newark prepares an annual campus implementation plan that outlines strategies and initiatives to achieve their strategic goals. These plans routinely include references to the partnership and opportunities to further develop shared resources. For example, one of the included strategies is to "Work with COTC to encourage dual admission, limit course duplication, and address remediation" (The Ohio State University at Newark, 2013). Referencing the relationship in their respective strategic plans places the partnership as a top priority, helping to establish a culture that supports and nurtures the relationship between the institutions.

Study participants perceive that both institutional leaders demonstrate a genuine respect for each other and the other institution. They perceive that the leaders model that respect by constantly considering each other and the interests of the other institution before making a decision. The leaders consult with each other before making a final decision that would impact the other. They work together and have a shared vision for the campus. One respondent commented, “I think they are both really, really conscious of the other school’s mission and I think they really try hard not to infringe.”

Consistent with the Agreement between the two institutions (OSU, 1979), the managers believe that the institutional leaders work together and meet on an ongoing basis and collaborate on matters that impact the campus. One participant emphasized the leaders’ demonstrated commitment to collaboration, saying, “They both are at the table when it comes to budget time, they jointly review our requests whether they are operational or capital. They’re both informed and they want to be informed on certain cost-shared endeavors.” Another example that was commonly cited by the study participants was the leaders’ collaborative work on the institutions’ master plan, called the Framework Plan. One of the COTC study participants noted that although this planning effort was facilitated by The Ohio State University, both parties (COTC and Ohio State Newark) were always around the table together. She noted,

> [Campus leader] is always very interested in working with COTC on different partnerships when they’re doing framework planning and when they’re doing some of the long term planning for the campus in general. It’s always both parties around the table. It’s not Ohio State saying “well, we’re going to do this. Get on board or leave.” COTC and OSU are always in conversation about it.

Identity

As indicated in the section above, each of the partnering institutions maintains its own chief executive officer. Consistent with the initial sharing agreement between The Ohio State University and Central Ohio Technical College (The Ohio State University [OSU], 1971), this model of inter-institutional collaboration also allows each institution to maintain its own identity. Study participants offered insight on a number of divergent perspectives on institutional identity in connection with the partnership. They described identity within the partnership as having many different layers. Respondents described the ability for the institutions to maintain their individual identities and independent missions as a strength of this model of organization. The unique identify of the campus as one campus comprised of two independent institutions gives managers a sense of pride, resulting in greater job satisfaction. However, other examples were provided in which the partnership lead to the loss of identity for the individual institutions because of lack of clarity or merging of services and roles. Yet, participants were resistant to the prospect of true merger of the two institutions because they felt that it would diminish the specific mission of each institution and would result in the loss of individual identity. Being able to maintain each institution's individual identity was perceived by the study participants as important in order for each institution to be able to fulfill its specific mission and goals.

The study respondents acknowledged that the partnership model of inter-institutional collaboration allows the institutions to maintain their individual identities, yet at the same time, they indicated that the partnership may also lead to a lack of campus identity or confusion about the identity of each institution. The necessary attention that must constantly be given to ensure that each institution's individual identity is maintained makes the managers' jobs more difficult. Although the institutions share a campus, many of the managers agree that maintaining each institution's brand is important to achieving the institution's mission and goals. However, ensuring that each institution is appropriately branded and that its individual identity is maintained presents ongoing challenges to a number of the managers. One respondent noted,

> It goes back to preserving the branding, and the identity, and the priorities of...balancing that against the common infrastructure and the common environment that we're trying to provide for both institutions. It really comes down to preserving the identity and the priorities of each organization which are very different. And then doing that in a

> homogenous, single environment that you're trying to present, an infrastructure that you're trying to present for the entire organization. That's the most difficult thing that we struggle with here.

The identity of the campus as one campus with two independent institutions is perceived as a point of pride by the managers. The uniqueness of the partnership results in more fulfilling jobs for a number of the shared managers. Many of the managers, both shared and those working for just one of the institutions, felt that the shared campus environment provides additional opportunities and resources to individual employees and to the institutions that would not be available or realized if the institutions were operating independently. Study participants expressed that the partnership model provides opportunities to work in a wider variety of situations and with a larger number of individuals with different styles, allowing them to obtain a broader scope of experience. One respondent indicated that he found the work "more enriching" because every day, he found something different. He indicated that "if you like a challenge and a uniqueness and an opportunity to see something different, this [the partnership] is a very good way to do that." He further stated, "It is also a very good way from a work perspective, a professional development perspective, to build your skills and build your resume. It is an opportunity to say I've worked for two unique institutions simultaneously." Respondents also talked about the satisfaction they got from working for two distinct institutions. Drawing from her experience on the campus, one of the shared managers commented,

> I guess I just like being affiliated with both [institutions] because each has its own place, serve two totally different missions and each one of them is necessary. And it's nice to just be able to say you have relative reference to a four-year institution, you have reference to a two-year institution and you understand the differences between the two.

> You understand how it's different to be a two-year community college with open access and what kind of population that serves and what the differences mean versus a four-year where you have to have this certain GPA to even get in type of place. It's a different mix and it's good because it keeps you in the loop I think.

Related to the broader scope of experience offered by the partnership was the opportunity to engage with a wider variety of people from the two institutions, both employees and students. One manager stated that she felt that "the professional networking opportunity is greater because of it [the shared campus] and that's, from a personal perspective, an extremely positive thing." Of those who mentioned this unique opportunity to engage more broadly, one of the shared managers captures the general sentiment best when she says:

> Having the opportunity to interact with the people on a daily basis from both schools. I love learning all about the two-year school while also working for a four-year traditional school. I'm getting double the experience and there are different populations of students so you have a whole range of ages, socio-economic statuses, needs, so it's watching some of the students coming in with bigger challenges, watching them succeed. I'm proud to say I work here. Everything I do I'm satisfied with. It is interacting, working with both schools. It's an amazing experience.

Being associated with the unique model of organization provided a sense of pride for many of the study participants. Because the relationship is viewed as successful and is held up as a model of effectiveness, managers and supervisors are proud to be associated with the partnership. This sense of pride leads to greater job satisfaction for managers engaged in the partnership. One participant shared a story of one of the campus leaders showing a visitor around the campus and the sense of pride she felt about being associated with the shared campus:

> [Campus leader] tells the story that he was showing another dean or president of a small university around the campus and that they came to his office and they walked from his office to the quad, the green, and the person asked, “Now where is COTC?” And [campus leader] tells the story, “What do you mean where is COTC?” And the person said, “Where are the COTC buildings?” [Campus leader] responded, “Well, they are all campus buildings.” So satisfaction wise, out in the community, I am extremely proud to be able to say that.

Other study participants talked about what they have been able to accomplish as a result of the partnership and the sense of pride they gain from those accomplishments:

> This might sounds cocky...Being the best at what we do. I mean we’re held up as the model. Taking a very difficult, complex tech IT infrastructure and making it work for both organizations, and doing, and obtaining the efficiencies and the cost-savings that we do is hugely profitable uh to be able to do that. I think it comes back to the people. It’s just the teamwork and the camaraderie that we seem to have here at this campus between the two organizations. And that’s something to be very proud of.

Interview participants talked about their sense of personal pride resulting from employees on other shared campuses being envious of the relationship between COTC and Ohio State Newark. One manger commented, “I’ll tell you that my counterparts on the other regional campuses are envious. They wish that they could operate like we do. It’s kind of nice to be part of that”. Another manager commented similarly, stating,

> They [personnel working on the other Ohio State regional campuses] envy me immensely for the place I work. When somebody envies you, you’ve got to think, this is right. This is the right thing and it’s not pride like, negative thing. It’s just I know it’s the right thing

> and it's obviously the right thing because when I'm in Columbus with my colleagues they are all whining and complaining, nothing's good and nothing's right and I'm sitting there thinking everything's just fine thank you. It's successful.

