1

The Collaborative Imperative

People collaborate when the job they face is too big, is too urgent, or requires too much knowledge for one person or group to do alone. Marshalling what we know about learning and applying it to the education of our students is just such a job. This report makes the case that only when everyone on campus—particularly academic affairs and student affairs staff—shares the responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress in improving it.

Powerful Partnerships, *Preamble (American Association for Higher Education et al., 1998)*

Achieving this vision (of learning) will require concerted action among all stakeholders. Learning-centered reform cannot be accomplished by any one institution or even by the higher education sector alone. Collaboration with secondary school leaders will help ensure better preparation of all high school students for rigorous college learning. Collaboration among policy makers at the state and federal levels will focus public policy and resources on the quality of students' liberal education.

Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College *(Association of American Colleges and Universities, 2002)*

In the last two decades, there has been increasing recognition among organizational leaders more broadly and higher education change agents specifically about the importance of collaboration

among functional areas (e.g., student and academic affairs) to achieve their organizational mission and be effective. Collaboration seems to be an intuitively good idea to many people. We do not need a research study to illuminate how having more than one faculty member design a course can enhance the quality or complexity of ideas. We see the benefits of scientists working together in labs, creating breakthroughs that are unimaginable without cross-disciplinary work. These examples have become accepted wisdom on many campuses across the country. In fact, collaboration has moved from an intuitively good idea to an imperative because of the overwhelming evidence of its benefits (Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004; Katz & Martin, 1997; Loan-Clark & Preston, 2002).

A variety of external organizations and sectors are encouraging higher education to become more collaborative in its approach to teaching and research, including accreditors, foundations, business and industry, and government agencies such as National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation. These organizations have been espousing the importance and value of collaboration for knowledge creation and research, student learning, and improved organizational functioning (Ramaley, 2001). The recent "Spellings report" (U.S. Department of Education, 2006) suggests that higher education needs to work in collaboration to increase access, lower costs, and improve performance. If you look at the conferences announced in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* they often have collaboration within the title: "Collaborating to Embrace the Changing Dynamics of Higher Education," "University and Community Partnerships: Improving Access to Higher Education," "Collaboration for the Advancement of College Teaching and Learning," "Using Technology to Create Greater Cross-Campus Collaboration," and "Diversity: A Shared Responsibility—Getting Student and Academic Affairs to the Table."

Yet collaboration is not widespread in the academy, and if one attends a professional conference in the field, one is likely to

hear about the difficulties of trying to implement a plan for student and academic affairs collaboration or a campuswide research center. Learning communities and student and academic affairs partnerships struggle to become institutionalized because higher education institutions are generally organized in departmental silos and bureaucratic or hierarchical administrative structures. Even though there is great difficulty in implementing collaborative initiatives, the imperative to collaborate and logic supporting collaboration are very strong. As a result, we see campuses attempt one collaborative effort after another, often with limited success. For example, one year they may try to develop a first-year transition program, the next year a transfer center, followed by a research collaborative, but each project struggles to get off the ground. We need to better understand how to support this work and make it successful.

Much has been written about the barriers to collaborative work, but little has been written about how to foster collaboration within higher education. (For barriers to collaboration see Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004; Love & Love, 1995; Schroeder & Hurst, 1996; Sobol & Newell, 2003; Stein & Short, 2001.) This is the challenge that is undertaken in this book: to provide a working framework for institutions interested in creating a context in which collaboration can flourish. Currently, each college or university independently attempts to determine its path to collaboration. This approach can be extremely problematic, as research suggests that without intention and design, over 50 percent of collaborations fail (Doz, 1996). Furthermore, tinkering with collaboration on the edges—that is, trying out an innovation in a pocket (although better than no collaborative work because it can lead to collaborative efforts)—will not allow institutions to meet the promise of a collaborative advantage; campuses will experience more success if they redesign their campuses. But before getting too far ahead of ourselves, we want to describe more about the reasons that collaboration has become so

important and why it is often difficult. This background on the logic of collaboration establishes a context for understanding why institutions should undertake the work, how to move to a collaborative environment, and why fairly major reorganization is necessary.

