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ABSTRACT

The emergence of academic entrepreneurship is a recent phenomenon and the application of academic entrepreneurship is not consistent nor has consensus among institutions (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) posited that to understand the benefits and barriers of supporting and creating entrepreneurial activity in higher education, researchers need to apply the following conceptual dimensions when studying academic entrepreneurship: (1) creative disruption; (2) (dis)equilibrium; (3) innovation; (4) value creation; (5) [and] opportunity recognition. In this dissertation, a qualitative multi case study examined academic entrepreneurship with particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Through data analysis, the researcher sought to understand how university summer session administrators as institutional entrepreneurs foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape and additionally, how university summer session programs engage in entrepreneurial market and non-market or socially-oriented activities; ultimately recognizing how institutions may adopt the activity into the broader university strategic plan (Mars and Rios-Aguilar).

The participants for the study consisted of three summer session administrators, their supervisors and faculty and staff whom support market or non-market like activity during the summer session. Data collection methods included audio-recorded personal interviews, focus groups, document collection and observations were conducted at three public higher education institutions located within the North Central region of the North American Association on Summer Sessions (NAASS). Through data analysis, three themes and a number of subthemes emerged: 1) Campus Collaboration, with subthemes
of: a) Expanded Student Support Services, and b) Facility Usage; 2) Business Enterprise with subthemes: a) Incentivizing and Risk Management, b) Marketing c) Data Analysis and Reporting; and 3) Enrollment Management with the subthemes: a) Outreach to New Audiences, b) Retention and Completion Efforts and c) Year Round University.

The implications of this study suggest a business enterprise dependent on revenue will be aware of competing market forces, will use data driven decision-making and utilize incentive models to drive entrepreneurial culture. Secondly, enrollment management issues such as retention and graduation rates are increasingly reliant on the success of summer sessions. In addition, administrators play a vital role in shaping enrollment goals, fee structures and advising infrastructures for their organizations as supported by Sims, 2007. Finally, summer session administrators are collaborating with offices across campus to provide student support services. The intent is to work across service silos, present a united front to students while maintaining service expectations year-round rather than just Fall and Spring semester.

Most entrepreneurial activity identified in this study is portrayed as unique to summer yet could be adapted for Fall and Spring. Adapting summer session activity into the traditional calendar provides universities new teaching and delivery formats, new operating procedures and policy opportunities, and transparency with data driven decision-making resulting in fiscal gain. The future of summer sessions maybe where students attend universities year round and summer is no longer seen as the remedial semester operating outside of the traditional academic calendar.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

American universities are currently experiencing a profound shift within their economic and political environments. Led by a continuous unstable national economy, this shift is transforming higher education institutions to becoming more flexible and creative in how they deliver education (Clotfelter, Ehrenberg, & Getz, 2008; Sam & van der Sijde; 2014). Issues of declining state funds, competition from for-profit institutions and pressure for higher graduations rates are forcing institutions to adapt to remain relevant. Furthermore, within this competitive, market-driven economy, universities need to innovate through enterprising and entrepreneurial initiatives if they want to compete (Crowe, Hyun, & Kretovis, 2005; Demetrulias, 2005; Dev, 2005; Gee, 2014; Giroux, 2014; Mitchell, Palacios, & Leachman, 2014).

A public university education, not previously considered a good for sale, is increasingly treated as a commodity (Clotfelter, Ehrenberg, & Getz, 2008; Giroux, 2014; Sam & van der Sijde; 2014; Tuchman, 2009). Securing fiscal resources and operating within a funding level acceptable of public funds are critical functions of higher education (Dev, 2005). Since institutions of higher education have always contributed to society, their place within state budgets as well as public discourse, cannot be underestimated. Because of this role, universities have often been overlooked as profitable and entrepreneurial, contributing to economic development and the populous (Dev, 2005; McClendon & Perna, 2014; Sam & van der Sijde; 2014; Tuchman, 2009).

Two decades ago public institutions viewed a corporate approach to business repugnant and typically regarded corporate strategies as practices only found at for-profit
universities (Schejbal, 2009). Today, almost all institutions of higher education have gained acceptance of these divergent corporate-like models and have begun to adapt to a competitive market. Technology and market-like pressures are forcing universities to be competitive and consumer focused. Resources like these are shifting universities reliance for state allocations as sole source funding to a creative engine capable of self-sustainment (Schejbal, 2000).

One program within the institution, summer sessions, has adapted to these models quicker than other programs because of its unique position outside the traditional academic frame and calendar (Dev, 2005; Johnson, 2000; Schejbal, 2009). Summer session, typically regarded as the third semester, is administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters. Mostly a centralized operation overseen by an administrator, summer session is constantly wrestling with financial implications, innovative program development, and effective and efficient administration (Heikel, 2000; Johnson, 2000).

Historical literature reveals university summer session programs were governed by conventional managerial functions and programming addressed remedial students who were ill-equipped to handle the rigor of traditional academy (Crowe, Hyun, & Kretovics, 2005; White, 1999). Currently summer sessions are viewed as an extension of the traditional academic program that affords students, faculty, staff, and the institution additional opportunities for advancement (Alexander, 1997; Crowe, Hyun, & Kretovics, 2005). Summer sessions programming within the last two decades ushered in models for organizational self-sustainment, revenue sharing with the institution as well as the
academic departments, and hybrid centralization models for effective program administration (Demetrulias, 2005).

Summer session programs are constantly involved in developing and implementing entrepreneurial opportunities, yet the work of these units is not widely recognized as contributing substantially to the financial and social purpose of the institutional mission (Dev, 2005; Iverson, 2005). Enhancing and balancing the social and economic mission of the university may be utilizing the role of summer session administrators and programs (Dev; Iverson; White, 1999). Summer session programs can be the core of university program innovation, self-sustainment, and flexibility. They work with academic departments to research, develop, and incubate new programs to provide a sustainable future (Schejbal, 1997; Young & McDougall, 1988). According to Dev (2005), “although planning and developing summer programs may seem daunting, institutions will be greatly rewarded for strategically expanding” (p. 56). University programs, such as summer sessions, are rich in entrepreneurship, connect to their missions, and operate more effectively are more likely to experience increased student enrollments, balanced budgets, and thrive in the 21st century (Demetrulias, 2005; Iverson, 2005). Academic entrepreneurship theory provides an appropriate conceptual framework for gaining a deeper understanding of experiences present during university summer sessions. An academic entrepreneurial lens will provide a sense of what is occurring outside the traditional fall and spring calendar and how universities position the third semester to be entrepreneurial. This examination will provide the basis for an argument that universities begin to examine the major differences in procedures, policies, and programming occurring during summer and determine which such differences,
entrepreneurial in nature, should be strategically considered for how universities operationalize the traditional academic year. Understanding these consequences of an entrepreneurial culture is important when applying theoretical and conceptual underpinnings to study (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009).

**Conceptual Underpinnings**

A range of entrepreneurial constructs traditionally shaped from management and economic theories provide an overarching theoretical framework for this study. An examination of social (Cherwitz, 2005; Flynn, 2013; Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, 2006; Young, 2013) and institutional entrepreneurship (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009; Foss, 2006; Lachmann, 1971; Weik, 2011) and additional theoretical underpinnings, help guide and affirm academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Metcalf, 2009; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010) as the conceptual theory most appropriately suited to understand how summer session programs create market and non-market or socially oriented activities.

To affirm that academic entrepreneurship is the appropriate conceptual underpinning, it is the intention of the researcher to present entrepreneurship as the collective theory under which two additional theories, institutional and social, share similar entrepreneurial constructs but individually focus on different aspects of academic entrepreneurship. Institutional entrepreneurship focuses on the role of entrepreneurs within the organization and how they foster innovation (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009). Social entrepreneurship addresses the non-market or social orientated activity identified by Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) as a critical component of an academic entrepreneurial enterprise (Young 2013).
Utilizing an educational entrepreneurship conceptual framework, this study sought to understand how university summer session administrators as “institutional entrepreneurs” foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape and additionally, how university summer session programs engage in entrepreneurial market and non-market or socially-oriented activities (Mars and Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 442). Mars and Rios-Aguilar posited that to better understand the benefits and barriers of supporting and creating entrepreneurial activity in higher education, researchers need to apply the following conceptual dimensions when studying academic entrepreneurism: (1) creative disruption; (2) (dis)equilibrium; (3) innovation; (4) value creation; (5) [and] opportunity recognition. Furthermore, this study examined what the benefits and barriers are to supporting entrepreneurship through summer sessions (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Existing research on institutional entrepreneurship examines the phenomena rooted in management and economic constructs. Research also failed to observe and consider non-market or socially oriented activities; such as course delivery methods, instruction, and modifications in administrative processes (Demetrulias, 2005; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). A sound model for analyzing academic entrepreneurship is contingent on the inclusion of “non-market activities shaped by social, political, and economic forces and conditions” (p. 453). Utilizing academic entrepreneurship as a conceptual framework will provide a focused study on innovative actors, programs, systems, and structures occurring in summer session programs.
Statement of the Problem

American institutions are finding themselves in the midst of an economic and social shift towards accountability and commodification, which is forcing colleges and universities to adapt to an entrepreneurial culture (Clotfelter, Ehrenberg, & Getz, 2008; Gee, 2014; Giroux, 2014; Mitchell, Palacios, & Leachman, 2014; Tuchman, 2009). As universities experience budget deficits and shortfalls in state funding, institutions are seeking creative ways to increase revenue (Sam & van der Sijde, 2014; Schejbal, 2009). Therefore, in today’s higher education environment, targeting new programs that are financially profitable, while maintaining the university’s mission, are essential (Dev, 2005).