Being able to provide increased opportunities to students via the partnership is another source of greater job satisfaction for many of the study participants. One of the COTC managers shared:

> I'm very satisfied. I'm very excited about the opportunities our COTC students have that they would not have had otherwise without the partnership. Ohio State is a 4-year college. They offer a lot of student activities, athletics, the housing on campus; all of that is here because of Ohio State. Our COTC students are able to partake in that because of our partnership. We have cost-shared divisions that will allow them to go to Italy, for example, or go and be involved in community service and do things that we may not have been able to sustain without this partnership. It's really exciting to know that with this partnership our students are able to have that college experience that they may not have had if they were going to just a stand-alone 2 year school. For me to be able to sit down with a student and "so okay you're struggling in a class, let me tell you what we can do for you as a college" and to be able to explain this is why we can do it. When a student comes in and they're "well, I've looked at all these other schools and they're so expensive, why are you guys so affordable?" To be able to say "well you know what we're affordable because we have a fabulous partnership with Ohio State." For me that's very satisfying to know that having the partnership with Ohio State has given our students opportunities they may not have had otherwise.

Many of the interview respondents felt that the institutions were able to be successful in their collaboration because there was a lack of competition between the two. Throughout the interview process, managers expressed their perception that the two institutions did not compete, but instead complement each other. The majority of the respondents do not perceive the two institutions as competitors. Consistent with the expectations outlined in the Agreement between the two institutions (OSU, 1979), the managers believe the partnership allows the institutions to be true to their independent missions while gaining efficiency from their collaboration. They expressed the ability to maintain separate missions as an importance characteristic of the partnership model of collaboration. The differences in student demographics at the two institutions are better served by maintaining the identities of each institution. As independent partners, the institutions can focus on their different missions and students benefit because they receive the individual perspective from that particular institution in a shared-campus environment. As described by one of the managers, "If I'm the four-year partner, what I do, I do very well. If I'm the two-year partner, I do what I do very well. But we will work together collaboratively to make both of our missions even more stellar then if we did one collaborative component."

Managers indicated that they felt that the institutional missions of the two institutions would be diluted and the capabilities of each institution would be diminished if the two institutions were merged into one. One manager expressed the importance of maintaining institutional identity, saying,

> It's important for COTC to be focused 100% on what it does best and OSU to be focused 100% on what it does best. If you tried to somehow merge them, I just feel that that would be diluted and not good for either institution. You have to maintain the identity

> and the pride and the mission of each organization. That's when they serve the students the best. If you try to bring them together, I just think that's going to be diluted.

Managers expressed that the two institutions would lose their individual identify and would not be able to build on their individual strengths if they were merged. They perceive that the institutions receive greater benefit from the partnership arrangement than they would from merging. Maintaining the institutional focus and mission of *both* institutions is critically important to the managers.

Some of the study participants perceive that the brand recognition of The Ohio State University plays an important role in the viability of the shared campus. Two of the managers believe that the loss of The Ohio State University identity would be devastating to the institutions. They believe that many students attend the campus due to the brand and if that was not maintained, enrollment and the success of the campus would suffer. One of the COTC managers commented,

> I don't think it would make sense to merge because our missions are very, very different. Ohio State already offers some associate degree programs, on this campus even, the associate of arts degree, but COTC's focus is the technical education. We have a very, very centralized focus. We want to get individuals trained for the workforce. We want to get them ready to go into a job and be successful on day one. And I think there's a danger of losing that technical side of the mission if we became just a state institution that offered both four-year and two-year degrees.

One manager in the study felt that a true merger would be more beneficial to the two institutions than the partnership arrangement. Although she stated that she did not believe that a merger would ever be possible due to Ohio State University's participation in the partnership, she indicated that she thought a merger would allow the campus to serve more of the needs that are within the community.

Time

All of the study participants talked about the partnership model and its relationship to the managers' time. Many of the shared managers expressed that the partnership model of inter-institutional collaboration required them to routinely allocate time to obtain "buy in" from both institutions, to dispel the perception of favoritism or unbalance, and to "check in" with one or the other of the institutions. Further, the partnership model required managers to spend time in duplicative or redundant meetings. Study participants expressed that time was a limitation of the partnership. They stated that they did not have enough time to focus on one or the other of the institutions, or to work more closely with students.

Managers working for both Ohio State Newark and COTC talked about the time required to get "buy in" from both institutions. Working for two institutions means having more people engaged in the decision making processes and balancing their differing needs, both of which requires additional time to ensure that both parties are in agreement and onboard with the decision. Because the institutions have different needs, their perspectives of what they want may different. More time is typically required to ensure that all of the perspectives are discussed. Two of the respondents specifically noted additional time was required because the partnership required a larger number of people participating in processes and decision making. They shared:

> I think it's [the partnership] a plus but certainly means time and maybe getting buy in isn't near as easy. Getting everybody on board with what you are trying to do…well it isn't as easy with two institutions. I don't think it is significantly more difficult because at the table are people from COTC and OSU. Their perspectives may be different but I

> don't think it's because there are two institutions. It's just that different needs have different perspectives. It's just more people.

Another respondent expressed similar sentiments:

> When there are projects that are one side of the house or the other, there are advantages and disadvantages. But when it's a cost shared project, especially when it is a high profile project, it tends to be a very big group. Because you have representation from both boards, both administrations, both faculties. See what I mean? It turns a small group into a very big group. You just have to manage that and it's got its challenges.

Additionally, respondents felt that the partnership requires them to constantly "check in" with the other institution before implementing a particular process or service to be sure that it is compatible with the interests and needs of the other institution. This additional time requirement added to the burden of the managers and was perceived as a possible compromise or concession resulting from the partnership model of collaboration, depending upon whether or not that particular service or process could be implemented based upon that check in.

Managers working for both institutions shared that they felt pressure to constantly demonstrate that their offices are working equally as hard for both institutions. Managers said that faculty and other employees had expressed their perception that employees in certain offices were not working as hard for their institution as they were for the other. These managers felt that they had to dedicate significant time to ensure that work was fairly distributed across the two institutions. Additionally, they spent time working to dispel the perception of favoritism or unbalance. Several managers shared that over the years they have received complaints that their offices do not do enough to serve a particular institution's students. Although all of the shared managers expressed that was not the case, they felt compelled to work to dispel that perception.

One manager stated that although she did not think their criticisms were valid, “it was a perception thing that I continuously tried to address.”

Although many of the offices are shared between the two institutions, many duties and responsibilities are not (OSU, 2012). This sometimes results in the staff having to spend time duplicating meetings or services for each institution. For example, separate student orientations are conducted for Ohio State Newark and for COTC by the financial aid staff. In order to maintain the identity and branding of each institution and to address the different processes and procedures with the students, separate orientation sessions are more appropriate. However, providing separate meetings results in a much higher workload which can result in managers’ perception that their work is more difficult in the shared environment.

Both managers working for only one of the partnering institutions and the shared managers believe that the amount of time they can focus on each of the institutions is more limited as a result of the shared model of inter-institutional collaboration. One of the shared managers expressed that working for two institutions resulted in him being less focused on each institution then he believed he would be if he were working for only one institution. He perceived that he could provide more emphasis and attention in his work if focusing on one institution and that he could perhaps be more effective if he did not have to spread his attention between the two institutions.

The increase volume resulting from the partnership is perceived by some managers to result in the inability to provide more personal service to the students. Participants commented that their colleagues on the other Ohio State regional campuses had the opportunity to get to know their students on a more personal level since they are dealing with a smaller student population. They felt that by doing so, those campuses perhaps provided a better, more engaged experience for their students. One of the shared managers explained,

> On the OSU side, if I did OSU only, I think I could…we might know our students more. When I'm with my regional colleagues, they know their students because they engage with them more, even when the student doesn't need to. I think they engage their students more. Students, when they need us, they come to us and I don't know many of them by name. It's not that we're not serving everyone; it's that we are serving twice the population than some of our other colleagues serve. I don't think that changes how we serve. We still serve everyone equally.

Complexity

Many of the managers perceive that the complexity of working within an inter-institutional partnership arrangement causes additional administrative challenges and makes their jobs more difficult. Different institutional personalities and styles, multiple points of focus, lack of boundary clarity, complexity of the financial structure, increased volume, and in some cases, duplication of services were identified as ways in which they perceive their jobs to be more difficult than if they were serving only one institution or working on a campus that was not shared.

