2018

Ideology In The Evolution of Nonprofit Academic Programs

Norman A. Dolch
University of North Texas, nadolch@sbcglobal.net

Robert F. Ashcraft
Arizona State University

Jack Beckerle
Lindenwood University

Roger Weis
Murray State University

Ideology In The Evolution of Nonprofit Academic Programs

Abstract

How do academic programs evolve? This overarching question has several subcomponents such as the following: 1. What gives impetus to new programs on a campus? 2. Do new programs begin as undergraduate majors and degrees that eventually progress to the graduate level? 3. Are there critical faculty masses that are necessary for the evolution of programs? These and similar questions are addressed in this analysis of four case studies examined over a 20 plus year period. Guiding this inquiry is the literature on organizational development as well as academic program development and sustainability. Among the findings are these: 1. External and internal factors of a campus including beliefs or ideologies influence the development of new programs. 2. While one might think that undergraduate level programs precede graduate programs on a campus, programs do not necessarily develop in this manner. 3. Critical faculty levels may be more myth than reality. These conclusions and others from this inquiry may be common sense on one level but the reality is that they are not. The purpose of this inquiry is to debunk often-embraced myths in higher education.

Keywords

Ideology in The Evolution of Nonprofit Academic Programs

Norman A. Dolch, University of North Texas

Nonprofit Academic Center Conference

Chicago, IL July 2015

Abstract

How do academic programs evolve? This overarching question has several subcomponents such as the following: 1. What gives impetus to new programs on a campus? 2. Do new programs begin as undergraduate majors and degrees that eventually progress to the graduate level? 3. Are there critical faculty masses that are necessary for the evolution of programs? These and similar questions are addressed in this analysis of four case studies examined over a 20 plus year period. Guiding this inquiry is the literature on organizational development as well as academic program development and sustainability. Among the findings are these: 1. External and internal factors of a campus including beliefs or ideologies influence the development of new programs. 2. While one might think that undergraduate level programs precede graduate programs on a campus, programs do not necessarily develop in this manner. 3. Critical faculty levels may be more myth than reality. These conclusions and others from this inquiry may be common sense on one level but the reality is that they are not. The purpose of this inquiry is to debunk often-embraced myths in higher education.

This paper examines the evolution of academic nonprofit programs. The fundamental question is how they come into existence and change over time. Evolutionary theory was popularized in the 1800's by Charles Darwin and his *Origin of the Species* and utilized in the social sciences by such social science Stallworth's as Spencer, Durkheim, and Tönnies. Evolutionary theory has also impacted disciplines such as education evidenced by articles such as one by Bertachi and Spagat (2002) that discusses the evolution of modern educational systems.

Evolutionary theory has undergone considerable change since its inception according to Eisenstadt (1967). Early models viewed development as unilineal and also failed to specify the mechanisms and process of change from one stage to another. These are critical realizations for understanding the evolution of academic nonprofit programs. Consider the fact that in public administration many departments have a nonprofit specialization in the Masters of Public Administration (MPA) but no undergraduate program. In fact, Columbia University established its Institute for Not-For-Profit Management in 1977 and began offering a certificate program for nonprofit managers. In 1982, the University of Missouri at Kansas City started a nonprofit concentration in its MPA program. These program beginnings are discussed in O'Neil's 1998 article on the history, current issues, and future of nonprofit management education. The inquiry of this paper is on the evolution of programs within universities and it examines questions such as the following: 1. What gives impetus to new programs on a campus? 2. Do new programs begin as undergraduate majors and degrees that eventually progress to the graduate level? 3. Are there critical faculty masses that are necessary for the evolution of programs?

Theories of Organizational Evolution and Change

As Hall and Tolbert (2005: 154) point out, organizational change can be approached in a number of ways and two of them are the internal political perspective and the interaction of organizational characteristics. Both of these approaches are discussed and some conclusions reached. Then, the literature on change in academic programs is examined with the intent of generating some guidance for examining four university case studies about the development of nonprofit academic programs.

Internal Political Perspective of Change

While Baldridge and Burnham (1975) argue that organizational characteristics are more important to innovation than the attitudes of its members, Hage and Dewar (1973) argue the opposite. Hall and Tolbert (2005: 170) argue this is the old philosophical chicken and egg argument. Which came first? The chircken or the egg. The solution seems to reside in the view of Max Weber who felt organizational change as heavily dependent on the push of various charismatic individuals or groups and the eventual routinization of the changes into the organizational structure (Eisenstadt, 1967: 227).