Defining Collaboration

First we provide some thoughts on and definitional distinctions related to the concept of collaboration. People are constantly working together, but what makes an effort collaborative? Research that we cite in this text about the advantages of collaboration often does not differentiate clearly among teamwork, collaboration, coordination, partnering, or networking. Although these studies may not be clear about terminology, what is clear is that they are examining different ways of working together that involve a more collective and interactive approach. The study we conducted focused on campuses that were involved in collaborative efforts, and we were interested in these types of working relationships. We briefly describe some of the differences between these terms so the reader understands some of the dissimilarities, but they are not essential to understanding our argument. Whether you are interested in increasing the amount of teamwork, coordination, networking, or collaboration within your campus, the framework described in this book will help you succeed.

Now let's examine some definitions of collective and interactive work. Networks are not deliberately designed, do not necessarily have shared goals, and depend more on the exchange of information and ideas. Cooperative arrangements are usually more formal than networks and may involve a memorandum of agreement or other formal structure (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). They typically involve coordination in which partners share information or work on tasks together but usually do not

fundamentally alter their work (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). Partnerships and collaboration involve joint goals and a reliance on each other to accomplish the goal. Collaborators try to align goals and identify a similar mission, such as student character development. They then try to work at a more fundamental level, which entails joint planning and power sharing (Hagadoorn, 1993; Lockwood, 1996). In order to be considered collaboration, it is essential that the process entail an interactive process (relationship over time) and that groups develop shared rules, norms, and structures, a task that often becomes their first work together (Wood & Gray, 1991).

Also, there are two types of collaboration commonly referred to (usually called alliances)—internal and external (Wood & Gray, 1991). Internal collaborations include areas such as cross-functional teams, interdisciplinary teaching and research, and student and academic affairs collaboration. External collaborations include steering committees, P–16 partnerships, campus-community partnerships, research parks with industry and business, and regional health collaboratives. External collaboration has received a great deal of attention in the business literature because alliances and mergers are considered a key aspect of surviving in difficult financial times (Saxton, 1997; Whetten, 1981). In the higher education literature, more research and writing has been developed on external collaboration, including work on university and community partnerships and school and university collaborations (Brisbin & Hunter, 2003; Johnston, Wetherill, High, & Greenebaum, 2002; Timar, Ogawa, & Orillion, 2004). The study of collaboration reported in this text explored both external and internal collaborations, but focused more on internal collaborations as there is generally less literature in this area.

Is collaboration always necessary? No. There is nothing worse than people forcing collaboration on a situation that simply does not require it. Not all decisions need multiple forms of expertise; sometimes a program can be better offered by one unit, some policy

issues cannot be broadly shared because of privacy, and sometimes learning needs to be focused within a specific discipline to master a competency. We want to make sure this book is *not* interpreted as denying the value of individual efforts, efforts within a department or function, or discipline-based work.

The Logic of Collaboration

Why are so many external constituents interested in having higher education become more collaborative? These external groups (accreditors, the United States Department of Education, state policymakers) are all responding to research conducted in the last thirty years within government and business. In the 1980s, American businesses suffered from competitive challenges that forced them to look at their operational structures and to examine ways to be more successful (Cole, 1999). One of the main lessons learned from this research and reflection is that the hierarchical and bureaucratic structure of American businesses (and organizations more broadly) was preventing them from innovating and responding to customer or client needs (Damanpor, 1996; Kingston, 1995). Products were more costly, and therefore less competitive, because of the lack of collaboration across functions, which has been found to be more efficient. Under pressure from difficult financial times, changing demographics, globalization, and increasing complexity, "siloed" work with duplicative activities and a lack of communication and synergy across function was not working anymore. Under these new conditions, organizations were forced to rethink their work. In the business literature, the main strategy for addressing these many new challenges has been through collaboration and partnership. For example, partnerships help combine resources and identify new solutions to problems by combining expertise. Rosabeth Moss Kanter (1996) coined the term "collaborative advantage" to describe the way that private sector organizations had begun to engage in strategic partnerships

that enhance institutional capacity to meet the demands of the new environment. In addition, the now famous term "learning organization" coined by Peter Senge (1990) is centered on collaboration (teamwork, cross-functional work) to increase effectiveness and meet external organizational challenges. Government agencies and units also began to reexamine hierarchical structures and implemented Total Quality Management and other techniques to create more cross-functional work (Cohen & Brand, 1993; Osborne & Gaebler, 1992).