The different institutional profiles and the style and personalities of the key characters of each institution (i.e. institutional leaders, faculty, students) contribute significantly to the complexity of the work performed by the managers. The partnership is between two different types of higher education institutions, each with a different mission and different student profiles. The ethos and culture of the two institutions are very different, given their different institutional types: a regional campus of a major research institution and a technical college. The governance structure of Ohio State Newark is consistent with that of a typical major research university in that faculty plan a significant role in decision making and governance. The regular faculty are tenured and tenure-track and typically hold terminal, doctoral degrees. In contrast, the technical college faculty are unionized and the terminal degrees in their specialties may be at the associate, baccalaureate, or master's levels. The managers did not feel that managing the administrative staff added any complexity to their work. However, study participants indicated that because of the different institutional missions and different levels, their work with the different faculty bodies does add a level of complexity to their work. One respondent talked extensively about managing the different faculty expectations resulting from the differences in the faculty bodies, stating, "That's a very interesting balancing act to try to work with both those personalities and provide them with the service and the support they need." Another manager talked specifically about his work in managing the different institutional "personalities" of the faculty:

> The personalities associated with those two groups are very different and you have to be very flexible. And you always have to be on your toes a bit, knowing and understanding the passions of those two groups of people and how you react and what's important to them. You have to understand what's important to them; you have to be able to interact with different people and, and that's not easy all the time. It's not like a single group of people that you have to interact with that are all the same. You have very different types of people that you have to interact with and that's a challenge.

The different faculty profiles also lead to different needs in the classroom, which adds to the complexity of work for the managers. For example, one of the study participants talked about his work to satisfy the different classroom needs resulting from the different faculty profiles:

> When you try to bring it into the classroom, you've got to support the whole spectrum of teaching and learning because you know on the OSU side, there's some very high-end simulation type laboratory environments that we have to present and at the same time because we want to use common facilities, we have to make sure that the technology that we implement in that classroom can support both that high-end stuff and just the normal learning and teaching things. So that's a challenge; just trying to get the right mix of equipment configured appropriately; be able to support that wide range of teaching and learning methods that are provided by both sets of faculty.

Another area of difference in the two institutions' profiles is the demographics of their students. Ohio State Newark serves a more traditional student: the average age of the students is 21 and the majority are recent high school graduates. The average age of the COTC student is 29. Many of these students are working adults with families of their own. As a result, the students' expectations and needs are different. One manager explained that his office provided different services based upon the different student profiles:

> The populations served are so very different in terms of their needs, their expectation of what higher education is, and what they will do with it. We serve both student populations differently given the nature of the student profile needs. So when a student comes in for whatever program or service, we are one of the few [offices] that really do ask them right up front "which institution are you affiliated" because they will most likely need a particular kind of service stream. It is making sure we provide them what they need, how they need and the particular time that they need it.

Although Ohio State Newark and COTC share a campus, the two institutions are independent and each has its own senior leader. Despite both leaders' commitment to the partnership, as discussed in the leadership theme, respondents felt that having two separate leaders with different reporting structures added complexity to their management responsibilities. Given their differences in roles and their individual characteristics, the personalities and leadership styles of these two individuals are very different. Managing the operations of two independent institutions led by two different executive leaders requires the shared managers to be adaptable and flexible. Being responsible to two leaders requires the manager to be able to adjust his/her behavior to accommodate the style of the individual leader. For example, one manager commented on how she adjusts the way in which she delivers her message based upon which executive she is working.

The needs of the individual institutions are different, and managing those differences adds complexity and requires constant attention. Managers shared examples of times when one institution had a significant need in a particular area that the other institution did not embrace or have the same need. They explained that this complexity requires them to consider how this might impact the shared relationship and to ensure that dialog and communications happen. One manager emphasized the importance of being able to facilitate the conversations when the needs of the two institutions do not align and of being cognizant of where the give and take happens. He stated,

> As an institutional leader for one or the other institutions, you have to think about these are our needs. Let's talk about how that might impact the cost share relationship but being cognizant of it and being comfortable in having that dialog is very important and that happens here consistently. That to me is probably one of the most important elements. If you work in that cost shared arrangement and you feel that one is dragging

you a little bit more than the other down a particular road, make sure there is clarification, communication. That helps. And there seems to be a willingness to always do that.

The partnering relationship between COTC and Ohio State Newark requires managers to be generally knowledgeable about both institutions. When asked what they believe the perception of the managers working in non-shared roles is of the partnership, cost-shared managers believe that non-shared managers have different perceptions of the partnership. Some believe that those managers working for only one of the institutions appreciate the partnership and believe that it adds value to what their single institution can provide, while others may feel that they aren't receiving their share of services or may not be fully aware of the partnership. Shared mangers also perceive some of their colleagues that are in non-shared roles to be more "brand loyal," aligning themselves more strongly to "their" institution rather than demonstrating a commitment to both.

The shared managers also perceive that there are several managers working in non-shared roles that know very little about the partner institution. One participant stated, "I think those that have never played in the other sandbox are just unaware." The shared managers believe that people who have seen the benefits of the collaborative arrangement are much more open to and more satisfied with the relationship. The views expressed by the non-shared managers support that perception. All of the participating managers that work for only one of the partnering institutions were fully aware of the partnership, believe that the partnership is beneficial to both institutions, and want the partnership to be successful. These managers also expressed their belief that there is unrealized potential within the partnership and are opportunities to further or deepen the relationship, especially in regards to enrollment and outreach. They believe further development in these areas would also increase the impact the partnership has on the communities the institutions serve.

Managers working for the partnering institutions are expected to have a broader range of knowledge and must be well-informed about each institution’s processes and procedures. Although COTC and Ohio State Newark are both higher education institutions, many of the central functions are processed differently and require the managers and their employees to learn two different processes for the same type of work. For example, in processing financial aid applications, the institution in which the student is enrolling determines the process that is followed and the types of duties and responsibilities that are completed for each student. The size and scope of the institution also seems to play a role in the establishment of processes and standard operating procedures. Bid requirements/limits, for instance, are set at a much higher level at Ohio State, which then requires different processes. Several of the managers talked about their frustrations with managing the different procedures.

Although having different processes requires employees to learn multiple procedures, sometimes these differences can be used to the departments’ advantage. If the managers have the flexibility to determine which institution’s policy they will use in completing a given project, selecting one or the other may allow the project to be completed in an easier, more timely fashion. For example, selecting to manage a capital project through the institution that has the higher bid threshold results in the manager not having to send the project out for competitive bids which may provide the manager with additional flexibility to select vendors and allow the project to move forward more quickly.

Another perceived complexity of the partnership is the embedded redundancy necessary to maintain the partnership. In many cases, although the two institutions share resources and departments, they are still maintaining two systems. For example, in the office of financial aid, although this office is shared between the two institutions, the staff are managing two separate management information systems, one for each institution. Although the systems and procedures are similar, staff are required to learn different procedures for each institution, adding an additional level of complexity to their jobs.

Another area of complexity identified by the study participants is the financial structure. The partnership requires special consideration to finances, as outlined in the Collaboration Agreement between the two institutions (The Ohio State University [OSU], 2012). COTC and Ohio State Newark maintain three budgets—one for each individual institution and one for the shared services. This financial structure was described by some of the study respondents to add a level of unnecessary complexity that needed to be constantly navigated. One of the shared managers commented,

> I've often said that it wouldn't be the end of the world to put it [the budgets] all in the cost shared budget. It would probably be easier. It some ways it's not worth the hassle for the three budgets for a department like this one. That's a challenge to play a budget game that is kind of artificial when it could just be the cost shared budget. It just isn't worth it for this department.

Another of the shared managers expressed that the complexity of the financial structure required more time and extended the length of the process.

> When you've got two institutions, two funding streams, there is just the bureaucratic process. For instance, if you are going to combine funds from COTC and the OSU side, there are different ways to do that and that can be a lengthy process. How do we transfer COTC capital dollars, for instance, to an OSU fund or are we going to do that? And then

> that kicks us into a different set of processes because we've offered to do that. When we transfer money for a capital project from COTC to OSU, that just kicks in a whole different series of means and methods. I mean it's not the biggest challenge in the world but it is. It adds a level of complexity and time.