In a study by Daft and Becker (1978) schools were being encouraged by federal policies to try new programs. Economic conditions, internal politics, and power struggles were important determinants of the nature of the new programs. These power struggles were internal organizational politics and it is known from the earlier work of March and Simon (1958:173-177) that alternatives to present action are not sought unless the present action is unsatisfactory and leads to these two propositions on internal political struggles in organizations: 1. The amount of search for new alternatives decreases as satisfaction increases. 2. Where search for new alternatives is suppressed, program continuity is facilitated in organizations.

Interaction of Organizational Characteristics

In the previous discussion on the internal political perspective, reference is made to organizational characteristics. These characteristics are readily identified in the work of Hage and Aiken (1970) as complexity, formalization, stratification, and centralization. Organizational characteristics should be considered as factors both internal and those external to the organization such as markets or financial resources.

A study on university program innovation by Mannas and March (1978) suggested that during adverse economic times of constricting budgets, strong university departments had access to alternative resources such as federal grants whereas weaker ones tended to increase course offerings, make courses more accessible, and increase course benefits through more credit and higher grades. Organizational characteristics include more considerations than the traditional structural variables of the formal and complex organizational literature and the usefulness of external environmental considerations *a la* open systems theory should not be underestimated.

Change in Academic Programs

In conversations with thirteen central administrators at eight universities, Miller (2013) found that program development was a two-step process involving curriculum development and approval with faculty responsible for curriculum development and approval an administrative function involving governance and state regulations. Among the important findings was that no one within the university wanted surprises and informal discussions are usually held with the provost's signature the key. Topics for these discussions range from institutional fit to duplication and sustainability. Sometimes the discussions lead to developing tracks within existing programs and multidisciplinary programs were said to be particularly problematic because of administrative responsibility. Miller identifies both factors fostering and impeding program development. A theme also addressed in the research of Donnelly and Harding (2015).

Donnelly and Harding (2015) provide a list of drivers for program design or review and barriers to program design based on an online survey of 73 academics in the institutional program chair or coordinator role. Drivers for program design ranged from market considerations like skill shortages and unemployment to staff identifying instructional gaps, and attempts to stay current by responding to industry feedback. Barriers identified ranged from

financial concerns like difficulty paying specialized lecturers to attitudes and beliefs such as "Its not broken, don't fix it", to institutional considerations such as a lack of internal supports for program development.

Synthesis and Guidance for Inquiry

Vigner (2008) provides insight for synthesizing the organizational` change literature with that of change in academic programs. He reviews several change approaches and concludes that it is a contextual model comprised of an outer context and an inner context for universities. The outer context are factors external to the university such as legislative funding, racial groups and other organizations. The inner context involves the way that universities are structured in terms of internal governance and management. For the inquiry reported in this study, university organizational structure, governance policies and practices, interpersonal relationships and organizational politics are all important considerations and should not be dismissed.

Research Design

The study is based on four campuses that are either part of the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance (NLA) network of campuses or were part of it. Rather than name them, the campuses are referenced as A thru D. Information reported in the cases is from the web sites of the programs as well as material provided by the campus directors or former campus directors through conversations with the author, presentations, interviews, and write-ups about their programs.

Case Studies

Case A

The inception of this program started in May of 1994 when the first director of the program received an invitation from the new provost along with all other faculty at the university to share ideas with her about ways for the campus to better connect with the community. After discussing with a colleague his knowledge about the NLA program and receiving an enthusiastic endorsement because human services was one of the most rapidly expanding areas in the workforce, he scheduled a meeting with the provost who asked him to pursue it although his dean was not enthusiastic. There are advantages to being a tenured, full professor and the opportunity was pursued with the formation of a town-gown advisory committee hand selected by the professor.

This committee met several times during the Fall Semester of 1994 and in December voted on whether to bring the program to campus. The faculty voted "no" and the community representatives who were executive directors of the largest nonprofit organizations in the community voted "yes". The stumbling block was the $8,000 affiliation fee. When it was discovered that the faculty had no problem with the fee if the community raised the money, the

community members turned to the advisory committee chair, the faculty member who became the first program director, and charged him with figuring out how to do it. He did by constructing an agreement for services which allowed nonprofits in the community to write checks at various levels for services to be provided by the NLA program.