As these sectors (government and business in particular) began to re-examine how they function and change how they fundamentally operate, it was only natural that they would want to encourage this type of collaboration within other organizations. Accreditors and state policymakers began to suggest that colleges and universities work across units in order to effectively conduct student assessment, for example. In addition, various funders such as government agencies and foundations began to encourage joint submission of grant proposals to enable cross-sector solutions to societal problems (Ramaley, 2001). The various benefits that accrue to collaborative activities made government and businesses feel compelled to try to encourage this activity on college campuses.

Advantages of Collaboration

In this section, we review the collaborative advantages that convinced Kanter (1996) and Senge (1990) that successful organizations are ones that can encourage collaborative activities, especially related to their main functions and mission. These collaborative advantages are reasons that business and government have supported and will continue to support collaborations.

Innovation and Learning

Perhaps the most important and cited advantages to collaboration are that it creates innovation and learning (Senge, 1990;

Googins & Rochlin, 2000). Study after study demonstrates that bureaucratic and hierarchical organizations reinforce the routine following of policies and procedures (Austin, 2000; Barringer & Harrison, 2000; Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Kanter, 1996; Senge, 1990). If people are focused on routines and follow policy exclusively, they will not question ineffective practices and policies or work to innovate. However, organizations that are set up in a matrix fashion (have both horizontal and vertical linkages and connections among staff), with cross-functional structures (different functions within organizations work together and report to each other), or are team based (units work collaboratively rather than individually and in various functional areas) and encourage more interaction, information sharing, communication, and collective problem solving result in innovation and learning. Although there are other outcomes from collaboration, such as increased communication, which can be advantageous itself, collaborative efforts are typically touted for their relationship to innovation (Paulus & Nijstad, 2003). As Mohrman, Cohen, and Mohrman (1995) note: "innovation occurs when different perspectives and knowledge bases are joined, resulting in the reframing of problems and solutions that would not have been likely or possible from within one perspective" (p. 8). Although many college campuses may not see the importance of innovation as easily as businesses that create new products and respond to the changing market, there are many functions on campus that do require innovation. For example, research often involves innovation, particularly applied research. In addition, campuses are being asked to conduct assessment of student learning and institutional effectiveness. Campuses are more likely to innovate and learn if they are set up to create novel solutions. In general, campus environments have changed dramatically (more diverse students, additional technological demands, increased need for security and safety, new skills needed for student success), but processes have not necessarily evolved. Some researchers

(Chafee, 1998; Ewell, 1998; Keith, 1998; Tierney, 1998) suggest that this inability to innovate is compromising higher education's effectiveness and quality.

Cognitive Complexity

Another important outcome of working in collaborative ways is cognitive complexity (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Googins & Rochlin, 2000). Cognitive complexity is a perspective of a problem or issue with nuanced solutions that represents multiple perspectives. Problem solving might not always result in innovation or new ideas, but having a more complex perspective to address problems can enhance solutions. Research on teams, in particular, demonstrates that having individuals that represent different types of expertise (functional area) or background (gender or race or social class) enhances the number of perspectives offered and develops a complex picture, analysis, and resultant solution (Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Denison, Hart, & Kahn, 1996; Eisenstat & Cohen, 1990; Neumann & Wright, 1999). Collaboration ensures that the needed expertise to problem solve an issue is available and addressed. How many times have you been on a committee that had to address complex problems, such as understanding rising attrition rates or difficulty recruiting a diverse student body, and realized the need for different types of expertise to address the issue? Campuses need to pay more attention to establishing teams with appropriate expertise.

Better Service

Collaboration also creates better service within an organization (Ascher, 1988; Brown, 2000; Bloland, 1997; Fried, 2000; Denison, Hart, & Kahn, 1996; Hyman, 1995; Swanson & Weese, 1997; Wohlstetter, Malloy, Hentschke, & Smith, 2004). Although organizations create individual units to handle and manage discrete sets of activities, processes cut across organizational units. Organizations that work across functions better address students'

needs, for example, by eliminating the need to send a student from advising to financial aid to the TRIO program to obtain a solution to a problem. Because information is shared between offices and communication is open, each office has a better chance of serving students and helping them understand what other office they need to be directed to in order to resolve a problem. This also helps address student concerns more quickly, thus creating greater efficiency and effectiveness. Service offered through siloed organizations typically involves more time to resolve a problem, sending the client to multiple locations, and often leads to incomplete or inaccurate resolution.

Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency

Collaboration can also decrease costs and lead to greater efficiency (Googins & Rochlin, 2000; Hagadoorn, 1993). If every unit within a college campus decides to set up a separate unit to conduct assessment of student learning, the cost to implement this function will be quite high. However, if a variety of similar units work together to conduct student learning assessment, a cost savings can be obtained. In addition, these units can learn from each other and share ideas about outcomes assessment. The time saved through information sharing also saves money because less time and fewer human resources are used to address common issues on campus. Furthermore, collaboration often leads to learning among people who work together and hence can save professional development money and create greater efficiency as the staff in various units become more effective in conducting their work. Collaborating in this fashion is not an argument for greater centralization of resources, but it is an acknowledgment that collaborating can create cost savings for certain organizational functions. Also, hierarchical organizations tend to be a costly way of integrating complex work. Having a proliferation of managerial and control rules can also result in delays and lack of responsiveness as decisions have to move up the organizational chain.

Employee Motivation

One of the least described advantages of collaborative organizations (but a very important one) is that employees tend to be more motivated and committed and have greater job satisfaction. Working in teams can increase desire for personal development, and employees tend to enjoy having more interaction and access to greater information (Denison, Hart, & Kahn, 1996; Googins & Rochlin, 2000). Because individuals work on a variety of projects of interest and share ideas with other people who are interested in similar initiatives, they tend to be more satisfied in their positions. Working with a team or any matrix organization enlarges an individual's experience and usually involves increased responsibility and involvement in decision making, which are all results generally related to improved morale (Denison, Hart, & Kahn, 1996). In short, collaboration can lead to much greater effectiveness, efficiency, and a better work environment.

Higher Education and the Logic of Collaboration

There is a plethora of evidence from other sectors such as business and government about the advantages of collaboration, as well as increasing research support from within higher education for the need of campuses to rethink their organizational structures in order to reap the rewards of collaboration (Knefelkamp, 1991; Love & Love, 1995; Stein & Short, 2001). It is these rewards and opportunities that compelled leaders such as Donald Kennedy, former President of Harvard, in his book *Academic Duty* (1997), to state that reorganizing higher education institutions for collaboration is one of the primary challenges and has the greatest promise for ensuring excellence in the future. Kennedy and other higher education leaders and scholars have documented how undergraduate education has become impoverished, a decline often exacerbated by siloed departmental structures (Arnold, 2004). Departmental specialization has resulted

in students' receiving a fragmented knowledge base with the consequent difficulty in thinking in multifaceted and problem-based ways. Undergraduate education, the primary mission of the higher education system, is impoverished as faculty focus on upper division courses within their disciplinary area of specialization. The departmental structure represents a barrier to creating quality education by stifling collaboration and providing few rewards for focusing on general and liberal arts education. Kennedy has been joined by other major educational leaders such as Derek Bok (1986), and many national associations have critiqued higher education for its individualistic and siloed structure. Perhaps the most well-known document to articulate the benefits and need for collaboration is *Powerful Partnerships: A Shared Responsibility for Learning* (American Association for Higher Education, American College Personnel Association, and National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, 1999). The report makes the case that: "only when everyone on campus—particularly academic and student affairs staff—shares responsibility for student learning will we be able to make significant progress for improving it" (p. 1). The Association of American Colleges and Universities report, *Greater Expectations* (2002), also notes that the future success of higher education is dependent on collaboration across disciplines and units and between higher education and other sectors.

Although much of the concern and pressure to collaborate has focused on the impact of a fragmented learning environment, there have also been critiques to how fragmentation has affected and limited knowledge production (NAS, Institute of Medicine, & NAE, 2005; Paulus & Nijstad, 2003; Rafferty, 1994; Sobol & Newell, 2003). Thus, there has been growing concern that current organizational structures prevent higher education from meeting its mission of providing a quality learning environment, ensuring value added to students by increasing their learning, and creating valuable knowledge for society. Research suggests that

collaboration can enhance student learning, enhances research production, improves governance and management, and creates more productive services (Conway-Turner, 1998; Eyler & Giles, 1999; Kezar, Hirsch, & Burack, 2001; Knefelkamp, 1991; Lenning & Ebbers, 1999; Love & Love, 1995; Smith & McCann, 2001).