According to Dev (2005), “…summer programming offers higher education institutions an opportunity to take advantage of their strengths and resources to generate revenue and further their missions” (p. 56). Within a market-driven higher education landscape, university leaders need to recognize the entrepreneurial aspects of summer sessions and the opportunity this type of programming contributes to the university strategic plan and financial viability (Dev; Schejbal, 2000).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to add to a body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilars, 2010) within public university summer session programs. Since summer sessions are typically administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters, particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Further, the study
analyzed the benefits, limitations, and consequences of supporting collegial summer entrepreneurial activity. Limited research exists on educational entrepreneurship in summer session programs (Demetrulias, 2005; Langrell, 1990; Mars and Rios-Aguilar); therefore, a multi-case study approach was selected to provide a detailed narrative of market and non-market or socially oriented activity within varying sizes of public university summer session programs (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005).

**Significance of the Study**

There is a need for more in-depth knowledge about the role of summer sessions in the new era of higher education commodification (Tuchman, 2009). Despite summer session researchers continually insisting summer programs are innovative and entrepreneurial, a deeper understanding of new managerialism and innovative programs in an accountability system is needed (Datnow, 2006; Tuchman, 2009).

In addition, little attention has been given to the conceptual and theoretical boundaries of educational entrepreneurship (Langrell, 1990). Existing research on entrepreneurship in higher education is rooted in managerial and economic theoretical underpinnings focusing almost exclusively on market driven phenomena. The literature fails to recognize non-market-oriented activities or socially oriented activities (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Further, little empirical work exists within higher education literature that gives attention to the characteristics and implications of individual entrepreneurial behaviors. Since this study attempts to examine the role of institutional entrepreneur through summer session administrators and faculty, it is important to understand what the benefits
and limitations are to the university and how they may impact the strategic plan (Demetrulias, 2005; Mars and Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Historically, change resistant university faculty and staff have viewed the direction to produce entrepreneurial activities as a consequence of the administration’s insular policies; driving the bottom line for the promotion of self-interest projects (Schejbal, 2000). Understanding this perception would provide for more robust research on how academic entrepreneurs create market and market-like opportunities and how within developing a university strategic plan the feelings of victimization can be avoided (Demetrulias, 2005; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Research Questions**

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How do university summer session administrators define innovation?
2. How do university summer session administrators foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape?
3. How do university summer session programs engage in the following entrepreneurial dimensions through market and non-market or socially-oriented activities?
   a) Creative disruption
   b) Innovation
   c) Value creation
   d) Economic (dis)equilibrium
   e) Opportunity recognition
4. What are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

5. What are the barriers to supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

**Design of the Study**

In selecting a design for this study, Creswell (2009) stated qualitative research is a means to explore and understand an individual or group problem within a natural setting. To illustrate this depiction of a social problem, researchers should understand their own role, interpret and make sense of phenomena in terms of the meaning people articulate (Mertens, 2005). Through a social constructivist lens and a grounded theory approach, the researcher utilized inductive logic to make sense of a problem and render substantial meaning from the situation (Creswell; Mertens). Social constructivists rely heavily on the participants’ views, listening carefully to what they say and do in their settings (Creswell). Grounded theory allowed the researcher to compare and contrast emerging themes among different groups across several sites (Creswell). To collect rich and thick data for identifying themes, a multi-case study approach was selected with the intent to provide an in-depth exploration of a program such as a university summer sessions program and the opportunity to build upon an emerging field of data which limited prior research exists (Creswell). Within a qualitative multi-case study, the researcher can invoke several methods of data collection such as interviews, focus groups, and document analysis to accumulate rich, thick, and detailed information (Creswell). The multi-case study approach is particularly appropriate for understanding different entrepreneurial
activities occurring within American public institutions of higher learning (Merriam, 1998).

**Design Controls**

Social constructivists recognize their own background and experience shape interpretation of the data analysis (Creswell, 2009). The researcher has worked in higher education for approximately thirteen years and has served as the primary administrator charged with the administrative responsibilities for a mostly centralized summer session program. Acknowledging potential bias and to ensure the trustworthiness of the study, the researcher invoked several methods including peer debriefing to control for the study, ultimately increasing the validity (Creswell). Peer debriefing with the dissertation advisor provided an opportunity for the researcher to confront and question certain bias during the study (Mertens, 2005). Use of member checking is “the most important criterion in establishing credibility” (Mertens, p. 255). The researcher ensured the participants’ viewpoints were accurately portrayed by sharing a draft of the research report with them for additional clarification. During collection and data analysis, triangulation of the data allowed the researcher to develop and converge themes across several data sources (Creswell). The researcher also developed an audit trail to conserve the rich data for other researchers. Personal interview and focus group protocols were peer reviewed to determine validity and reliability. The protocols consisted of open-ended questions “intended to elicit views and opinions from the participants” (Creswell, 2009, p. 181).
Limitations and Assumptions

Creswell (2009) suggested limitations establish boundaries for the study. The limitations and assumptions of this study are mostly associated with the design and researcher’s experience. The design of this study was limited or confined to the study of three, public four-year post-secondary institutions chosen within the North Central region. Therefore, the researcher was cognizant of over generalizing the findings to the institutions and summer session programs. Moreover, there is little research on entrepreneurial activity occurring within summer session programs.

In addition, this study was limited by the use of Mars and Rios-Aguilar’s (2010) conceptual framework on educational entrepreneurship to design the interview questions and how the researcher collected and interpreted the data. For a holistic study of a university program, Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) suggested the researcher examine market and non-market or socially oriented activity through five entrepreneurial dimensions. However, since the study was bounded by time, location, and the quantity of data collected on site, the researcher did not provide a comparable study of the participant’s interactions in their national settings (Creswell, 2009).

Furthermore, the researcher brings a certain worldview and bias to the study. The researcher examined summer entrepreneurial activity cognizant of how the constructivist’s worldview and current practitioner’s role influenced the study (Creswell, 2009). Although these lenses suggest a certain bias, the researcher was committed to remaining open-minded and objective throughout the progression of the study (Creswell).
Definition of Key Terms

It is important to define key terms in a research study (Creswell, 2009). The definition of key terms helps clarify ambiguity in language used throughout the study (Creswell, 2009). The following terms are defined for this inquiry:

**Commodification.** The transformation of universities as they attempt to accommodate for business changes affecting the lives of their faculty, staff and students. The development of a more corporate approach to education that produces powerful administrations and disenfranchised faculty (Shumar, 1997).

**Creative disruption.** A new or different type of innovation that emerges from a university to capture new audiences not traditionally being served (Chiles, Bluedorn & Gupta, 2007; Christensen, 2008). It is the combination of disruptive technology and increased focus on student outcomes (Christensen, 2008). The newest technological idea disrupts the bigger and better model while bringing to market a product or service that is typically more affordable and easier to use (Christensen & Erying, 2011).

**Economic (dis)equilibrium.** Formed from the basis of theories in economic equilibrium, innovative entrepreneurs occasionally disrupt the existing market place by creating synergies to accomplish new lines of business. Chiles, Bluedorn and Gupta (2007) posited individuals can engage in entrepreneurial activity when complacent organizational structures and resources are in a state of disequilibrium. They act on market opportunities which bring greater efficiency (Drucker, 1985; Etzkowitz, 2011; Guskin & Marcy, 2003; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Institutional (dis)equilibrium.** Departments or units within a post-secondary institution share resources and facilities to offer educational programs in areas
underserved by traditional colleges and universities. The goal is to work together so that each university unit maximizes its competitiveness. The consortium of units balance and equalize member needs and share information among the membership (Chiles, Bluedorn & Gupta, 2007; Flora & Hirt, 2010; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Institutional entrepreneur.** Institutional entrepreneurs see change as the norm and as healthy. Usually they don’t bring about change themselves; they just recognize it (Christensen & Erying, 2011). Institutional entrepreneurs use the rules, negotiate in the bureaucracy, and adapt to environmental changes to create entrepreneurial activities (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). An innovative and creative individual, such as faculty and staff, that recognize efficient opportunities, creates innovative strategies for transformation and makes them accessible to others ultimately for the advancement of the institution (Langrell, 1990; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Institutional entrepreneurship.** A higher education institution shifting focus from state funding to other more competitive sources of funding (Andrizzi, 2003; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997).

**Innovation.** An effort to create purposefully focused change within a university’s economic or social potential; a function of entrepreneurship such as products, models, or services applied technologically, economically and/or socially which serve as a catalyst for change and transformation (Christensen, 2008; Langrell, 1990; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Opportunity recognition.** A philosophy can strengthen and empower faculty and students to become change agents, harnessing their intellectual entrepreneurship (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009). Collaboration across disciplines and partnerships can
create market and non-market like opportunities (Cherwitz, 2005). A university-industry collaborate project or platform used for social exchange and transformation that encourages civic responsibility (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Social entrepreneurship.** Social entrepreneurship takes from a mix of models to “reconfigure solutions to community problems and deliver sustainable new social value” (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, 2006, p. 523). Social entrepreneurs are committed to creating collaborative, interdisciplinary, and social relevant research and learning (Cherwitz, 2005).