Since the NLA certification was not awarded by the university, approval did not need to go to the university system level or state level. Whenever possible, existing courses were used to offer formal training and a few new courses were shepardad through the college and university courses and curricula committees. Administration was done by the willing faculty member who became the campus director.

University A has offered the Certified Nonprofit Professional(CNP) designation and certificate in its various forms since 1995. As a certificate, it does not compete with majors because any student at the university may take the CNP while working on their degree. An English professor once stopped the director in the hallway to ask if it was true that his Shakespeare students could still major in English and get the CPN designation. When the response given was "yes", the English professor said it was a wonderful program and he would encourage students to participate.

For the first several years the nonprofit study program was only a certificate type of program. To enhance the university's attractiveness to students in its geographic target area, the university administration decided to initiate minors. Prior to this decision, the university had no minors. All the NLA program director needed to do was fill out the paper work for 21 hours of study in an area like nonprofit administration and the minor was placed in the university catalogue. The program director did this and now the nonprofit study program has a certificate program and a minor area of study.

The minor mirrors the requirements of the certificate. The program is most popular with general studies, community health, and sociology students, but others such as management, criminal justice, psychology, and history are represented in the mix of students in any given year.

CPA certification originally required 22 hours of formal course work, participation in the student organization, attendance at the Management Leadership Institute, and attendance at one of two retreats held throughout the year. These requirements changed as a result of competency changes on the part of NLA in 2008. The formal courses required are Organizational Theory and Research (3 hrs.), Introduction to Not-For-Profit Organizations (3 hrs.), Practicum in Not-For-Profit Organizations (3 hrs.), Seminar in Not-For-Profit Organizations (3 hrs.), internship (3 hrs.), the American Humanics Management Institute (1 hr.) and 6 hours from the following 3 hour courses: Principles of Management, Principles of Marketing, Introduction to Leadership, and Seminar in Public Relations for Nonprofit Organizations.

The program is located in the College of Arts and Sciences and housed in The Institute for Nonprofit Administration, formerly known as the Institute for Human Services and Public

Policy. Previously, it was in the History and Social Science Department located in the College of Liberal Arts. Since certificate programs at LSUS are under the Division of Continuing Education and Public Service, the program reports to one Dean and one Division Director. An Advisory Committee of faculty and community nonprofit leaders has provided support for the program since its inception. George Khoury, a local philanthropist, endowed a professorship for the program and the student organization initiated a major fund-raising event, The River Bend Review, which has developed into a premier fundraising event for the campus.

Built on the undergraduate program is a highly successful M.S. in Nonprofit administration that today is 100% online. The vision for this master's program stems from 1975 when the Dean for the College of General Studies was exploring the possibility of a master's program. A decision was made on campus that each college was to have a master's program. For the College of General Studies this was to be the Master of Science in Human Services Administration patterned after a similar program at Rider University that was interdisciplinary and included concentrations in criminal justice, community organizations, and public administration. Twenty-two years later when the Dean became Chancellor of the university, the Director of the Nonprofit Studies Program suggested to the chancellor while they were walking down the hall that the program be given consideration. The chancellor said "yes" and the director dug the proposal out of his files that had occasionally been resurrected over the years but never endorsed. Interestingly, a former provost indicated that when the proposal came to his desk it was dismissed without much thought because he believed it would never attract students. It quickly became one of the larger programs on campus attracting a significant number of African-Americans to a campus perceived historically in the community as hostile to them.

There was an attempt to develop a doctorate in Applied Public Policy and Administration that would allow a concentration in nonprofit organizations. Although it would have not only been self-sufficient financially and generated a significant income for the university, the university system would not allow it. The rationale was that the campus did not have enough qualified faculty even though the proposed faculty were nationally recognized scholars from around the country using a format pioneered at Case Western Reserve University for their Doctorate in Management.

It is interesting to note that a few years ago local community pressure mounted for the campus to merge with another state university under a different system of governance. This was narrowly avoided by the vote of a key state senator but the result was the immediate establishment of several new academic programs including a Doctorate of Education which has the possibility of a concentration in nonprofit organization. There are now several students following this tract so University A has a doctoral program available for students who desire it.