Another limiting factor of the partnership cited by study participants is their perception that this complex model of organization makes it difficult for some students and other campus constituents to navigate effectively within one or the other of the institutions. Sometimes the lines of authority are blurred and it is difficult to determine where the lines of authority for one or the other of the institution begins and ends. Because of the lack of boundary clarity, students are sometimes confused as a result of the partnership. The two institutions share a number of resources and services, but not all services are shared (OSU, 2012). They maintain a number of areas independently. For example, each institution maintains its own math lab and writing centers. Sometimes students are unclear as to which office they should go to for assistance. Managers working in offices that are not shared are often times faced with students they cannot effectively serve.

Additionally, although the curriculum is completely separate, students do not readily understand why courses do not easily transfer from one institution to the other. In their report, Freeman, MacDonald, Rose, & Snyder (2008, p. 5) explain that "a strict "2 + 2" articulation program with our [Ohio State's] co-located institutions and other two-year institutions may not be possible given the different missions of the institutions." This lack of portability of curriculum and the unfulfilled expectations of students that all course work transfers between the two institutions is another complexity that presents challenges for the managers. One of the

COTC managers shared her experience with students and their confusion about transferring credits, saying,

> The biggest challenge is students come in with this perception that we share a campus, that means you're going to share everything; that means all my credits are going to transfer no matter what, and there's just this, this basic assumption that why go to COTC? I want to transfer to Ohio State. I'll be able to graduate after 2 years. I'm not going to lose anything. That is definitely the biggest challenge is getting students to be able to understand that. We are separate institutions. We have different missions. Our style in the classroom is going to be different than Ohio State. Yes, they accept a lot of our transfer credits, but it doesn't mean it's going to apply directly to a program. There's a lot of, of almost coming around the back end. After students have gone through and they've transferred to Ohio State, they're coming back because they're upset. "Well I was under the impression..." And so there's also a lot of like smoothing over when students have felt that they were misled. It's very tough to deal with and we're working very hard on the COTC side to try to better explain to students the transferability of our credits.

Managers in my study also noted that transferability of credit between the two institutions is not just a point of confusion for students but also for some of the staff. Many staff members do not understand the way credits transfer between the two institutions. Managers suggest that additional training is necessary to ensure that staff fully understand the mechanics of transfers so they can communicate effectively to students.

Although managers working for both institutions perceived their jobs to be more complex and difficult as a result of the partnership, they all expressed that their positions would be less appealing to them if they only worked for one institution or the other. One shared manager stated it simply by saying, “My job would be easier, yes, but probably boring.” These managers describe themselves as individuals who thrive in this complex environment and find more fulfillment working with the complexity that the partnership creates rather than working for a single, non-partnering institution. They used words like “fun,” “interesting,” “unique,” “connecting,” and “rewarding” to describe their more complex work environment.

The managers believe that although it adds complexity, the partnership is an effective model of collaboration for increased efficiency. Consistent with the Compact outlined in the Collaboration Agreement between the two institutions (OSU, 2012), several of the managers perceive that the institutions are able to accomplish more than they could independently and that both institutions gain as a result of the partnership. In their minds, the sum of the whole partnership is greater than its individual parts. Managers believe that both of the institutions have greatly benefitted from the success of the other. They believe that the collaborative partnership helped each one become something better than they would be individually. Respondents shared several examples where they believe the institutional partnership resulted in great success than each institution would have netted independently. Examples included several capital building projects and a recent scholarship campaign. One manager summed up the impact of the partnership more broadly, beyond the immediate benefits of the two institutions, by stating:

> It is beneficial for staff. It’s beneficial for students. It’s beneficial for faculty. It’s beneficial for the community. There really aren’t any major red flags or any major downsides to this partnership. With COTC and OSU’s partnership, you know, in terms of funding, those cost-shared, we help each other, so when the finances are tight with the state or when the budget’s being cut, we don’t fare as bad as the other schools do because

of this partnership.

Summary

In this chapter I examined the managers' perceptions of and experiences in working in the long-term partnership between two institutions that share a physical campus and have been engaged in a partnership since the founding of the second institution to answer the outlined research questions. I identified the patterns that emerged from the data and I presented data on five themes. These themes included topics such as community expectations, leadership, identity, time, and complexity. These themes reveal a range of perceptions related to the partnership and are related to the a priori themes of successful collaboration characteristics identified in the literature and discussed in Chapter 2.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The continued decline of state support to colleges and universities has led many institutions to consider inter-institutional collaboration as a way to maximize resources and increase efficiency. This study investigated the perceptions of managers and directors working at institutions engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership on this model of educational collaboration. I examined this issue through the lens of the experience of managers working at Central Ohio Technical College and The Ohio State University at Newark. These two institutions share a physical campus and have operated as partners since the establishment of the technical college in 1971. The study was guided by three research questions: Guided by the characteristics of partnership success, how do managers who work at a college or university engaged in a long-term inter-institutional partnership perceive this model of educational collaboration? What benefits do they perceive this model of organization provides to the institutions? What characteristics do they perceive as essential for sustaining the collaboration over time? The primary findings of my study are:

- The partnership model of inter-institutional cooperation is perceived as a viable organizational model that is accepted by campus leaders and strongly supported by the community.
- Primary benefits resulting from the institutional partnership include increased job satisfaction and greater cost-effectiveness of operations. These benefits are perceived

to outweigh the identified challenges associated with identity, time, and complexity. Managers perceive maintaining individual institutional identity, an inability to be as nimble in decision making due to additional time needed to obtain buy-in from a larger group of stakeholders with different needs and perspectives, and the additional administrative challenges resulting from working in this complex environment as limitations of this special type of partnership arrangement.

- Commitment of institutional leaders and having complementary missions are essential characteristics for long-term sustainability of the partnership.

A summary of these findings is included below, along with implications of the study and areas for further inquiry.

According to my study of two co-located institutions engaged in a long-term collaboration, managers perceive the partnership model of inter-institutional cooperation as a viable organizational model that is accepted by campus leaders and strongly supported by the community. The role of the community and their expectations for collaboration between the two institutions is an important finding of this study that was not cited in the literature. Managers perceive that the community sees the partnership as an important asset to the community and that the community expects the two institutions to collaborate for increased efficiency with scarce resources. The study participants believe that the uniqueness of the partnership appeals to community members and results in stronger investiture by the community in both financial support and connection to the campus. Managers believe that community expectations for the collaboration reinforce the partnership and have contributed to the long-term viability of the partnership.

Increased job satisfaction and greater cost-effectiveness of operations are the primary benefits resulting from this partnership model of inter-institutional collaboration in which the two institutions are co-located on a single campus. Managers and directors feel that the level of cooperation between the two institutions is unusually high and that the relationship is unique. They take great pride in the partnership which leads to greater job satisfaction for them then if they were working for just one institution. Even those managers who work for only one of the institutions are proud to be associated with the partnership. All of the directors and managers believe that the partnership provides increased opportunities for students that attend the institutions. This model of inter-institutional collaboration is perceived by managers to provide cost efficiencies that the institutions would not be able to realize independently. Study participants are confident that consolidating operations and providing services as one entity financially benefits both institutions. However, none of the managers were able to provide evidence in this regard.

These findings, however, might also be explained by "organizational saga", which Clark (1972) uses to describe the history, heroes, rituals, customs, ceremony, and symbols that endow an institution with a special sense of place. An organizational saga presents some rational explanation of how certain means led to certain ends, but it also includes affect that turns a formal place into a beloved institution, to which participants may be passionately devoted. In my study, the special type of partnership in which the two institutions are engaged is part of their organizational saga. Being physically located on the same campus and having been in a sharing relationship since the founding of the technical college are significant historical features of their partnership. It is possible that the strong sense of pride and the high level of job satisfaction expressed by the study participants result from the indoctrination into this heritage rather than the partnership model itself.

According to my study, the additional administrative complexities, challenges with regard to maintaining individual institutional identity, and an inability to be as nimble in decision making due to additional time needed to obtain buy-in from a larger group of stakeholders with different needs and perspectives were identified as limitations of this special type of collaborative model. Additionally, the model lends itself to redundancy in operations in areas where two independent systems are maintained. The additional level of complexity created by the partnership causes additional administrative challenges and makes jobs more difficult for managers and directors working within the partnership. Managers are required to juggle multiple points of focus based upon the needs of the individual institutions, they find themselves continually needing to eliminate the perception of favoritism or imbalance, and they spend time trying to balance the needs of the students based upon the different student profiles. Additionally, this complex model of organization makes it difficult for some students and other campus constituents to navigate effectively within one or the other of the institutions due to lack of boundary clarity. Further, this particular model of inter-institutional collaboration has led to confusion for students about the portability of curriculum between the two institutions. Since the two institutions are appropriately focused on their independent missions, their respective course work and curriculum are different. In many cases, classes are not easily transferred between the two institutions. Due to the level of sharing between the two institutions, this is inconsistent with the expectations of the students and has led to confusion and disappointment.