**Technology transfer.** Includes licensing activities which may be emerging or developing. Universities can take ownership of federally funded project results and researchers are able to earn monetary rewards for their work (Etzkowitz, 1998).

**Value creation.** The creation of financial profits generated through the institution’s engagement in market and market-like behaviors and activities or intangible value creation which contributions to economic development or student entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

**Summary**

The 21st century has ushered in a new era of responsibility, accountability, and the commodification of public institutions of higher education (Tuchman, 2009). With the adaption of a more corporate-like environment, institutions are becoming more entrepreneurial and have the opportunity to increase revenues, enhance their missions, and strengthen their institutions (Dev, 2005). Researchers (Alexander, 2007) concluded summer sessions are the “hotbed” (p. 51) of entrepreneurial activity yet limited research exists on exactly what that activity entails. Ultimately, there is a need to begin to
understand the implications of entrepreneurial growth at public post-secondary institutions through the lenses of university summer session administrators, faculty and staff.

This chapter provided the background and problem of the study, established educational entrepreneurship as the conceptual framework for data collection and analysis, and explained the significance and need for further research. It also provided the key terms and limitations of the study. A review of literature is presented in Chapter Two. In Chapter Three are the research design and methodology of the study. Detailed in Chapter Four is the data findings and analysis for the study. Included in Chapter Five are the findings, conclusions, implications for practice, and consideration for future research.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Public education is increasingly being treated and viewed as a commodity instead of a knowledge transfer industry (Giroux, 2014; Pilgrim, 2013; Schejbal, 2000; Tuchman, 2009). Securing resources and operating within a funding level acceptable of public funds are critical functions of higher education institutions. Since universities are a large sector of society, their place in the public coffers, as well as public discourse, cannot be underestimated. However, universities are often overlooked as profitable and entrepreneurial, contributing to economic development and the populace (Dev, 2009; Dingfelder, 2007; McClendon & Perna, 2014). Their contribution to economic development that has been even more critically prevalent under reduced state support. Despite declines in state appropriations in the past two decades, universities have experienced growth through “market-generated revenues in the form of escalating student tuitions, new entrepreneurial ventures like executive education, and more money for sponsored projects from the foundation” (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2005, p. 27). Dependence on more market-like revenues has public institutions operating more like private one (Rhoades, 2006). In addition, universities are “pushing out the frontiers of knowledge” (p. 6) seeking a more competitive advantage. As market income continues to substitute for public appropriations, institutional commodification will persist unabated, establishing entrepreneurial enterprises of higher education (Gee, 2014; Giroux, 2014; Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mitchell, Palacios, & Leachman, 2014; Sam & van der Sijde; 2014; Tuchman, 2009).
Within the evolving entrepreneurial institution, summer session programs continue to be involved in developing and implementing entrepreneurial opportunities. However, within the university, the work of these units is not widely recognized as contributing substantially to the financial and social purpose of the institutional mission (Schejbal, 2009). To assist universities in balancing their social and economic goals, senior administration will need to understand the role of the summer session administrators. Thus, when fully utilizing summer session administration and their programs will create additional educational entrepreneurial opportunities (Fish & Kowalik, 2009; Schejbal, 1997; Schejbal, 2009; Young & McDougall, 1988).

A range of entrepreneurial constructs traditionally created from management and economic theories provide an overarching theoretical framework for this study. Entrepreneurial constructs, such as social and institutional entrepreneurship, (Breneman, 2005; Dees, 1998; Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, 2006; Young, 2013) will help guide and affirm educational entrepreneurship (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010) as the conceptual theory. This theory is most appropriately suited to understand how summer session programs create market and non-market or socially oriented activities (Mars & Metcalfe; Mars & Rios-Aguilar; Pusser & Doane, 2001) for an institution of higher education. Gaining a deeper understanding of experiences present during university summer sessions through an educational entrepreneurial lens will provide a sense of what is occurring outside the traditional fall and spring calendar and how universities position their third semester to be entrepreneurial. This examination will provide the basis for an argument that universities begin to examine the major differences in procedures, policies, and programming occurring during summer and
determine with such differences, entrepreneurial in nature, should be strategically considered for how universities operationalize the traditional academic year. Mars and Metcalfe stressed a thorough examination of the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of entrepreneurship prior to “applying entrepreneurial principle, concepts, and terminologies to academic activities” (p. 9).

**Emergence of Entrepreneurship within Public Higher Education Institutions**

To fully understand entrepreneurial behaviors as they exist within public higher education today, it is important to explore the economic and institutional shifts which have created conditions that support and encourage entrepreneurship within the academy (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). The ideology of a state supported university dates back to colonial times with the founding of Harvard University in 1636 (Couturier, 2005). The state supported university was designed to educate the elite for preparation to enter the workforce and to engage in civic responsibility. Curriculum was classical in nature and mandated to faculty and students (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). It was not until the mid-1800s the development of the modern university appeared, credited to a German diplomat, Wilhelm von Humboldt. Humboldt envisioned a university as a change agent (Drucker, 1985). His vision spread to the United States and over the next thirty years, American university presidents built institutions rich in scholarship and research. The most impactful and adaptable part of Humbolt’s vision was the development of the elective system. The elective system provided students and faculty to choose what they wanted to study and teach (Christensen & Eyring). One of the loudest proponents of Humbolt’s vision is Charles Eliot. Eliot, who became known as the father of the modern American higher education system, viewed the system through the same innovative lens.
as Humbolt. Eliot, trained in Germany as a young academic, discovered a connection between scholarship and national economic productivity (Christensen & Eyring). He returned to the United States in the mid-1800s to transform Harvard University, implementing his innovative university model. Eliot’s model posited institutions of higher education should excel at all academic disciplines with an emphasis on advanced study, contribute to the social and economic welfare of the community and provide freedom of choice in curricular study and use of endowment funds (Kimball & Johnson, 2012; Morrison, 2001). He referred to the university as a corporation (Morrison). American universities either followed Harvard’s model or began to decline in relative public influence. Universities who provided faculty and students the opportunity to choose their studies created an intellectual free market (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Kimball & Johnson, 2012).

Through the centuries, state governments have broadened the public universities scope with the passage of such legislative acts as the Morrill Act of 1862 and the Smith Lever Act of 1914 (Christensen & Eyring, 2011; Couturier, 2005; Etzkowitz, 1998; Pusser & Turner, 2006; Shannon, 2015). The importance of this legislation, and others, reinforced state governments and universities symbiotic relationship. “In exchange for financial support from taxpayers, universities agreed to keep tuition low and provide access for students from a broad range of economic backgrounds” (Yudof, 2002, p. 24). In addition, universities trained graduate and professional students, promoted arts and culture, and helped solve problems in the community (Yudof).

The Higher Education Act of 1965 introduced federal financial aid and strengthened the importance of student access to post-secondary education. Over time,
these changes, mostly legislative, have “built up the idea that colleges and universities are serving society in meaningful ways through the provision of affordable, quality higher education” (Couturier, 2005, p. 97).

In the United States, during the 70s and 80s, the nation’s economy and workforce labor grew exponentially and shifted from a managerial to an entrepreneurial economy (Thelin, 2004). According to Drucker (1985), post-World War II universities built the new private and metropolitan universities. From the mid-1940s to the 1980s, constituted a major growth period in American higher education. Universities deliberately designed for a new and different market for people in mid-career rather than for students graduating from high school. This was a significant response to a major shift in the culture of higher education (Christensen, 2008). Most of the job growth occurred at new institutions from serving non-traditional students and other student-customers seeking workforce ready programs (Drucker). The Bayh-Dole Act of 1980 allowed universities to retain ownership of research results ultimately forging a stronger relationship with industry (Etzkowitz, 1998). In addition, states benefited from universities through research, community, business and public school support and public discourse (Couturier, 2005). These ideals, coupled with an enthusiastic market economy, permeated an American society through the mid-1990s exacerbating growth of all types of higher education institutions (Zemsky, Wegner, & Massy, 2005). Mars and Metcalfe (2009) described this period of growth as the new industry. Fueled by new technologies and an explosion of new institutions eager to serve the masses, higher education was producing a new populace of graduates (Mars & Metcalfe).
It was not until the 1990s universities began to experience flattening and in most cases decreasing support from their state governments. Thelin (2004) surmised the fiscal challenges faced by our educational institutions were an accumulation of increasing social service obligations forced down from the state and federal government. The results of this shift of financial obligations were exacerbated with the economic financial crisis in the early 2000s. As a result of this shift, Couturier (2005) suggested the historic compacts made centuries ago were beginning to erode.

Institutions found themselves balancing the viability of higher education and protecting educational administrative functions as Breneman (2005) concluded, “all sectors of higher education in recent years have been forced by economic pressures to become even more entrepreneurial in style and substance” (p. 3). Consequently, public institutions are more aggressive in the competition for financial resources from state governments, simultaneously, state governments are struggling to support the vast number of institutions created during the booming economy of the 1980s (Guskin & Marcy, 2003; Thelin, 2004).