University B

University B offers an academic minor to undergraduates in nonprofit management called Youth and Nonprofit Leadership. The program began in1989 when the campus had a president who was very committed to strengthening universities and colleges to meet public expectations. In its advertising material, the NLA Program at University B claimed to be the largest in the country in the 2000s. Around 1990, the program moved from the Health, Physical Education, and Recreation Department to the Educational Studies, Leadership, and Counseling Department, then to the Wellness and Therapeutic Sciences Department in the College of Health Sciences and Human Services and today resides in the College of Education and Human Services.

The core curriculum of the undergraduate minor in Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Program is 19 hours. These are the topics and the hours of credit students receive for the courses: 1. Trends and issues in youth and human services (3 hours), 2. program administration in youth and human services organizations (3 hours), 3. leadership and support services in youth and human services organizations (3 hours), 4. a seminar in leadership development (3 hours), six hours of internship with an agency (6 hours), and a senior seminar (1 hour).

Students choose two, three-credit course electives in areas as diverse as accounting, environmental education, outdoor recreation, ethics, and adolescent psychology. In deciding upon electives, students first discuss their interests and goals with the NLAP director.

In addition to the undergraduate minor, the Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Program also has a Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Concentration in the Masters of Human Development and Leadership. This concentration is taught via internet courses and the average size of classes is 30 students in each of the 4 courses for the concentration. Approximately 75 students in the Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Program are graduate students in this master's program. although the master's program is part of the College of Education, not the College of Health Sciences and Human Services in which the Youth and Nonprofit Leadership Program is located.

 The University B NLAP philosophy is "to prepare students for leadership and volunteer roles in youth, human service, and other nonprofit organizations." There are no specific philosophies for each course, although service learning occurs in all core courses. Students learn constructs and theories within each NLAP course and then have opportunities to apply their learning through service learning experiences. University B as an institution permits a special designation to be placed on a student's transcript if they complete a specific number of hours in service learning courses. This was developed by the program director with a grant from the W.K. Kellogg foundation. The service learning orientation of the NLAP is reflective of service learning across the curriculum at University B.

A 25-member advisory committee consisting of professors, administrators, staff, and local nonprofits works with the program director. It meets biannually but does not actively participate in the governance of the program, being more supportive in nature. Financing of the program occurs in two ways. It has a general line item in the university budget and also some

funds are generated externally, chiefly for Management Leadership Institute, through the completion of service learning projects. However, some of the money raised also goes to the nonprofit organizations involved.

The NLA program at University B graduates between 30 and 40 students a year, with an impressive placement rate of close to 100 percent within a few months of graduation. Prior to that, as part of the minor, students will have gained experience through an internship placement. This has proven helpful with many internships turning into full-time jobs upon graduation, or with a job in a related area and/or agency. The program assists with this placement. About 80 percent of the internships are paid, with about 60 percent of them outside of the university community. This pattern exists because the community of University B is not a metropolitan area, so there are not many area placement opportunities and leaving the area for the summer internships creates financial hardship for many. Bowling Green, KY, Nashville, TN, and even St. Louis, MO serve as common places for internships.

University B continues its nonprofit studies programs but is no longer a member of the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance. It dropped its membership a few years ago when the program launched a master's degree. Joining the Nonprofit Academic Council (NACC) seemed more strategic as the program moved in a new direction. A part of the $8,000 Alliance affiliation was used for the NACC affiliation fee and the remaining dollars for aspects of the program.

University C

University C has operated its nonprofit studies program nearly forty years. While the NLA certification program still resides in the same college and academic unit that was in existence since its founding, naming changes have occurred involving both the college and department. For example, the College of Public Programs is now the College of Public Service and Community Solutions and and the academic unit within the college that administers the program was transformed from the Department of Recreation Management and Tourism to the School of Community Resources and Development (SCRD). Unique to the supervision of the program is the role of the ASU Lodestar Center for Philanthropy and Nonprofit Innovation, a unit also reflecting a name change from its beginning in 1999 as the Center for Nonprofit Leadership and Management. The NLA program is governed as a program within SCRD but day-to-day programming and management is the responsibility of the ASU Lodestar Center. A community board called the Leadership Council of the ASU Lodestar Center, comprised of business, philanthropic and nonprofit leaders, continues to assist with community relations, fundraising and curricular/co-curricular enrichment. The ASU Lodestar Center is the "driver" of academic programs within the nonprofit and leadership and management education themes of SCRD. There are currently five distinctive pathways for undergraduate students in the field. They include the NLA program, the NLM major, the NLM minor, the B.I.S. program and a special NLM track within the Public Service & Public Policy undergraduate degree. So while the overall NLM curricula of programs formally resides within SCRD, the supervision and direction