Managers in my study perceive commitment of institutional leaders and having complementary missions are essential characteristics for long-term sustainability of the partnership. In my study, the behaviors of the leaders were clearly an important characteristic of the partnership's long-term sustainability. The most senior leaders are often seen together and they share physically office space. They have successfully created a culture of collaboration and mutual respect, and their written and oral communications reinforce their respect, commitment, support of the other, and their collective vision for the shared campus. Through their behavior, the leaders demonstrate their ongoing commitment to the relationship. The finding of the importance of respect, effective communications, and commitment support the characteristics of successful collaborations identified in the literature, particularly Baker (1993), Czajkowski (2006), Dodourova (2009), Mohr & Spekman (1994), and Tushet (1993). However, the additional finding regarding the importance of the institutions having complementary missions adds an additional perspective to current research.

Study participants talked at length about the lack of competition between the institutions. Managers and directors believe that the two institutions primarily serve different student populations and that their primary purposes and missions are complementary rather than competitive. Each institution is perceived as a strong contributor to the campus, each fulfilling an important need and providing important services to a particular segment of the student population. This lack of competition allows employees to work harmoniously within the two institutions and, the managers believe, has enabled the two institutions to sustain their partnership over time.

The literature suggests that sustainable higher education partnerships are those that become part of the institutional culture and are built into the administrative processes of the organization (Amey, 2010). In my study, ongoing attention to the relationship, respect for the partner institution, common/clear expectations of the partnership, and a willingness to make concessions and to be open-minded and flexible were identified as essential components for sustaining an institutional partnership over the long-term.

Implications for Practice

Growing pressure on colleges and universities across the country to provide the highest quality education at the lowest responsibility cost will continue to challenge college executives and boards of trustees. Additionally, the resources that support colleges and universities are become more limited while the services demanded of them and their associated costs are increasing. For higher education institutions, the political and financial environment has driven strategic decisions related to inter-institutional collaboration. Partnerships, mergers, and other forms of inter-institutional collaborations are increasingly being employed by colleges and universities as an effective strategy to address shrinking financial resources and to build capacity to achieve stated organizational goals (Lang, 2002). In this section I provide additional interpretations informed by this study of two co-located institutional partners and as a practitioner to make recommendations to aid higher education leaders as they consider and begin to engage in collaborative relationships with other higher education institutions. In my study, the findings were surprising consistent between the two groups of participants (managers that work for both institutions and managers that work for just one of the institutions). Other types of partnerships and inter-institutional collaborations may be more likely to have differences. Additionally, findings from this single case study of two, co-located institutions cannot be generalized to collaborations of other types.

The following table outlines four key elements of successful partnership and provides higher education leaders a summary of the implications for practice discussed below.

Additionally, Table 4 serves as a ready reference of recommendations for leaders who are considering engaging their college or university in an inter-institutional collaboration.

Table 4

Elements of Successful Partnership

Element	Action	Links to the Literature
Consideration of Collaboration Models/Financial Incentives	➢ Study models of collaboration ➢ Consider financial incentives of collaboration	➢ Adequate financial and human resources (Czajkowski, 2006)
Approaches to Gain Support for Collaboration	➢ Demonstrate commitment of campus leaders ➢ Obtain buy-in and ensure openness to partnering ➢ Involve others at all levels in the institution ➢ Build trust ➢ Leave egos at the door ➢ Assume positive intent	➢ Trust (Czajkowsky, 2006; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Whipple & Frankel, 2000) ➢ Commitment (Dodourova, 2009; Edmuti, et al., 2005; Mohr & Spekman, 1994; Whipple & Frankel, 2000)
Identification of Expectations of the Partnership Relationship	➢ Define and outline expectations ➢ Engage in candid dialog ➢ Layout and create the plan ➢ Be realistic with expectations	➢ Defined goals (Baker, 1993; Czajkowski, 2006; Tushet, 1993; Whipple & Frankel, 2000) ➢ Clear Roles (Edmuti, et al., 2005) ➢ Coordination (Dodourova, 2009; Mohr & Spekman, 1994)
Reinforcement Methods for Partnership Sustainability	➢ Provide ongoing attention to the relationship ➢ Respect each other o Engage in open communication o Be open minded and flexible o Be willing to make concessions o Plan ahead ➢ Recognize needs are not always balanced/conflicting priorities	➢ Respect (Czajkowski, 2006) ➢ Communication (Czajkowski, 2006; Dodourova, 2009; Elmuti, et al., 2005; Mohr & Spekman, 1994) ➢ Conflict resolution techniques (Baker, 1993; Mohr &

	➢ Keep bigger picture in mind	Spekman, 1994; Tushet, 1993; Whipple & Frankel, 2000)

Consideration of Collaboration Models/Financial Incentives

A variety of inter-institutional collaboration models exist (Lang, 2002). This study suggests that college and university leaders should study other models to determine why they happen and in what ways and why they are successful. Study participants' responses indicate that the efficiencies gained by cost-sharing affords partnering institutions opportunities for growth in new programming and services. If administrators are looking to move to a sharing model, study participants indicate that leaders must "do their homework" and see how other colleges have made it work. It would be helpful for institutional leaders to talk with people who are at a lower level of leadership than they are and to listen to people who have experienced the benefits of being in a healthy, shared campus environment. Study participants believe that having someone who has been in or is currently in that type of collaborative environment would serve as a valuable resource for obtaining feedback as to what other institutions have done in order to set up a partnership properly from the beginning. They believe leaders can then determine what their institution may need to move forward or what concessions they may need to make in order for the inter-institutional collaboration to be considered further.

Over the past several years, funding for colleges and universities and the economy in general have been difficult. Higher education institutions are constantly challenged to find new ways to maximize resources in order to achieve their goals. My study participants' responses suggest they believe that the cost-savings resulting from sharing personnel and services are a strong incentive for institutions to collaborate in this way. Many times, by functioning as a single unit, partnering enables institutions to leverage the types of activities and services that can be provided in a larger institution environment and apply them to two smaller institution. There is huge value in that. This study suggests that leaders need to consider the financial incentives of a collaborative arrangement and weigh the benefits against the costs of such an arrangement. Findings from this study indicate that senior leaders should determine the extent to which partnering could be financially beneficial. Consideration should be given to the redundancy of having two different IT departments, for example, when they could have one. Consideration should be given to the possibility of combining two independent departments into one and the potential for cost savings resulting from sharing the cost of one larger system and perhaps less personnel overall.

Approaches to Gain Support for Collaboration

This study also suggests the importance of the leaders demonstrating their commitment to the partnership. According to many participants, institutional leaders must present a unified front when launching into and maintaining an inter-institutional collaborative arrangement. Study participants recommend that leaders send a unified message of their commitment to and expectations for the partnership and that they model the behavior they expect to see from subordinates. Without strong leadership and a strong explanation as to why campus leaders thinks this model of organization will be beneficial to both institutions, it will be difficult to get everyone below to support the partnership arrangement.

Senior leaders' or the board of trustees' desire for collaboration is not enough to implement an inter-institutional model of organization. According to many participants, sustainable partnerships require buy-in at all levels of the organization. People deep within the organization need to believe in the benefits of the partnership arrangement and be committed to its success. This study's findings suggest that campus leaders must understand the importance of involving others at all levels within the institution in the partnership development process. In cases where commitment is broadened within the institution to include additional champions at lower levels within the organization, the partnership is afforded a greater degree of stability (Amey, 2010). If organizational leaders can gain and share a view of how much more beneficial a collaborative model of organization would be, they may be able to generate interest and obtain buy-in from across the institution. Involving all levels of employees in any kind of collaboration proposal allows possible issues to be identified and addressed up front. Study participants believe that individuals impacted by the collaborative relationship should be given the opportunity to mull over the proposal and figure out whether it is really going to work for them and let them think ahead to what kinds of things might be issues so that they can be worked through.