In addition to newly created universities during the 1980s, established public universities are placing significant emphasis on raising revenue, from all sources – “maximizing tuition, increasing enrollment, refinancing debt, establishing higher fund-raising goals and, in the public sector, pulling out all the stops to persuade state officials to increase appropriations” (Guskin & Marcy, 2003, p. 13). Shafritz, Ott, and Jang (2011) stressed competition among public post-secondary institutions have increased and so has the pressure to become more commercial and entrepreneurial.
The pressure to be more commercial “has cast a chill on scholarship” (Couturier 2005, p. 95). As an example, research publications have become commercially owned and are “priced beyond the means of many academic libraries and individual scholars, inhibiting the flow of knowledge and scholarship” (Couturier, 2005, p. 95). In addition to funds from commercialism, students are increasingly incurring more of the cost of education (Breneman, 2005). With double-digit increases in student tuition over the past fifteen years, universities are no longer serving the public’s need and no longer providing access to everyone. Instead, they have tightened admission standards, advertise merit aid to attract students with higher grade point averages and recruit students who can pay their tuition (Breneman, 2005).

Changing societal conditions have forced institutions to approach new methods of delivering education and demand responses different from the compacts followed years ago. University administrators and state and national policymakers are debating whether or not institutional missions and historical commitments can be protected while increasing revenue production, maintaining core academics values and managing the risks associated with entrepreneurial activities (Breneman, 2005; Doane & Pusser, 2005, Mair, Robinson, & Hockerts, 2006). Guskin and Marcy (2003) further emphasized college and universities should begin to transform their institutions into a profit generating enterprise.

In the process of transforming, institutions are developing innovative models for teaching, learning, student success, and use of technology (Guskin & Marcy, 2003; Pusser & Doane, 2001). Higher education organizations are reinventing themselves by structuring their operating core on private and public business models (Mair, Robinson,
Breneman (2005) stated, “society can preserve the public purposes of our great institutions while requiring that they assemble their resources through market competition” (p. 9). Likewise, Couturier (2005) postulated aggressive entrepreneurial institutions should begin to revisit and possibly renew historic compacts for the sake of public good; however, Marquardt (2011) believed the nation has moved beyond historic compacts and now operates in an ever expanding and vital knowledge economy.

**Knowledge Economy**

Higher education plays a critical role in a “nation’s ability to remain competitive in the global knowledge economy” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 26). Through the first half of the last century researchers (Etzkowitz, 2011; Marquardt, 2011; Powell & Snellman, 2004) described the economy as more managerially focused; operating with a lesser educated workforce and centered on efficient based manufacturing processes. Within the last three decades the nation’s economy has evolved, recognizing the importance of a knowledgeable based workforce (Etzkowitz). An entrepreneurial, knowledge based economy “celebrates technological innovation and the contemporary labor market that favors those who have completed advance training” (Marquardt p. 27). Powell and Snellman defined the knowledge economy as “production and services based on knowledge-intensive activities that contribute to an accelerated pace of technological and scientific advance as well as equally rapid obsolescence” (p. 201). Marquardt and Powell and Snellman concurred the new economy demands a knowledgeable workforce, innovative production methods, and rapid information sharing. These developments have been a catalyst for entrepreneurship within post-secondary institutions (Christensen & Erying, 2011; Mars & Metcalfe).
Christensen and Eyring (2011) furthered argued post-secondary education institutions must transform to “serve the changing educational needs of a knowledge economy” (p. 3). In a knowledge economy, the speed of communicating information has “intensified the commodification and commercialization of academic work, extending the location of production of the knowledge “products” of higher education beyond laboratories and into classrooms” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 36). Higher education institutions, just like their corporate counterparts, should respond and adapt within an environment that includes swift technological advances, substantial societal change, and increasing competition (Marquardt, 2011; Sporn, 1996). Mars and Metcalfe argued academic capitalism is the only lens to view and evaluate these behaviors within a knowledge economy.

**Academic Capitalism**

Academic Capitalism is a lens to study the multifaceted and interconnected activities of an entrepreneurial institution. In the last two decades the new economy has increasingly placed restrictions on the distribution of public funds to postsecondary institutions (Rhoades, 2006; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). These restrictions left less discretionary funds fueling “acute resource dependency in higher education systems” (Slaughter & Leslie, 1997 p. 25). The theory of resource dependency theory allows institutions to seek new revenue generating opportunities allowing the freedom to operate outside the constraints of restricted funds (Bolman & Deal, 2008; Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003; Sims, 2007). This theory leads institutions to engage in academic capitalism, which Slaughter and Leslie posited as a different direction in higher education fiscal support to meet societal responsibilities. Under this direction, universities need to raise
net revenue to subsidize state funding and diversify revenue streams (De Zilwa, 2005; Rhoades, 2006). In addition to increasing tuition and fees, Breneman (2005), De Zilwa and Slaughter and Leslie stated universities are increasingly fundraising, asking for unrestricted monetary gifts, and competing for more contracts and private research grants to sustain endowments and the university general funds.

Slaughter and Rhoades (2004) suggested the four building blocks of an academic capitalist knowledge learning regime is *interstitial organizations, new circuits of knowledge*, and *enhanced capacities and intermediating organizations*. The first block, *interstitial organizations*, connects different units of the institution “for the purpose of creating and capitalizing on market and market-like opportunities” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 31). Trends include the intersections is university and industry collaborations. The university conceptualizes and produces knowledge and the marketplace disseminates it (Mars & Metcalfe).

The second building block of academic capitalism is *circuits of knowledge*, where academic units can create cross disciplinary innovative approaches to “research, problem solving and production” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 32). Universities have begun to develop interdisciplinary degree programs across many academic departments providing a more market-driven approach to serving students (Pusser & Doane, 2001). The third block is the enhancement of managerial capacities. Rhoades (1998) suggested the new knowledge economy workforce consists of managerial professionals. These professionals manage sophisticated administrative processes that support academic entrepreneurship in a resource-driven environment (Mars & Metcalfe). Engaging in academic capitalism can require substantial resources for support and oversight and some
will view an institution as managerial heavy while they expand revenue-generating activity (Doane & Pusser).

The final block of academic capitalism is intermediating organizations. These groups “advance private sector agendas through the allocation of resources to those working in colleges and universities” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 33). An example of academic capitalism at work within a public institution is the existence of a continuing education unit. Post-secondary continuing education units advance private sector agendas with the ability to be efficient, flexible, and quick to respond to emerging demands in the marketplace (Pusser & Turner, 2006). Managed by professionals paid to develop and examine entrepreneurial curricular activity, they illuminate market driven aspects of entrepreneurship and intersect academic departments and the private sector (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009)

**University Continuing Education Units**

Numerous colleges and universities engage in profit seeking behavior through schools or divisions of continuing education (Breneman, 2005). “University continuing education programs are well positioned in the emerging competitive environment for post-secondary education” (Pusser, Gansneder, Gallaway & Pope, 2005, p. 39). In a time of fiscal uncertainty and rapidly changing student demographics, existing units have already tapped into those demographics and garner more enrollments and profit for their institutions. According to the United States Department of Education, the majority of students enrolled in a program through continuing education units are referred to as non-traditional learners (Sporn, 1996). In the last few years the non-traditional student has
become the majority of students enrolled in degree and certificate programs, and thus, the non-traditional has become the traditional or contemporary student (Pusser, et al., 2005).

Following demographic trends, continuing education units keep abreast of the labor market to offer a wide range of programming. These units provide a more expanded and convenient way for students to complete degree programs. In addition, continuing education units provide vocational, technical and soft skill training leading to credit or noncredit credentialing and typically deliver work site locations (Pusser, et al., 2005; Wiltenburg, 2015). Most students enrolled in continuing education programs are employed full-time and complete their courses part-time via distance learning or in the evenings. Furthermore, continuing education units also expand partnership with external entities to enhance their revenue generating strategy (Irvine, 2015; Pusser, et. al., 2005).

Fiscally, continuing education units “operate with substantially different revenue sources than do the core academic units of nonprofit postsecondary institutions” (Pusser, et. al., 2005, p. 37). Continuing education units, typically a self-supporting university unit, ideally require all programming to fiscally break even or turn a profit for the institution (Breneman, 2005). Relatively little to no assistance from the university general fund means heavy reliance on student enrollment and fees. “Continuing education programs potentially can have a significant impact on the future of postsecondary education although they also inherit risk; if they don’t generate revenue…they may not persist” (Pusser, et. al., 2005, p. 29). Evidence of these activities produced by continuing education units provides considerable support that nonprofit postsecondary institutions can be entrepreneurial in a competitive market (Shannon, 2015, Zemsky, Wegner & Massy, 2005).
Like continuing education units, institutional mission should encompass multiple entry points and completion options for students and provide universities the freedom “to operate in today’s fast paced market” (Couturier, 2005, p. 99). Another institutional entry point and opportunity for degree completion typically housed in continuing education units is summer sessions.