of the programs, including their alignment with Nonprofit Academic Centers Council Curricular Guidelines for Undergraduate and Graduate Degrees and the Nonprofit Leadership Alliances' Competency Framework for certifying students, resides within the Center. Moreover, most of the learning experiences and intellectual assets provided to students come through the Center.

Given its long history in the nonprofit studies field, it is not surprising that in 2007 University C launched the nation's first B.S. degree in nonprofit leadership and management along with a minor and certificates. While some of the nearly 40 students who enroll in the NLA program at University C each year now pursue this B. S. degree option, many of the NLA students pursue other degrees and continue to cross into the NLA Program and earn the Certified Nonprofit Professional credential. The strength of the NLA program at the university continues to be its interdisciplinary nature as students choose a degree in various fields (e.g., music, communication, journalism, etc.) and cross into the NLA Program for national certification in nonprofit management and leadership. Additionally, one of the earlier pathways to the AH national certification continues to occur and is reflected in those students who pursue the Bachelor of Interdisciplinary Studies (B.I.S.) degree. The B.I.S. degree combines two emphasis tracks to form a major and this continues to be a pathway for students interested in combining a core interest area with nonprofit management. A number of combinations with the NLA Program has occurred such as business-AH; communications-AH; psychology-AH, women's studies-AH, etc. However, with the advent of the B.S. Degree in nonprofit leadership and management, increasingly AH students are seeking this degree as their primary affiliation.

Along with the B.S. Degree noted previously is the Master of Nonprofit Studies (MNLM) degree that was launched during the 2006-2007 year. Three formal student pathways exist within the NLM thematic area at the graduate level. These include the Master of Nonprofit Leadership and Management program (formerly the Master of Nonprofit Studies), the NLM Graduate Certificate and the Social Enterprise and Community Development Certificate (SECD), available only online. Both the NLM undergraduate and MNML graduate degrees were created in direct response to market demand for such offerings and builds on the strengths of the NLA Program at University C. Currently, nearly 200 students are pursuing the NLM undergraduate programs (including the major, minor, B.I.S. and certificates) and more than 80 students are pursuing the MNLM degree and graduate NLM Certificate, and the SE & CD Certificate, making the university's nonprofit studies program of more than 300 the largest of its kind in the nation. In 2016, the MNLM program is available to qualified students fully on-line and also through an in-person option. A relatively new Ph.D. program in Community Development, within SCRD, includes options for students to pursue interests in nonprofit and nongovernmental organizations. The program owes its thematic reputation in nonprofit education to the legacy of the NLA program and related programs that have emerged since its beginnings.

Placement rates for students graduating from the NLA Program at University C remain high (80-90%) and increasingly students desire post-baccalaureate education offerings. Therefore, while the primary mission of the NLA Program at ASU has been to attract, educate,

and place undergraduate students into nonprofit positions, growing demand is expanding the NLA offerings to include two additional student demographics: 1) graduate students interested in earning their CNP credential, and, 2) non-degree seeking students who desire pursuing and alternative pathway to the CNP through online offerings outside the degree apparatus of the university and within the professional and continuing education unit of the ASU Lodestar Center, known as the Nonprofit Management Institute. Without regard for which pathway a student seeks, and whether or not a graduate actually uses their education for a nonprofit career, there remains a strong sense that any student who is educated through the program, becomes a better community volunteer, donor and citizen.