Student Learning and Teaching

In their book entitled *Student Success in College*, Kuh, Kinzie, Shuh, & Whitt (2005) identify shared responsibility (collaboration) for educational quality and student success as being associated with campuses that have high levels of student engagement. One of their main conclusions is that leaders should encourage collaboration across functional lines. Colleges and universities with strong levels of student engagement were organized similar to high-performing organizations in business with multiple partnerships, cross-functional collaborations, and teams. Some of the key elements that they note are faculty collaboration across disciplines and units in developing curriculum; student and academic affairs collaboration to develop first-year experience and transition programs, residential programs, and service learning; and inclusion of educators from the library or distance learning into the creation of educational activities. Their research found that students are more likely to thrive and learn when support comes from multiple sources that are working together.[1] For example, summer bridge programs are particularly successful on these campuses because they include expertise from multiple student affairs offices (advising, tutoring, safety), faculty from a variety of units, librarians, students, and key administrators across units.

Although Kuh et al. (2005) examined campuses that are designed to encourage collaborative work and have an overall ethic of collaboration, there is research from studies of specific collaborations (e.g., service learning) that also support the impact of collaboration on student learning. For almost two decades, there has been a concerted movement to create greater collaboration between student

and academic affairs. For example, Kuh et al. (2005) concluded that academic and student affairs collaboration helps create innovative solutions and programs that enhance student learning, such as learning communities and undergraduate research experiences; brings a broader expertise and set of perspectives to programs and services offered to students; and provides greater alignment and synergy between the academic mission and services and support of academic mission (Kezar, Hirsch, & Burack, 2001; Schroeder, 1999b).

Higher education institutions are realizing the importance of enabling internal collaboration to create a better learning environment and as a result a variety of new collaborative practices have emerged and studies have been conducted on their effectiveness. Several recent studies of interdisciplinary teaching (Barkley, Cross, & Major, 2004; Conway-Turner, 1998; Smith & McCann, 2001), learning communities (Smith & McCann, 2001), and community service learning (Eyler & Giles, 1999) illustrate that these collaborations enhance student performance on many learning measures. Interdisciplinary teaching has been found to promote greater student engagement in learning, increased likelihood to develop higher cognitive skills (i.e., problem solving and critical thinking), promotion of creative thinking, increased sensitivity to ethical issues, and a greater tolerance for ambiguity (Hursch, Hass, & Moore, 1983; Newell, 1994, 1998; Newell & Green, 1982). Furthermore, collaborative learning contributes to an openness to diverse perspectives, fosters persistence in college, and promotes greater faculty-student interaction, which has a notable impact on student success and learning (Astin, 1993; Cabrera et al., 2002; Pascarella & Terenzini, 2005). Similar to interdisciplinary learning, partnerships among multiple departments and units have a positive impact on student learning (Bosworth & Hamilton, 1994). The study of Kuh et al. (2005) on student engagement also found that shared responsibility among multiple groups (i.e., student and academic affairs, staff, and faculty) enhances student learning and success. Students experience increased student engagement and a greater sense of

integration into the college, experience that also leads to student success (Nesheim et al., 2007).

Research

Collaboration has the opportunity to improve research and knowledge production. A variety of authors have noted how interdisciplinary research, which draws on the expertise of faculty across various units, creates innovative and holistic knowledge that improves our understanding (NAS, Institute of Medicine, & NAE, 2005; Paulus & Nijstad, 2003; Rafferty, 1994; Sobol & Newell, 2003). For example, studies demonstrate how interdisciplinary research enhances research production and improves understanding of how to address issues of poverty, infectious diseases, environmental degradation, and health care (Bradshaw et al., 2003; Frost & Jean, 2003; Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004; Mattila, 2005; Ramaley, 2001). Similarly, faculty who have developed multi- and interdisciplinary research centers to address pressing problems of our times often obtain greater funding from external sources and develop richer knowledge (Boardman & Ponomariov, 2007; Frost & Jean, 2003). The National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health have been encouraging higher education institutions to create interdisciplinary research institutes to draw on the expertise across campuses and to create more innovative and holistic research. The benefits of interdisciplinary research and multidisciplinary research centers are many. Researchers note that interdisciplinary research centers allow for the sharing and synthesis of knowledge across a wide set of disciplines, enable more rapid sharing of information, forge external and internal networks, raise prestige, promote faculty productivity, and stimulate the production of new and innovative research (John-Steiner, 2000; Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004; London & Walsh, 1975; Younglove-Webb, Gray, Abdalla, & Purvis Thurow, 1999). Multidiscipline, multipurpose university research centers (MMURC), which are specifically funded by the National Science Foundation's Engineering Research Center and

Science and Technology Centers programs, are attributed with increasing technology transfer (Boardman & Ponomariov, 2007). MMURCs have contributed the promotion of technology sharing between universities and industry, which often leads to new technologies available to the general public.