**Historical Examination of University Summer Session Programs**

The higher education transformational shift has impacted all levels of institutional programming, including one important program historically regarded as the third semester and referred to as summer school. Researchers believe the conceptual beginnings of a university summer program started as early as the American Civil War (Doane & Pusser, 2005, 2006), conversely Young and McDougal (1988), contended postsecondary summer school program began in 1891, when “Harper introduced the summer session as a higher education innovation at the University of Chicago” (p. 39). A university summer school’s purpose was to serve students who needed to complete remedial work, seek additional assistance, or retake a course. In the last quarter century, summer school has taken on a new connotation and has been properly renamed summer sessions (Schejbal, 1997).

Typically viewed as a “slack period” for students (DiGregorio, 1997, p. 7), most summer session administrators in the early twentieth century reported directly to the president of the university, determined faculty appointments and salaries and were responsible for student attendance, discipline and registration procedures (Heidenreich, 1967). Historically, summer sessions offered credit courses from existing disciplines and
departments, employed regular faculty and drew primarily from resident undergraduate and graduate students” (Doane & Pusser, 2005). Administrators also had the autonomy for budgetary expenditures, predetermined course enrollment and produced an annual report. It was not until the end of this past century, some institutions began to report summer sessions as a “self-supporting” program and began to account for innovation (Heidenreich, 1967; Young & McDougall, 1988). Yet, most recently summer sessions have been described as an opportunity for transformation (Schejbal, 2000). Evidence suggests transformation has begun in all aspects of the program including administration, faculty appointments, student services and with the development of program mission statements (Dev, 2005).

Summer sessions has administratively shifted from the operating core to an auxiliary unit, supporting the entire university operation (Doane & Pusser, 2005; Mintzberg, 1979) which Heikel (2000) defined as a quasi-centralized unit. Under a centralized model, “decisions about summer course offerings and staffing are generally made or at least approved by the academic departments (Doane & Pusser, 2005, p. 45). Prior to a centralized model, summer session administrator responsibilities included: assigning budgets to individual schools or departments, determining schedule of courses and faculty teaching assignments, publishing course catalog, facilitating admissions and registration procedures and enforcing university policy (Doane & Pusser).

The majority of universities have restructured their summer session model to be centralized further embracing entrepreneurship. Summer session administrators managing a centralized program have control of budgetary and fiscal operations” which will potentially maximize cost effectiveness and income production” (Heikel, 2000, p.
These administrative structural changes of centralizing summer session programs bolster revenue and addresses shrinking institutional allocations (Heikel, 2000; Hentschel, 1991).

In addition, an aspect of an entrepreneurial program, like summer sessions, is the ability for the administrator to see their role as enrollment manager. According to Sims (2007), summer session administrators play a “vital role in shaping enrollment goals, fee structures and advising infrastructures for their organizations” (p. 7). Since the 2000s, administrators have studied the enrollment motivation, satisfaction for students and faculty in an attempt to attract new students and provide new programming (Donnelly & Kessler, 2000; Fish & Kowalik, 2009; Kowalik, 2005). “A great deal of attention has been turned to the changing demographics of postsecondary enrollees” or also known as non-traditional student (Pusser, et. al, 2005, p. 27).

One of the biggest changes of a university summer session and administration in recent years is the attitude towards a service mentality (Martin, 2002). Because of its condensed often flexible formatting, summer sessions have led the way for alternative delivery, scheduling options, removal of procedural barriers, and the creation of new forms of services (Martin, 2002). These activities that have transformed summer sessions from a barely visible university enterprise to a session seen as an institutional “cash cow” (Schejbal, 1997, p. 3). Young and McDougall (1988) stressed that the ability of summer sessions was to attract and retain students, earn a profit and “consequently become functionally part of the regular ongoing educational experience for degree-oriented students should be of concern and interest to university administrators” (p. 39).
Summer sessions usually offers general education or sought after major requirements which can generate revenue and produce outcomes (Doane & Pusser, 2005). “Perhaps no program in higher education is organized and funded in a greater variety of ways than is the summer school or summer session” (Smith, 1972, p. 2). The organization and financing of university summer sessions provide a useful example of a largely self-supporting unit within a nonprofit institution that can be seen as entrepreneurial (Johnson, 2000). Since institutions summer sessions are required to operate on a surplus-revenue-generation model, the operations are usually nested in or relatively close to core academic operations (Doane & Pusser, 2005, 2006; Penders, 2000). Summer sessions generate revenue that usually exceeds instructional costs of delivering the courses (Doane & Pusser, 2005). With the surplus revenue, most institutions have revenue sharing agreements with the colleges, schools and or academic departments. Revenue sharing agreements create a strong incentive for deans, department chairs and academic faculty to offer courses targeting new student markets. Once a budget-driven term or financed through an annual budget allocation, summer sessions operate as self-sufficient, revenue generating organizations and offer a model of entrepreneurial activity that remains close to the academic core of colleges and universities (Doane & Pusser, 2005, 2006).

Another evolving aspect of a university summer session program is the involvement of the faculty (Johnson, 2000). Faculty have appeared to teach from what DiGregorio (1997) described as a ‘bubble.’ They have typically set the tone for limited classroom interaction with lecture and set out of classroom office hours, limiting interaction with students. Most recent customer service demands and technological
capabilities have required faculty to provide a more inviting student-centered approach (Kops, 2009). Faculty members are creating new ways to provide learning opportunities for students and summer provides the opportune time for experimentation (Heinz & Lewis, 2009). They can experiment with course content and delivery, additionally they can teach a new group of students, develop a new course, or practice skills they acquired as practitioners (Heinz & Lewis, 2009; Kops, 2009).

Teaching outside a normal course load provides faculty to earn additional income (Price & Bradford, 2010). Sometimes teaching a normal course load during the summer can be very lucrative for faculty (Trewatha, Coulter, & Coulter, 1997). Summer sessions provide “faculty a means to supplement academic-year salary, generally in the form of overload pay” (Doane & Pusser, 2005, p. 45; Price & Bradford, 2010). Typically, faculty will teach half of their yearly course load during the summer sessions which range in varying lengths typically more intensive than the fall and spring semesters. Scott (1993) stated summer course formats and faculty load led to better interaction and stronger relationships with students.

In a centralized summer session model, most of the courses offerings are determined by the college deans, department chairs and faculty, so a strong working relationship with the summer session administrator is imperative. Summer session administrators have indirect influence over courses and faculty (Doane & Pusser, 2005). Taking advantage of flexibility of faculty schedules in the summer, universities are enriching existing curriculum with visiting faculty and providing an opportunity to conduct collaborative research (Martin, 2002). Moreover, faculty members have shown
responsiveness to student needs and have begun to transform their program offerings into a student-centered and life-long learning model (Martin, 2002).

The most important aspect of a university summer session program is the student. Summer session administrators have continually been asked to meet the ever changing academic needs of students in creative and innovative ways (Martin, 2002). Students can transform their learning experiences not normally available during the academic year. Transformational ways include more applied and experiential learning such as field experiences immersion courses, internships and cultural travel (Doane & Pusser, 2005). “Intensive immersion courses found in many summer programs also contribute to enhanced educational outcomes especially in certain disciplines such as learning a foreign language” (p. 51).

Students choose to attend summer sessions for a variety of reasons, the most popular is keeping a student on track for graduation. Administrators and policy makers often see summer sessions as a way for students to accelerate progress towards their degree (Doane & Pusser, 2005; White, 1999). Summer sessions provide universities the opportunity to “offer credit bearing courses outside the academic year, usually in an intensive format, and to enrich curriculum by offering courses not available during the academic year” (Doane & Pusser, 2005, p. 45). Summer sessions also offers general education courses that normally have created demand during the fall and spring semester (Doane & Pusser, 2005). Universities are monitoring course waitlists to capture additional enrollment and create new sections that could be taught by an adjunct faculty and offer equal number of graduate courses. Additional sections provide lower faculty student ratios leading to greater student satisfaction. DiGregorio (1997) stated the format
of summer session courses yielded closer student instructor relationships. Increasingly students have reported “higher levels of satisfaction with summer sessions courses than with the same courses offered during traditional semesters” (Martin, 1997, p. 64).

Other summer session advantages for students include: retaking a course previously taken during the fall and spring semester, remedial study in subjects such as math and writing, an opportunity to focus intensively on one study or to lower the overall cost of college (Donnelly & Kessler, 2000; Price & Bradford, 2010). Summer sessions provides students the option to extend and enrich their university experience. Traditional students can pursue interests outside their discipline and new student markets can begin to engage a university not served during the traditional calendar year. Additionally, summer session can help universities improve utilization of their facilities (Price & Bradford, 2010; Zumeta, 2006) and increase the use of overall campus resources (Doane & Pusser, 2005).