Consistent with the research conducted by Czajkowski (2006), Mohr & Spekman (1994), and Whipple & Frankel (2000), participants' responses suggest that trust is an important component of collaboration. Knowing this, steps should be taken to build trust such as having individuals at all levels of the organization involved in the decision making processes. Finding the right mix of people who are willing to work together in the partnership is important. As suggested by this study, asking employees to be part of developing the plan makes them a part of the process and helps to bridge the inherent disparities between the institutions.

Based upon the findings from this study, managers perceive personalities and egos can make partnering difficult and must be overcome in order for the collaboration to be effective long term. As stated by one of my research participants, institutional leaders that are interested in developing inter-institutional partnerships must be willing "to leave their egos at the door and walk into the room being willing to talk and compromise." This study suggests that by abandoning their egos and assuming positive intent, leaders can more easily move beyond the point of talking and negotiating and can make "something great happen." Adjustment and changes will be necessary. No amount of talking and negotiating will eliminate the need for continual refinement of the collaboration. Study participants believe that leaders must be prepared to make adjustments along the way, which most likely will include concessions and compromise. Consistent with the work of Baker (1993), Mohr & Spekman (1994), Tushet (1993), and Whipple & Frankel (2000) around concessions and compromise as essential components of partnership success, this study suggests that leaders within the partnering institutions must be able to be flexible and be willing to adapt and change if needed.

Identification of Expectations of the Partnership Relationship

Establishing clearly defined goals is an important component of partnership success (Baker, 1993; Czajkowski, 2006; Tushet, 1993; Whipple & Frankel, 2000). Consistent with the literature, this study suggests that leaders contemplating engaging in an inter-institutional collaboration should spend time defining and outlining the expectations of the partnership. Expanding on current research, this study offers a slightly different perspective on the importance of the partners establishing clearly defined goals as indicated by Baker (1993), Czajkowski (2006), Tushet (1993), and Whipple & Frankel (2000) in that it suggests that administrators need to *come into* the relationship with a clear understanding of why they want to engage in a collaborative relationship and be able to clearly articulate why engaging in such an effort is necessary and beneficial. This study indicates that campus leaders should engage in very candid dialog behind closed doors before it becomes more of a public forum of discussion.

This study suggests that campus leaders must layout and create the plan for the cooperative relationship. They must carefully define what they want to accomplish and how they want to do it, and they must determine how they are going to get there. Tangible expectations need to be addressed, such as how will the physical layout happen, how will the institutions be integrated, and will the institutions keep their individual identity or will they develop a new identity common to the partnership?

Study participants caution that administrators need to be realistic with their expectations. Typically all parties are not going to get everything they want, and the relationship is not going to be established overnight. This study suggests that leaders should expect to compromise and prepare to invest the time needed to fully explore options and alternatives. Further, it implies that leaders need to ensure open communications and be above-board in everything that it is possible to be above board about. Intentional conversations regarding expectations in both the short- and long-term as well as the middle road are necessary. Having this understanding will set the course from which the rest of the community will follow.

Reinforcement Methods for Partnership Sustainability

Engaging in an inter-institutional relationship is a dynamic process, one that needs to be attended to on an ongoing basis. Collaborative relationships do not just continue to happen because someone says it happens. They need to be reinforced, rethought, and revisited on a regular, continual basis. This study supports findings from previous research (Czajkowski, 2006) that mutual respect is key to successful collaborations in higher education. Administrators preparing to engage in an inter-institutional collaboration must determine ways to respect each other. Suggestions from my study in which leaders can demonstrate respect for their partner include engaging in open communication, being open minded and flexible, being willing to make concessions, and planning ahead.

Going beyond the scope of earlier studies that discuss the need for flexibility and coordination required for effective partnerships (Dodourova, 2009; Mohr & Spekman, 1994), this study note the imbalance of work between the two institutions that sometimes occurs and emphasizes the importance of leaders being able to recognize that the needs of the two institutions will not always develop in a balanced way. Sometimes priorities will conflict. This study suggests that leaders must take into consideration that managers working to implement the partnership may sometimes need to focus more time and energy in the direction of one particular institution to address that particular need. Keeping the bigger picture in mind and focusing on the larger goal of the institutional collaboration and the positives of the institutions as a shared entity may require some concessions that may benefit the partnership rather than one institution or the other. This study suggests that when both sides are working under that kind of thinking – the whole is more important than an individual priority – the partnership will be strengthened.

Summary

Inter-institutional collaborations are becoming a strategic necessity. Based on the findings of this study of two co-located institutions, colleges and universities engaging in such a partnership need to build a strong relationship between the two institutions and develop a culture of collaboration at the leadership level which is sensitive to the needs and desires of both institutions. To sustain the relationship over time, ongoing attention to the partnership must be given. Before engaging in such a partnership, it is important to study other models and to outline expectations. A general openness to the idea of partnering or collaborating must be apparent. Individuals at all levels within the institutions must be interested in developing the relationship. Additionally, community expectations for collaboration between the institutions are a strong component of the collaboration's ongoing viability.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study sets the foundation for future research on inter-institutional collaboration in higher education. This study was limited to one case study of two institutions engaged in a long-term partnership arrangement and, thus, is limited in scope and generalizability. Additional research is necessary to identify whether respondents from other higher education institutions involved in inter-institutional collaborations would provide similar responses and support the same findings.

Since my research was exploratory, by its very nature it leaves many avenues open for future research. This study identified several areas for future research on collaborations and some of my suggestions follow.

Throughout the course of this study, participants repeatedly talked about their perceptions of significant cost-savings resulting from the partnership. However, none of the respondents could provide evidence in support of that claim. A follow up study could be conducted to further analyze and quantify any such savings. For instance, further research might include a study examining the impact of the partnership on effective space utilization resulting from the sharing of facilities or exploring the direct dollar savings resulting from the sharing of staff. Such studies would build on the findings of this study by adding quantifiable data on the cost savings resulting from partnership models of inter-institutional collaboration.

Because inter-institutional collaboration is a difficult model to sustain over time (Amey, 2010; Amy, Eddy, & Campbell, 2010; Harman & Harman, 2003; Lang, 2002; Martin & Samels, 1994; Millett, 1976; Stephenson, 2011; Stewart, 2003; Trim, 2003), a longitudinal study of one or more collaborations could be designed to see how the collaborations adapt and change over time. A study could be constructed to include interviewing key institutional leaders from institutions that have recently initiated institutional collaborations to identify the key structures and components of the partnership. These leaders (or the individuals holding those positions at the time of the subsequent studies) could be interviewed on two to three year intervals to determine what changes, if any, have resulted over the passage of time and why the changes happened. Such a study would provide insight to higher education administrators who are initiating inter-institutional collaborations as to the potential adaptations they might expect to implement in order for their collaboration to endure over the long term.

Another area for further study is faculty's perception of the partnership model of collaboration between institutions. The majority of literature regarding inter-institutional collaboration provides information from the administrative perspective. The faculty point of view is absent. This research study exposed the significant differences between the faculties of the two institutions and indicated that curriculum and faculty are two areas in which sharing and collaboration are limited. Examining the partnership model from the faculty's perceptions may avail additional opportunities for collaboration and sharing.

Finally, additional research is also needed to determine how higher education institutions evaluate and assess the outcomes of their collaborative efforts and what types of evaluation and assessment methods are used. The success and effectiveness in operations and outcomes from inter-institutional collaborations varies widely. Ineffectiveness can be attributed to both the limitations of the collaboration or to poor design and implementation. As inter-institutional collaborations gain popularity, more formal evaluation of the effectiveness of collaborative arrangements will be required. Research on evaluation and assessment of the outcomes of inter-institutional partnerships is critical to improved practice.

It seems likely that many more higher education institutions will form collaborative partnerships to address the pressures of the current higher education environment. The challenge of collaboration rests in teaching those responsible for the partnership how to successfully manage and collaborate. Understanding better the many collaborative partnership models and their effectiveness is essential to guide higher education institutions toward sustainable inter-institutional collaboration.