In addition to the overall benefits of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research centers, there are also benefits to the individuals who participate in this form of research. Boardman and Ponomariov (2007) note that faculty who are involved in MMURCs not only gain access to additional resources and are able to associate with the prestige of these centers, they gain a sense of satisfaction by contributing to society. Sharing their skills and research often leads to the development of new technologies that industry is able to produce and make available to the general public. In turn, academic departments become more problem based as MMURCs involve more faculty and integrate into the academic culture. MMURCs are important research centers; they have afforded substantial federal funding and serve as a model of the potential benefits of collaborative interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research.

Interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research is not without its challenges. A lack of reward for collaborative research in the tenure and promotion process (Arreola et al., 2003; Bozeman & Boardman, 2004; Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004), expectations to complete work in both the department and research centers (Frost, Jean, Teodorescu, & Brown, 2004), and challenges to academic norms often lead to conflicts between disciplines and interdisciplinary work (Bohen & Stiles, 1998). However, the benefits of interdisciplinary research—the development of innovative and creative research, technology transfer with industry, increased likelihood of receiving external funding, and individual satisfaction for contributing to society—underscores the necessity that teams working together overcome those obstacles (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992; Austin & Baldwin, 1991). Simply put, the

benefits of interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research outweigh the challenges.

Improved Governance and Management

It is significant that collaboration not only fundamentally improves the core mission of postsecondary institutions (teaching, learning, and research), but it is also helpful in improving governance and management. Although higher education institutions have a history of shared governance (in contrast to the individualistic approach to teaching and research), the range of stakeholders involved in shared governance has been limited. For example, staff, students, and nontenure track faculty, which make up over 50 percent of the faculty, are often not involved in the governance of the institution. Collaborative efforts that involve people across various units usually result in a broadening of governance on campus to include new groups (Astin, Astin, & Associates, 2001; Kuh, 2006; Kuh et al., 2005). For example, in the effort to create a learning community, new stakeholders are brought to the table, such as librarians, clinical staff, and students (Bourassa & Kruger, 2001). These new stakeholders are usually recognized for having important ideas and input. As a result, campus leaders often realize the need to alter governance structures to be more inclusive. Research on governance in higher education demonstrates how increasing stakeholder groups' input leads to several important outcomes: it (1) increases the complexity of analysis, (2) results in stronger decisions, (3) develops greater buy-in and trust, and (4) tends to improve morale (Birnbaum, 1992; Bensimon & Neumann, 1993; Ferren & Stanton, 2004; Kezar, Carducci, & Contreras-McGavin, 2006).

Operations and Service

Collaboration also can create greater effectiveness and efficiency in day-to-day operations (Ferren & Stanton, 2004; Fried, 2000; Hyman, 1995; Muraskin & Lee, 2004; Schroeder, Minor, & Tarkow, 1999). For example, management is more effective on a

campus that establishes a budget process in which all units work together to create the overall budget and have input on the budgets of other units. When this process is well structured, resource allocation matches more closely the needs and priorities of the campus rather than being overtaken by politics and personal relationships. Many college campuses have to make difficult financial choices. State budgets have provided few increases for postsecondary institutions in the last few decades. Funding is shrinking for higher education as foundations and corporations provide fewer resources (Ehrenberg, 2006). However, corporations are more likely to give funding if higher education can demonstrate its accountability by providing services in the most efficient and cost-effective way. Campuses that can demonstrate how they work in nonbureaucratic and responsive ways attract attention from philanthropy and business.

Summary

This chapter has described how collaboration has become an imperative for higher education. A variety of influential external groups and agencies are encouraging higher education to reconsider the way it operates. The stakes are high, as many of these external groups provide funding to higher education. The chapter also outlined the many opportunities and advantages that result from working in a collaborative fashion based on research from a variety of sectors and also specifically within higher education. But to meet this imperative, it is necessary to understand some of the challenges to creating partnerships. This is the topic of the next chapter.

Notes

1. Kuh et al. (2005) can only measure proxies for learning outcomes. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) measures areas such as educational challenge, active and collaborative learning, faculty-student interaction, support services, and enriching educational experiences.