Summer sessions for most of a century operated “on the periphery of the university’s mission” (Martin, 1997, p. 8). Consistently, summer session mission statements, universities are identifying different target markets than your traditional undergraduate and graduate students (Fish & Kowalik, 2009; Heinz & Lewis, 2009; Sims, 2007). An examination of summer sessions mission statements revealed markets such as, high school students, guests, visiting university students, bridge programs for disadvantaged youth, continuing education intellectual development opportunities, cultural and intellectual events for students and surrounding community, and to provide a “setting for curricular experimentation, innovation, and change” (Martin, 1997, p. 11).
Many institutions are operating “summer session programs without a clear statement of role and purpose, and the degree to which summer sessions are integrated with the on-going institution’s program” (Young & McDougall, 1988, p. 49). Fish and Kowalik (2009) contended the same purposeful strategic planning that is applied to an institutional mission should be applied to the efforts in summer and vice versa. “In today’s highly competitive market of tertiary education, any strategy which enhances customer satisfaction will add towards the competitive advantage of that institution and therefore should be of considerable potential” (White, 1999, p. 251). As universities continue to encounter decreasing state funding, increasing operational cost, while competing for prestigious rankings, these institutions are focused on increasing productivity, efficiency and competitiveness (Gee, 2014; Giroux, 2014; Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mitchell, Palacios, & Leachman, 2014; Sam & van der Sijde; 2014).

Although present within the curriculum of higher education for over a hundred years, summer sessions in the last quarter century shifted from the university operating system to a continuing education auxiliary (Ebersole, 2015; Matkin, 2015). A university program originally administered as more from a managerial perspective has evolved into a third semester focused on innovation and profitability. Schejbal (1997) stated “most summer session programs are no longer the sleepy, barely visible enterprises that they were just a few years ago” (p. 3). Consequently, colleges and universities move beyond on traditional enrollment and management strategies (Ebersole; Heinz & Lewis, 2009; Matkin; White & Toner, 2000).

Since the mid-2000s, the “organization and financing of university summer sessions provide a useful example of a largely self-supporting unit within a nonprofit
institution that can be seen as entrepreneurial, is required to operate on a surplus-revenue generation model,” and is closely nested within a university continuing education unit (Doane & Pusser, 2005, p. 44). “As an example of an entrepreneurial unit that operates close to the academic core,” (p. 46). Successes can be integrated into the academic year to support institutional mission and values (Doane & Pusser, 2006; Ebersole, 2015; Martin, 2002).

“Summer session has the potential to offer advantages over the rest of the school year may have significant implications for marketing considerations as well: it offers compelling evidence that summer session is not peripheral to the mission of universities, but rather is central to the mission of educating students” (DiGregorio, 1997, p. 8).

Summer sessions as a core university mission serves as a catalyst and change agent; influencing both the academic institution and the surrounding community (Murgolo-Poore, 2014). To examine a university program as a change agent through an academic entrepreneurship lens, several broader theoretical constructs are initially explored. This exploration will help guide and affirm academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010) as the best-suited conceptual framework for the study.

Entrepreneurship Theoretical Framework

Entrepreneurship, a century’s old studied construct, hindered by a lack of scholarly consensus, is mostly argued to be multidimensional process that requires in depth examination (Levin, 2006; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010; Smith-Hunter, Kapp, & Yonkers, 2003). Believed to be defined over 200 years ago by French Economist J. B. Say, the definition presents the greatest frustration and confusion over the lack of a
common understanding of the terms entrepreneur and entrepreneurship (Davidsson, 2004; Drucker, 1985). “Studies falling under the rubric of entrepreneurship have pursued a wide range of purposes and objectives, asked different questions and adopted different units of analysis, theoretical perspectives and methodologies” (Low & MacMillan, 1988, p. 140). Smith-Hunter, Kapp and Yonkers (2003) defined entrepreneurship as a process “involving all functions, activities and actions associated with the perceiving of opportunities and the creation of organizations to pursue them” (p. 3). Low and MacMillan (1988) posited entrepreneurship is a multifaceted phenomenon that intersects across many disciplinary boundaries which they defined as the creation of a new enterprise. Davidsson suggested associating entrepreneurship with innovation and change-oriented behavior. Other researchers believe entrepreneurship involves task-related motivation, individual expectation of personal gain, and knowledge (Davidsson; Drucker). Attempting to provide a more holistic application of entrepreneurial constructs, Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) defined

…entrepreneurship as a process of creating and sustaining economic and/or social value through the development and implementation of creative and innovative strategies and solutions that require the identification of opportunity that results from economic (dis)equilibrium, risk taking and mitigation, and resource allocation and mobilization. (p. 446)

Consensus of a theoretical perspective is defined as entrepreneurship is a multidimensional process that involves an entrepreneur to deploy strategic innovative tactics to create opportunity for value and social creation (Zemesky, Wegner, & Massy, 2005).
Similar to entrepreneurship, entrepreneur has also generated varied definitions over the centuries. An entrepreneur can be defined as “someone who perceives an opportunity and creates an organization to pursue” (Smith-Hunter, Kapp, & Yonkers, 2003, p. 5). Other definitions suggested an entrepreneur is someone who identifies an opportunity and secures the resources to develop that opportunity (Huefner & Hunt, 1994). Amalgamating existing theories, an entrepreneur is someone who utilizes an innovative strategy to pursue a long term opportunity (Huefner & Hunt, 1994; Mars & Metcalfe, 2009; Smith-Hunter, Kapp, & Yonkers, 2003).

The theoretical construct, entrepreneurship, is mainly found in economic and management literature (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Based on early theories from Cantillon and Schumpeter, researchers suggested entrepreneurship focused more on the economic side of literature and specifically the role of the entrepreneur (Drucker, 1985; Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Developed in the eighteenth century, Cantillon’s framework identified “entrepreneurs as individuals who take risks in the market with the hope of realizing personal profits” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 10). With emphasis on function and risks, his framework is applicable to various market sectors. Cantillon stressed the ambiguity of life and argued anyone engaged in entrepreneurship must navigate risks associated with the marketplace (Ryan & Guthrie, 2009).

Likewise, to Cantillon’s research, Schumpeter argued entrepreneurship as a process of creative destruction (Drucker, 1985). Schumpeter believed entrepreneurship was more than a new invention but a “process of creating and implementing innovation-based solutions and responses to economic or societal problems and gaps in the marketplace” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 3). He stated a long-term stable economy
indicated stagnation and therefore to maximize profits and create economic value one should disrupt economic equilibrium (Drucker, Mars & Metcalfe). Mars and Metcalfe contended economic disruption is a “method to reallocate capital (physical, financial, human, and social), thus increasing economic efficiency and promoting growth in free-market economies” (p. 23). When an entrepreneur upsets and disorganizes an organization or economy through the introduction of a new product; it creates creative destruction. It is doing something different than better and bigger (Schultz, 1980). Similarly, is the theory on disequilibrium.

Conversely, Schultz articulated “entrepreneurship thrives on disequilibrium” (Schultz, 1975, p. 830). In a time of economic unrest, the entrepreneurial human factor can reallocate their resources in creative and innovative ways. The reallocation brings the economy back to an equilibrium state. Schultz’s theory defines organizations to practice resource shifting and constraint and accountability, it also can be understood as a constant, proactive variable (Schultz, 1980). Dynamic disequilibrium is brought on by the innovating entrepreneur rather than equilibrium and optimization. Entrepreneurs see change as the norm and as healthy. Usually they do not bring about change themselves; they take something in nature and endow it with economic value, they contend there is no greater resource than purchasing power (Drucker, 1985). Aligning with Drucker, Christensen and Eyring (2011), suggested purchasing power is the creation of the innovating entrepreneur; ultimately creating value and making a contribution.

Drucker (1985) favored Schumpeter’s lens and stated entrepreneurship is a product of changes in attitudes, values, and technology; technology as a form of management. Within an entrepreneurial economy, organizations find new ways to apply
management. It is a new application of management that provides organizations to solve problems and create new opportunities (Levin, 2006; Marquardt, 2011). Following Schumpeter’s work, Drucker posited entrepreneurship can be recognized in three different but sometimes overlapping ways. The first was through the unexpected, second incongruity between reality and the way it should and third, through process need or changes in industry and market structure (Drucker). Outside industry indicators include demographics, changes in perception, mood or meaning, new knowledge, or fiscal realities (Levin, 2006). Fiscal realities will drive a demand for efficiency and productivity creating entrepreneurial activity (Marquardt, 2011).

During the mid-1980s, researchers began to incorporate innovation with entrepreneurship (Anderseck, 2004; Drucker, 1985; Zemsky, Wegner & Massy, 2005). Mars and Metcalfe (2009) noted entrepreneurship has included strategies in innovation. Innovation can be linked to Schumpeter and as an introduction of “new products or services, thus causing a transformation in the capitalist production cycle” (p. 3).

“Innovation is the specific instrument of entrepreneurship; it’s the act that endows resources with a new capacity to create wealth” and innovation (Drucker, p. 31). Innovation is a tool with which organizations wield to create new products and services; ultimately serving new markets. Entrepreneurs should always search for change, respond to it, and exploit it as an opportunity (Christensen & Erying, 2011; Drucker).

Management is the new technological innovation rather than any specific new science or invention that is making the American economy into an entrepreneurial economy and now society (Levin, 2006).
Other researchers explored behavioral patterns of entrepreneurs who respond to changing economic and social conditions. Gartner (1990) approached entrepreneurship with constructs focused on innovation, the entrepreneur, creation and value, and profit and not profit activity. Mars and Metcalfe (2009) referred to this approach as supply side of entrepreneurship suggesting “individual entrepreneurs seek appropriate conditions in which to act entrepreneurial” (p. 20). Employing frameworks rooted in sociology and psychology, researchers focus on the individual entrepreneur’s motivation, creativity and understanding of market place risk (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, Vecchio, 2003). Under these frameworks, entrepreneurs are proactive in securing external organizational funds to advance their projects or missions and they use their creativity and inquisitiveness to serve the public good (Cherwitz, 2005; Hansson & Monsted, 2008).