Beginning in the Fall 2006 semester, the NLA Program and the operating units in which it resides moved to a new downtown campus which is planning to serve a projected 20,000 students through an array of colleges, schools, programs and centers. The success of the NLA Program has been a primary driver for how the new campus programs will be designed and the proximity of the program to the inner city means a closer reach to many of the core nonprofit partners that have supported the program and benefited from its impact over the years. In the future, the NLA Program will likely foster a greater global reach. This will happen because of student interest in social entrepreneurship/enterprise that extends beyond defined boundaries of city, state or country. Philanthropic Studies is also being implemented as an outgrowth of the core nonprofit management education curriculum and co-curricular activities that have been the hallmark of the NLA Program at University C. The present and future of the nonprofit studies program at University C accentuates the 8 design aspirations of the New American University, as promulgated by University C and its president. The NLA Program at University C remains, despite its nearly four-decade history, at the core of the values and trajectory of the university and the stakeholders it serves. As aligned with the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance, the nonprofit studies program at University C remains is still focused as an undergraduate campus based program with an interdisciplinary focus but now includes additional pathways for non-degree seeking students and students who have already earned a bachelor's degree and desire earning their CNP credential while pursuing a graduate degree of their choice. While the traditional NLA program that is about early career entry into the nonprofit sector the expanded offerings are attractive to mid-career professionals and those with experience in other fields who wish to re-career into the nonprofit sector

University D

University D with an enrollment of 16,000 plus, has expanded its offerings in nonprofit education over the last 10 years. Students today may obtain a major, minor, or concentration in the area of nonprofit administration referred to on the campus as Nonprofit Administration (NPA). In 2010 an on-line executive graduate degree in Nonprofit Administration was added to the traditional graduate program.

University D's programs are "designed to prepare students for leadership positions in youth and community service agencies." Its undergraduate degree has 25 hours of core courses including class such as Introduction to Nonprofit Organizations (3 hours), Fundraising (3 hours), Management of Nonprofit Organizations (3 hours), Human Resource Management (3 hours), Leadership (3 hours), Volunteer Management (3 hours), a capstone Senior Seminar (3 hours), an Internship (3 hours) and participation in the Student Association which functions as a non-profit organization for which students earn 1 hour credit a semester and may repeat 4 times. Optional courses include Nonprofit Budgeting and Financial Management (3 hours), Grantwriting (3 hours), the American Humanics Management Institute (3 hours), Individual Giving/ Special Events (3 hours), Marketing for Nonprofit Organization (3 hours) and a Leadership Experience (1 hour). Special topic classes (varying numbers of hours) are also offered on a regular basis and the Student Association is also offered as a noncredit course every semester and is open to all students on campus.

A Master of Arts in nonprofit Administration is offered as well as a five-year B.A./M program. This program is specifically designed for those without work experience Although its nonprofit academic programs remain in place, University D is no longer a member of the Nonprofit Leadership Alliance and does not offer the Certified Nonprofit Professional designation of the Alliance. This disaffiliation occurred in part because the university's long-time president retired who was a personal friend of the Alliance's founder H. Roe Bartle. When the president retired, the new administration had other priorities and disaffiliated.

Analysis

From the cases, it is apparent that program evolution is not linear. All the campuses began their nonprofit studies programs with NLA certification. Some developed undergraduate minors and bachelors degrees (Universities C & D) while others like Universities A and B went from minors to Maters degrees. The title of the degree vary from campus to campus allowing University C to claim the first B.S. Degree in Nonprofit Leadership. University D developed one of the very first baccalaureate programs in the country. At University A, the development of the doctorate had nothing to do with the nonprofit program itself and everything to do with external forces driven by non-nonprofit sector forces.

Table 1: Order of Program Development in the Case Studies

| University | Progression of Program Development | | | |
	First	Second	Third	Fourth
University A	Certificate	minor	masters	Doctorate
University B	certificate	minor	masters	
University C	Certificate	Bachelors	masters	Doctorate
University D	certificate	bachelors	masters	

Another aspect of program development apparent from the cases is the role of persons from faculty interested in nonprofit studies to deans, university presidents or chancellors, and persons in the community-at-large like philanthropists or executive director of nonprofit organizations. At University A, a former provost admitted to the program director that the master's program had languished several times from inaction because he believed it would not attract students. The president at University B with his strong belief about meeting public needs and expectations certainly helped champion the development of the nonprofit studies program on his campus. It is noted that with university C . There is no question that support or lack of support from university administration is critical to program development.

Program success seems to foster further program development. On campuses A, B, and C, successful certificate programs led to the development of minors, majors, and master level work. This is quite apparent in the case of University C with the entire program begin moved to a new downtown campus to serve as the cornerstone.