Conclusions

The number of inter-institutional collaborations between and among higher education institutions in the United States is continuing to grow in response to shrinking financial resources and the ongoing, increasing demand for services. The growth in these partnership arrangements across the higher education landscape leads to a greater need for understanding the leadership required to effectively sustain them. Although inter-institutional partnerships are typically initiated by presidents or other senior administrators, it is the manager whose work enables the partnership to continue. The intent of this study was to discover the perspective of managers and directors working for an institution engaged in a long-term inter-institutional arrangement on their perceptions of this model of educational collaboration and of factors that affect the ongoing success of the collaborations. It is how these operational managers perceive their work environment that is the focus of my research. Guided by the characteristics of partnership success identified in the literature, the questions elicited passionate responses from interview participants on their work environment including areas of influence, opportunities, and barriers to success and on the unique and significant challenges and opportunities associated with the partnership model. From the findings in Chapter 4 and the discussion in Chapter 5, higher education presidents, deans, managers, and researchers can get a much clearer picture of the perceptions of managers and directors whose role is to support and sustain an inter-institutional partnership. This enhanced understanding informs future research and can aid college and university administrators as they begin to engage in collaborative relationships with other higher education institutions.

It is my sincerest hope that this study has done two things. First, I hope that this exploratory research will be a springboard for others to examine the neglected area of the distinctive role managers and directors play in sustaining inter-institutional collaborative arrangements. These types of organizational arrangements are becoming more and more common in higher education (Amey, 2010; Harman & Meek, 2002) and the number of managers navigating in this complex environment is growing. Therefore, they deserve more attention. Finally, it is my wish that this study will show higher education administrators the many benefits of this special type of inter-institutional partnership. The increased level of job satisfaction experienced by managers and directors working in this type of inter-institutional collaboration coupled with the resulting operational efficiencies and cost-savings make this model of organization a sustainable model over the long term, one in which both the institutions and the employees benefit.

REFERENCES

Amey, M. J. (Spring 2010). Leading partnerships: Competencies for collaboration. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 149*: 13-23.

Amey, M. J., & Brown, D. F. (2004). *Breaking Out of the Box: Interdisciplinary Collaboration and Faculty Work.* Boston: Information Age.

Amey, M. J., Eddy, P. L., & Campbell, T. G. (2010). Crossing Boundaries Creating Community College Partnerships to Promote Educational Transitions. *Community College Review, 37(4)*: 333-347.

Amey, M. J., Eddy, P. L., & Ozaki, C. C. (Autumn 2007). Demands for Partnership and Collaboration in Higher Education: A Model. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 139*: 5-14.

Anderson J., & Narus, J. (January 1990). A model of distributor firm and manufacturer firm working partnerships. *Journal of Marketing*, 54. 42-58.

Baus, F., & Ramsbottom, C. A. (1999, Summer). Starting and Sustaining a Consortium. *New Directions for Higher Education, 1999*(106), 3-18.

Baker, L. M. (1993). Promoting success in educational partnerships involving technology. In *Proceedings of Selected Research and Development Presentations*, Convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, Research and Theory Division, New Orleans, La., January 13-17, 1993.

Bleeke, J., & Ernst, D. (November-December 1991). 'The way to win in cross-border alliances', *Harvard Business Review*, 69(6). 127-135.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Bracken, S. J. (2007). The importance of language, context, and communication as components of successful partnership. *New Directions for Community Colleges, 139,* 41-47.

Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2002). Accessing and improving partnership relationships and outcomes: a proposed framework. *Evaluation and Program Planning*. 25(3), 215-231.

Brueder, R. L. (1989). College mergers: An emerging alternative. *AACJC Journal*, 60(1), 37-41.

Burton, V. H. (1994). FOCUS: Ohio University-Zanesville. The efficiencies of a co-located campus. *Ohio Association of Two-Year Colleges Journal,* 19, 1993-94.

Central Ohio Technical College. (2013). *Securing the future 2009-2013*.

Clark, B. R. (1998). *Creating Entrepreneurial Universities*, Pergamon, Oxford.

Clark, B. R. (1980, March). Academic Culture. Working Paper, IHERG-42, Yale University, Higher Education Research Group.

Clark, B.R. (1970). *The distinctive college: Antioch, Reed & Swarthmore*, Chicago: Aldine Pub. Co.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*, (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Czajkowski, J. M. (2006). Success Factors in higher education collaborations: A collaboration success measurement model. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved on November 30, 2012, from WorldCat dissertations and theses database. (OCLC: 794588851).

Day, G., & Klein, S. (1987). Cooperative behavior in vertical markets: The influence of transaction costs and competitive strategies. In M. Houston (ed.), *Review of Marketing*, 39-66.

Deloitte Consulting LLP. (March 2011). 2011 Global Shared Services Survey Results Executive Summary. Retrieved November 4, 2012, from http://www.deloitte.com/assets/Dcom-UnitedStates/Local%20Assets/Documents/IMOs/Shared%20Services/us_sdt_2011GlobalSharedServicesSurveyExecutiveSummary.pdf.

Dent, S. M. (2006). Partnership relationship management - Implementing a plan for success [white paper]. Partnership Continuum, Inc. Retrieved from www.partneringintelligence.com.

Dodourova, M. (2009). Alliances as strategic tools: A cross-industry study of partnership planning, formation and success, *Management Decision*, *47*(5), 831 – 844.

Dove, C. S. (2004). The shared service center: A model for university efficiency? (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved on December 23, 2012, from ProQuest dissertations and theses database. (OCLC: 765420971).

Drucker, P. (1996). Nonprofit prophet. *The alliance analyst*.

Dwyer, F. R., Schurr, P., & Oh, S. (April 1987). Developing buyer-seller relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 51, 11-27.

Elmuti, D., Abebe, M., & Nicolosi, M. An overview of strategic alliances between universities and corporations. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 17(1), 115-129.

Fain, P. (January 2012). Georgia university system proposes consolidation of 8 campuses. Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved on June 28, 2012, from http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/01/06/georgia-university-system-proposes-consolidation-8-campuses.

FEFC (2000). *Mergers in the further education sector – Summary Report*. Coventry: FEFC.

Forcier, M. F. (2011, September/October). Innovation through collaboration: New pathways to success. *Trusteeship, 19(5)*. Retrieved on November 30, 2012, from http://agb.org/trusteeship/2011/9/innovation-through-collaboration-new-pathways-success

Frazier, G., Spekman, R., & O'Neal, C. (October 1988). Just-in-time exchange relationships in industrial markets. *Journal of Marketing,* 52, 52-67.

Freeman, E. B., MacDonald, W. L., Rose, G., & Snyder, J. (2008). *The Regional Campuses of OSU Respond to the University System of Ohio – Opportunities, Challenges and Recommendations* (Report). Retrieved from http://oaa.osu.edu/irp/regionalcampuses/Regional%20response-%20USO%20.pdf

Gabarro, J. J. (1987). The development of working relationship. In J. W. Lorsch (Ed.), *Handbook of organizational behavior*. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice Hall.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. (8th ed.). New York: Pearson.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gray, b. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding Common Ground for Multiparty Problems*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Handy, C. (1988). *Understanding voluntary organisations*. London: Penguin Books.

Harman, G., & Harman, K. (2003). Institutional mergers in higher education: Lessons from international experiences. *Tertiary Education Management*, 9(1), 29-44.

Harman, K. (2002). Merging divergent campus cultures into coherent educational communities. *Higher Education*, 44, 91-114.

Harman, K., & Meek, L. (2002). Introduction to special issue: "Merger revisited: international perspectives on mergers in higher education". *Higher Education, 44*, 1-4.

Hassett, E., Cunningham, P., Kancheva, E., Newsome, M., & Wells, S. (2002). Shared IT services at the Associate Colleges of Central Kansas. EDUCAUSE Center for Applied Research, Case Study 1, 2002.

Hook, M. (August 2011). Chancellor Zimpher Announces Creation of SUNY Campus Alliance Networks [press release]. Retrieved June 28, 2012, from http://www.suny.edu/sunynews/News.cfm?filname=2011-08-04-FINAL-CampusAlliance

Huber, G. & Daft, R. (1987). The information environment of organizations. In F. Jablin *et al*. (ed.), *Handbook of Organizational Communication*. Sage Publications, Newbury Park, CA. pp. 130-164.