Both the notion of innovation and the behavioral pattern of entrepreneurs have evolved over the past decades not only to suggest new ways of producing goods but also to recognize knowledge creation or “intellectual activity” and research (Cherwitz, 2005; Llano, 2010; Marquardt, 2011; Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Knowledge creation occurs through problem solving, experimentation, demonstration projects for organizations and fuels innovation (Marquardt, 2011). It is more than applying narrow theoretical understanding. Entrepreneurs apply management concepts and techniques by asking “what is the “value” to the customer. Management techniques include: standardizing the product, designing process and tools and by establishing training on the analysis of the work to be done and then setting the standards it required (Cherwitz, 2005; Drucker, 1985).
Applying theories of knowledge creation through the use of management techniques in the marketplace, entrepreneurship can best be defined by Mars and Metcalfe (2009) “as those activities (collective or individual) that combine risk, innovation, and opportunity, particularly in times of uncertain resources” (p. 3). Thornton (1999) believed market activity dictates the level and response of (individual or organizational) entrepreneurs. As external environments such as market or policy changes, entrepreneurs respond and engage in entrepreneurial activities transforming organizations into sustainable enterprises. Organizations will “enhances the performance of a business and its prospects for survival” (Avery & Bergsteiner, 2011, p. 6). Hansson and Monsted (2008) suggested external and internal resources have combined to encourage new entrepreneurship strategies. Organizational entrepreneurs strategize on how to move both external initiatives to create networks and opportunities (Hansson & Monsted). Even federal policies and initiatives can be a viable vehicle for economic development. Today entrepreneurship and entrepreneurs are seen as the intersection of institutional mission and the private marketplace (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Recently, Vecchio (2003) suggested a lack of research to warrant an additional theory on entrepreneurship and instead encouraged researchers to find common threads. Shane and Venkataraman (2000) posited “rather than explaining and predicting a unique set of empirical phenomena, entrepreneurship has become a broad label under which a hodgepodge of research is housed” (p. 217). Since the theoretical construct of entrepreneurship encompasses numerous theories, a narrowing approach through additional theoretical lenses, such as institutional, social and educational, will help explain how these theories apply to a postsecondary institution.
According to Lachmann’s (1971) institutional theory of entrepreneurship, institutional contexts guide and shape the individual behaviors of entrepreneurs, however, Paul Dimaggio, in the late 1980s, defined institutional entrepreneurs (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009; Foss, 2006). The framework of institutional entrepreneurship emphasized the role of actors and agency in the institutional change process (Battilana, Leca & Boxenbaum, 2009). Institutional entrepreneurs are actors who will influence, and initiate change that contributes to the transformation of an institution. They are seen as change agents challenging the institutional status quo (Battilana, 2004). This aligns with Schumpeter’s belief of an entrepreneur as a creator or creative destroyer (Weik, 2011). According to Battilana, Leca and Boxenbaum (2009), actors should initiate change and actively participate in the implementation of the change to be regarded an institutional entrepreneur. They can also be seen as initiating a new business plan divergent from the conventional plans. While Chiles, Bluedorn and Gupta (2007) summarized the description of the institutional entrepreneur by stating the “approach invites us to focus on entrepreneurs as both engaged in market and capital (re)formation processes yet embedded in institutional contexts” (p. 480).

Institutional entrepreneurs should investigate the theory of embedded agency; “how institutional change is possible if actors’ intentions, actions, and rationality are conditioned by the institutions that they wish to change” (Leca & Naccache, 2006, p. 628). Institutions should “remain fluid and malleable in order to have the ability to adapt to environmental changes and allow for the economic and social progress that is created through entrepreneurial activities” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 90). Within the
institution, entrepreneurs can wield knowledge to create purposeful behavior which involves thinking in sophisticated ways about processes. Knowledge provides actors to completely reject agency methodology and recognize the diversity and vast knowledge an institution holds (Lachmann, 1971). Knowledge is a critical feature of the economic landscape and new institutions form when institutional entrepreneurs “with sufficient resources see in them an opportunity to realize interests that they value highly” (Weik, 2011, p. 468).

“Academic entrepreneurs could be viewed as those higher education actors who innovatively leverage internal and external opportunities to not only generate economic resources for their own profit or in support of their academic institutions, but also to create within the academy social and political change” (Chiles, Bluedorn & Gupta, 2007, p. 472). Clark (1998) posited entrepreneurship at the postsecondary institutional level involved organizational restructuring, development of partnerships, and increasing revenue flows. The end result is a more efficient and self-reliant organizational model (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). According to Battilana, Leca and Boxenbaum (2009), “institutional entrepreneurship differs from, yet overlaps with some forms of entrepreneurship including social entrepreneurship (p. 96). Although institutional entrepreneurship explains the importance of the institutional entrepreneur role in a broader sense, it does not provide a framework for exploring market and non-market like activities within a university program.
Social Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurial constructs historically linked to profit oriented markets have long been considered to the detriment of serving the public good. Entrepreneurial constructs have broadened to include socially oriented activity; examining the social value of entrepreneurial behaviors (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). A phenomenon driven by a “new breed of pragmatic, innovative, and visionary social activities, [social entrepreneurship takes from a mix of models to] “reconfigure solutions to community problems and deliver sustainable new social value” (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, 2006, p. 523). A reaction to economic, socio economic, and political pressure, “the phenomenon consists of creative, problem solving individuals and organizations in the private, nonprofit, and government sectors that are attacking an array of local and global social problems” (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, p. 524). Mars and Metcalfe suggested, “socially oriented gains might include increases in community prosperity and quality of life that arise from university spawned economic development” (p. 56). The concept encompasses a wide range of activities, for example, “enterprising individuals devoted to making a difference; social purpose business ventures dedicated to adding for profit motivations to the nonprofit sector and new type of philanthropists supporting venture capital like investment” (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, p. 523).

Individuals creating these activities are known as, social entrepreneurs. Social entrepreneurs are committed to creating collaborative, interdisciplinary, and social relevant research and learning (Cherwitz, 2005). Social entrepreneurs are practical dreamers who have the talent and the skill and vision to solve the problems to change the world for the better (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, 2006). They operate in a free market
where “success is measured not just in financial profit but also in the improvement of the quality of people’s lives” (Mair, Robinson & Hockerts, p. 523). Social entrepreneurs need to be willing to challenge their customer and question their beliefs to create real change (Young, 2013).

While the term social entrepreneur has emerged as a global phenomenon in the last decade, it seems to have emerged within higher education only in the past few years (Shafritz, Ott, & Jang, 2011; Young, 2013). Recently, Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) contended the application of entrepreneurial principles and concepts to studies of higher education has become broadened to include socially oriented phenomena. Just as Couturier (2005) suggested the historic compacts eroded long ago, Cherwitz (2005) stressed universities create new social compacts with their states, serving citizens in new meaningful ways. In the past few years, higher education social entrepreneurs have created social programs, such as massive open online courses, they are also pushing disruptive changes that could threaten, as a side effect, traditional revenue streams (Flynn, 2013; Young).

In addition to massive open online courses, social activities include the following: student activism, creative and innovative strategies designed by students, professors committed on solving societal issues, faculty pushing social agendas through higher education processes, and student engagement in cross-disciplinary collaboration centered on social transformation (Flynn, 2013, Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Using the platform of free exchange, institutional entrepreneurs are able to design and implement innovative and creative approaches by which to solve a diverse range of serious economic and social problems (Anderseck, 2004; Dees, 1998; Mars & Metcalfe). Social entrepreneurs such as
university faculty have to be especially innovative to reach diverse societal groups; through sustainability and scalability (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009; Bornstein, 2004). Beckman and Cherwitz (2009) cautioned more moderate social entrepreneurship focused on individual student success will deter students and faculty from the freedom of political or social activism.

Within higher education, social entrepreneurship appears to have no concrete meaning (Young, 2013). According to economists “public or social benefits of an educated populace commands less attention in a world driven by market values” (Breneman, 2005, p. 4). Mars and Metcalfe (2009) stated, “More socially driven pursuits encourage new methods for enhancing the academy’s engagement with the external communities” (p. 1). Universities need to make a commitment to providing “broad access to a wide variety of programs at an affordable cost to serve students and preserve historical commitments to the public good” (Pusser et. al., 2005, p. 41).

Dees (1998) articulated social entrepreneurship as advancing a social mission over creating economic wealth but Mars and Metcalfe (2009) disagreed, suggesting social entrepreneurship activity can still create economic wealth and produce activities that advance the social mission of colleges and universities. Universities and society both benefit from research and knowledgeable graduates, they also foster socially oriented intangibles such “social tolerance, personal responsibility, and respect for the law” (Christensen & Eyring, 2011, p. 19). “Successful innovative strategies developed by social entrepreneurs will lead to sustainable and scalable social transformation (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Today, many universities are establishing funds and developing collaborative think tanks or harnessing the universities collective wisdom for the purpose
of generating social entrepreneurship (Cherwitz, 2005). Social entrepreneurship is an important construct to exploring non-market or socially oriented activity occurring in a university summer session program but it does not holistically account for market like activity or the role of the institutional entrepreneur. A more comprehensive examination of a university program such as summer sessions will be observed through an educational entrepreneurship lens.