Seemingly chance occurrences should not be overlooked in program development. A good example is the development of the minor program at University A. It developed because administrators believed that the listing of minor programs of study in the university catalogue might help attract students to the campus. Another example is from University B where the arrival of a new president who believed in the importance of meeting public expectations led to the NLA Program development. The opportunity in these instances was seized and the lesson is that they need to be seized because the opportunities may not be there at later. Reinforcing this observation is the development of the program at University B to award a certificate to students involved in service learning with a grant from the W.K. Kellogg Foundation that led to a special designation on university transcripts. University B seized the opportunity to make its transcripts distinctive.

Governance and approval to start programs were clearly concerns. At University A, the certificate program did not have to go to any campus committee or receive approval from any off-campus university system or governmental oversight organization like a Board of Higher Education.   When off-campus approval has to happen, institutional priorities and inter-organizational politics come into play. Private universities such as University D may largely escape this concern which is important for public universities. Universities B and C where the president had a belief in the importance of strengthening ties to the community ties to the community resulted in programs being established. Both University B and D illustrate how a change in leadership beliefs or concerns and outlooks over time affect programs affiliations and possibly their very existence.

The cases do allow for examination of the internal organizational structure of the universities and its impact on social change.   At University A, the lack of rules and regulations (formalization) regarding qualifying students at the university for external certificates resulted in the certificate program's establishment. When the provost at University A asked for faculty

participation in identifying and promoting ways for community involvement, the certificate program was examined. This suggests that the higher the level of participation in decision making, the higher the adaptiveness (change). However, at the same university (A), when the chancellor endorsed establishing a master's program, it happened leading to a contradictory statement: the higher the centralization, the higher the adaptiveness (change).

Discussion

Program development on campuses on the one hand should be logical, rational, and planned. It would seem that strong undergraduate programs would lead to graduate programs. The reality based on the four case studies is that they might but also might not. Vigner's embracement of the context of educational organizations allows for factors fostering and impeding change. More work needs to be done in this regard on the four cases in this piece of research in this regard. However, the analysis also identified chance factors and suggested what March and Heath (1994: 18-39) refer to as bounded rationality. Rather than logically exploring all alternatives and information, university administrators often make decisions on the basis of what they believe rather than everything they should know. According to Weick, Sutcliff, and Obstfeld (2005: 409) such behavior is known as sense making which is the "retrospective development of plausible images that rationalize what people are doing."   In other words, administrators and faculty look for facts and figures to back up their beliefs. These beliefs (ideologies) drive program change and are not rational. Logical, or based on rigorous research.

References

Donnelly, R., Harding, N. (2015) An Exploration of the Effects on Programme Design and development Effected by educational Leadership in Reaction to societal and Economic Factors in Ireland. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* 7, 2251-22534.

Eisenstadt, S.N. (1964) Social Change, Differentiation and Evolution. In N.J. Demerath, III and R. Peterson (Eds.) *System, Change, and Conflict* (pp. 213-229). New York: The Free Press.

Hall, R. H., & Tolbet, P.S. (2005) *Organizations, Structures, and Outcomes, Ninth Edition*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

Mannas, C. L. & March, J.G. (1978) Financial adversity, Internal Competition, and curricular Change in a University. Administrative science quarterly, 24: 541-52.

March, James G. (1994). *A Primer on Decision Making: How Decisions Happen*. New York: Simmon & Schuster.

March, J. G., & Simmon, H.A. (1958). *Organizations.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Miller, N. (2013) Conversations With Central Administration Facilitating Communication and Partnerships in New Program Development. *Planning for higher Education Journal,* 4: 45-61.

O'Neil, M. (1998). Nonprofit Management Education: History, current Issues, and the Future. In M. O'Neil and K. Fletcher (Eds.) *Nonprofit Management Education: U.S. and world Perspectives* (pp. 1-12). Westport, CN: Praeger.

Vigner, G. (2008). The Behavior-oriented Organizational Change Models and Large Scale Organizational change: A Case of the South African Higher education Transformation. *The International Journal of Learning,* 15:1447-9494.

Weick, K. E. , Sutcliffe, K. M., and Obstfeld. D. (2005) Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science*, 16: 409-421.