Katsinas, S. G., Colon, D. M., Johnson, J. L., Sanders, E. Y., & Thompson, D. (1999, Jan/Feb). The Development of two-year colleges in Ohio: The tension between state and local area interests. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23(1), 79-105.

Kotter, J. P., & Cohen, D. S. (2002). *The Heart of Change: Real Life Stories of How People Change Their Organizations*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Business SchoolPress.

Lang, D. (2001). Colloqy, first we should take care. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 47(28), A26.

Lang, D. (2002). There are mergers, and there are mergers: the forms of inter-institutional combination. *Journal of the Programme on Institutional Management in Higher Education. Higher Education Management and Policy,* 14(1), 11-50.

Leedy, P. D. (1997). *Practical research: Planning and design*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Leonard, W. (2010, March 5). CEU, USU prepare for potential merger. Deseret News. Retrieved December 23, 2012, from http://www.deseretnews.com/article/700014015/CEU-USU-prepare-for-potential-merger.html?pg=all

Leveille, D. E. (2006). *Accountability in Higher Education: A Public Agenda for Trust and Cultural Change*. Research and Occasional Paper Series. Berkeley: Center for Studies in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

Lincoln, Y.S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, confidence, trust: Problems and perspectives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: The making and breaking of cooperative relations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Martin, J., Samels, J. E., & Associates. (1994). *Merging colleges for mutual growth – A new strategy for academic managers*. London: The John Hopkins University Press.

Martin, J., & Samels, J. (1994). The New Kind of College Mergers. *Planning for Higher Education*, v. 22, Winter 1993-94.

May, G., & Smith, A. (1992). Gaining stature through community college-university consortia. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 78, 63-75.

Malena, C. (1995). Relations between northern and southern non-government organizations. *Canadian Journal of Development Studies*, 16(9), 7-29.

McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2001). *Research in education: A conceptual introduction* (5th ed.). New York: Longman.

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Millett, J. D. (1976). *Mergers in higher education: An analysis of ten case studies*. Washington, DC: Academy for Educational Development.

Miskon, S., Bandara, W., Fieit, E., & Gable, G. G. (2011). An exploration of shared services types in higher education. In *Proceedings of the 17th America Conference on Information Systems (AMCIS, 2011)*, Detroit, Michigan, USA.

Mohr, J., & Spekman, R. (1994). Characteristics of partnership success: partnership attributes, communication behavior, and conflict resolution techniques. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, 135-152.

Neal, D. C. "Introduction: New Roles for Consortia." In D. C. Neal (ed.), Consortia and Inter-institutional Cooperation, New York: Macmillan, 1988.

Ohio Board of Regents. (2004, June). Ohio Board of Regents Board Meeting 2004. [Meeting Minutes]. Retrieved from http://regents.ohio.gov/board_meetings/bdmeet/jun04/agd3-7.pdf

Ohio State University Profile. Retrieved September 3, 2012, from http://students.ohiohighered.org/applying/campuses/ohio-state-university.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Patterson, L. D. (1970, November). *Consortia in American higher education*. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearing house on Higher Education.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Pettigrew, A. M. (1979). On studying organizational cultures. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 570-581.

Porter, L. R., Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Boulian, P. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *59*, 603-609.

Powell, W. (1987). Hybrid organizational arrangements: New form or transitional development. *California Management Review, 30(1)*, 67-87.

Powell, W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy. *Research in Organizational Behavior, 12*, 295-336.

Provan, K. (1984). Interorganizational cooperation and decision making autonomy in a consortium multihospital system. *Academy of Management Review*, *9*, 494-504.

Pruitt, D. G. (1981). *Negotiation behavior*. Academic Press, New York.

Russell, J. F. & Flynn, R. B. (2000). Commonalities across effective collaboratives. *Peabody Journal of Education, 75(3)*, 196-204.

Salmond, D., & Spekman, R. (1986). Collaboration as a mode of managing long-term buyer-seller relationship. In T. Shimp *et al*. (eds), *AMA Educators' Proceedings*, American Marketing Association, Chicago, IL, pp. 162-166.

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

Stephenson, S. S. (2011): Discursive "policy logics" of mergers in US higher education: Strategy or tragedy? *Tertiary Education and Management*, *17(2)*, 117-137.

Stewart, G. (2003). College mergers: lessons to be learned from other sectors. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, *8*, 305-327.

The Ohio State University. (2013). *Strategic plan Regional Campus Cluster 2012-2016*. Retrieved on May 15, 2013, from http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/strategicPlanning/Ohio-State-RCC-Strategic-Plan-Jan-2012.pdf

The Ohio State University. (2012). *Collaboration agreement between The Ohio State University and Central Ohio Technical College*.

The Ohio State University. (1979). *Agreement between The Ohio State University and Central Ohio Technical College*.

The Ohio State University. (1971). *Agreement between The Ohio State University and Central Ohio Technical College*.

The Ohio State University at Newark. (2013). *Campus implementation plan 2012-2016*. Retrieved May 15, 2013, from http://oaa.osu.edu/assets/files/strategicPlanning/2012-Strategic-Plans/Newark.pdf

Tonkiss, F., & Passey, A. (1999). Trust, confidence and voluntary organisations: Between values and institutions. *Sociology*, 33(2), 257-274.

Trim, P. R. (2003). Strategic marketing of further and higher educational institutions: partnership arrangements and centres of entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Educational Management*, *17(2)*, 59-70.

Tushnet, N. C. (1993). *A Guide to Developing Educational Partnerships*. Washington, D. C.: Office of Educational research and Improvement; Los Alamitos, Ca.: Southwest Regional Lab., Program for the Improvement of Practice.

University System of Georgia website. Regents Approve Campus Consolidation Plan [press release]. Retrieved on November 11, 2012, from http://www.usg.edu/news/release/regents_approve_campus_consolidation_plan.

Whipple, J. M., & Frankel, R. (2000). Strategic alliance success factors. *Journal of Supply Chain Management*, *36(3)*, 21-28.

Williamson, O. (1975). *Markets and Hierarchies: Analysis and Antitrust Implications*. New York: Free Press-Macmillan.

Williamson, O. (1985). *The Economic Institutions of Capitalism*. New York: The Free Press.

Wulfhorst, C. C., Woolard, J. R., & Holder, T. (2011). *Celebrating the Journey*. Newark, OH: Central Ohio Technical College.

Yee, J., Chian, F. T. T., and Chan, T. (2009). A Preliminary Decision Model for Shared Services: Insights from an Australian University Context. *Proceedings of the 20th Australasian Conference on Information Systems.* Retrieved November 4, 2012, from http://www.swinburne.edu.au/ict/research/riso/publications/A%20preliminary%20Decision%20Model%20for%20Shared%20Services.pdf.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

APPENDIX A: INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Samples of Questions:

1. In your opinion, is the partnership successful? If yes, to what do you attribute to the success of the partnership between the two institutions? If not, why not?
2. Why do you think the institutions are able to successfully manage their partnership when the other co-located campuses are not able to develop a successful collaboration?
3. Most partnerships require some level of compromise. What do you feel is the biggest concession that one or the other of the institutions has made? What is the biggest challenge for you about this partnership?
4. What do the leaders of the institutions do/what actions do they take that demonstrate their commitment to the partnership?
5. What are the limitations of the partnership?
6. What conditions do you believe must exist for other institutions to undertake such a relationship?
7. How do you manage through a situation in which your priorities for the institutions conflict?
8. I imagine that your job would be easier if you were only working for one institution. What is it about the relationship that makes your job more difficult?
9. What about the relationship gives you the most job satisfaction?
10. What advice would you give leaders of other institutions that wanted to partner in this way?
11. If we were starting these institutions all over again, would you recommend this model again? Why or why not?

12. Would it make more sense to merge the institutions and have one “state college” that offered by 2 and 4 year degrees rather than a shared campus with 2 different institutions? Why or why not?
13. Is the partnership truly cost-effective? How do you know? What data do you have?
14. What are the opinions of managers who aren’t cost-shared at the two institutions of the effectiveness of the partnership? (i.e. the academic and enrollment management arms of the institutions aren’t shared).
15. What improvements could be made to the partnership?