**Academic Entrepreneurship Conceptual Framework**

Since the founding of Harvard University, institutions have been engaged in emulating a traditional model with much success but this model has become unsustainable. For institutions to survive, “established universities will have to break with tradition” (Christensen, 2011, p. xxvi) and become more entrepreneurial. The origins of academic entrepreneurship rose from the “so called neoliberal policies” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 4) and resource dependencies established by higher education institutions or otherwise coined a learning regime (Llano, 2010; Slaughter & Rhoades, 2004). Today literature claimed neo-liberalism caused institutions to place financial gains before serving the greater good (Mars & Rio-Aguilar, 2010). As state funding decreased, universities were indirectly encouraged to engage in market-like activities such as deregulation, privatization and commercialization of funded research, admissions, partnerships and organizational structures (Anderseck, 2004; Mars & Metcalfe; Slaughter & Leslie, 1997). Neo-liberalism is seen as the outcome of a learning regimes need to pursue new revenue streams and resources; otherwise, it encouraged the increase of predictable entrepreneurial behaviors in the postsecondary academy to the disadvantage of the academic mission (Mars & Metcalfe; Slaughter & Rhoades). “Inconsistent state
funding and neoliberal policy environments are in part responsible for the rise in market-oriented entrepreneurial behaviors and activities across the higher education sector” (Mars & Metcalfe, p. 39). As an example, the Bayh-Doyle Act of 1980 was seen as a neoliberal policy and permitted universities to commercialize their state funded research (Mars & Metcalfe).

Clark (1998) posited universities transform entrepreneurially through developing private partnerships, organizational restructuring with the goal to increase institutional revenue. Clark (2004) created organizational pathways to transform institutions into an entrepreneurial focused academy. The pathways include a strong proactive steering core Mintzberg (1979); supportive and strategic external network; a diverse funding base; a motivated and embracing academic core; and a pervasive institutional culture that embraces entrepreneurial principles and philosophies (Deem, 2001; Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). The more an institution guides and develops pathways, the more efficient there is more opportunity to create economic value (Clark).

Like Clark (2004), Mars and Metcalfe (2009) posited entrepreneurship should be positioned as a core institutional function, not a consequence of budget and resource constraint. Once a core function, academic entrepreneurship will emerge across the entire institution. Treating entrepreneurship as holistic becomes “relevant and useful to understanding and advancing innovative solutions to problems such as access, retention, and community outreach” (p. 21). Llano (2010) stated knowledge inside a postsecondary institution should be viewed as the raw material that can be commercialized. Knowledge wielded to produce products, new processes, and services that generate a return for the university. For example, an academic entrepreneur or professor can start a company
commercializing a social or economic service or product developed in a university laboratory (Mars & Metcalfe). In addition, academic entrepreneurs are bridging opportunities. Acting as brokers, they identify gaps between university departments and guide collaboration between internal and external entities; phenomenon that is increasingly prevalent in various forms across the modern day academy (Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mars & Metcalfe).

Emerging from two previous constructs on entrepreneurship, creative destruction and disequilibrium, Christensen (2011) posited two theories for understanding the increasingly competitive higher education market and the newly created products and services offered to students. These two theories are sustaining innovation and disruptive innovation. Like creative destruction, sustaining innovation is when an institution makes something bigger and better. Bigger and better includes residential halls, student centers, or online courses. In contrast, disruptive innovation disrupts the bigger and better model by bringing to market a product or service more affordable and easier to use than the traditional offerings such as reduced or no cost courses for the masses (Christensen, 2011).

The emergence of academic entrepreneurship is a recent phenomenon and the application of academic entrepreneurship is not consistent nor has consensus among institutions (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) asserted that prior literature provided “over-generalization of academic entrepreneurship as simply any market or market-like occurrence that takes places within or intersects the academy” (pg. 453). This over generalization failed to recognize the importance of non-market oriented activities such as social entrepreneurship. Mars and Rios-Aguilar believed academic
entrepreneurship, whether classified as market- or socially oriented, either creates or disrupts the organizational equilibrium of the academy.

A comprehensive model for analyzing academic entrepreneurship is contingent on the inclusion of entrepreneurial constructs observed in economic and management literature as well as analysis of “non-market oriented activities and behaviors shaped by social, political, and economic forces and conditions” (p. 453). To understand how entrepreneurship and, specifically, innovation apply to higher education, a stronger framework was developed by Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010). The framework seeks to encourage “consistent nomenclature and produce meaningful evaluations of the entrepreneurial principles and practices that pertain to research, instruction, institutional leadership and policymaking” (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. 6). Mars and Rios-Aguilar constructed a conceptual framework to better understand the role of the institutional entrepreneur and the benefits, limitations, and consequences of supporting and creating entrepreneurial activity in higher education. Mars and Rios-Aguilar suggested researchers need to apply the following conceptual filters when studying academic entrepreneurship:

**Creative disruption.** Based on the theory of disruptive innovation by Christensen (2011), select institutions develop a systematic technologically driven idea targeted to a customer/student base not currently being served. It is the combination of disruptive technology and increased focus on student outcomes (Christensen, 2008). The construct stated the newest technological idea disrupts the bigger and better model, while bringing to market a product or service that is typically more affordable and easier to use (Christensen & Erying, 2011).
**Technology transfer.** Includes licensing activities which may be emerging or developing; just as the *Morrill Act of 1862* donated federal owned land to universities in support of agricultural and industrial development, the *Bayh-Dole Act of 1980* is proving to be just as significant. The act provided for university-industry technology transfer through multiple ways. Universities can take ownership of federally-funded project results. University researchers are able to earn monetary rewards for their work. Small businesses had the opportunity to receive university licensing before big businesses and all technology transfer products should be manufactured in the United States (Etzkowitz, 1998).

**Economic (dis)equilibrium.** New technological advances that disrupt the way universities conduct business. Drucker (1985) claimed organizational equilibrium is disrupted when innovation alters complacent structures or redistributes resources. Another example of organizational equilibrium involves, “commercial activities that begin within colleges and universities and later are realized within the private marketplace” (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 446). For example, life sciences research could lead to commercial potential and intellectual rights, startups born from university research, and intellectual property protection including patenting university discoveries; or institutional zero based budgeting, putting an emphasis on programs that require additional financial resources (Drucker, 1985; Etzkowitz, 2011; Guskin & Marcy, 2003; Mars & Rios-Aguilar). Chiles, Bluedorn and Gupta (2007) posited individuals can engage in entrepreneurial activity when complacent organizational structures and resources are in a state of disequilibrium. They act on market opportunities which bring greater efficiency.
**Innovation.** Products, models, or services applied technologically, economically and/or socially which serve as a catalyst for change and transformation. Innovation, a key element in regional and national economic development and can be traced to colleges and universities (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). An educational administrator will introduce innovation as a response to regional or national pressures (Levin, 2006). An administrative innovation can include a new policy for recruitment purposes, reallocation of resources, and the restructuring of tasks, authority, or rewards (Llano, 2010).

**Value creation.** The creation of financial profits generated through the institution’s engagement in market and market-like behaviors and activities or intangible value creation which contributions to economic development or student eco entrepreneurship. “The ability to generate external funding seems to be the most important power dimension for generating internal legitimacy and resources” (Hansson & Monsted, 2008, p. 656).

**Institutional Entrepreneur.** Faculty and staff recognize opportunities and create innovative strategies for social transformation or faculty and/or staff create efficient opportunities and make them accessible to others; do not necessarily need to be an entrepreneur that create new opportunities but can also engage in reactive activities (Chiles, Bluedorn & Gupta, 2007; Lackmann, 1971; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Institutional entrepreneurs to view change as the norm and as healthy. Usually they don’t bring about change themselves; they just recognize it (Christensen & Erying, 2011). Institutional entrepreneurs use the rules and negotiate in the bureaucracy and adapt to environmental changes to create entrepreneurial activities (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). Shane and Venkataraman (2000) suggested institutional entrepreneurs need to source new
opportunities for innovation, evaluation them, and exploit them (Drucker, 1985). Higher education administrators are increasingly more entrepreneurial in their work; more strategic in accessing resources (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009).

**Opportunity recognition.** A university philosophy that can adapt to both abrupt and long term changes can provide a platform for opportunity recognition. A philosophy strengthening and empower faculty and students to become change agents; harnessing their intellectual entrepreneurship (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009). Collaboration across disciplines and partnerships can create market and non-market like opportunities (Cherwitz, 2005). For example, a university-industry collaboration and platform will drive social change and transformation while encouraging civic responsibility (Cherwitz, 2005).

Enduring entrepreneurship in higher education depends on universities reactiveness in developing a non-complacent culture through a collegial approach based in knowledge (Clark, 2000). Collegial or collaborative entrepreneurialism will provide faculty and administrators to become the owners of change; developing new capacities. New capacities give way to a wide range of market-oriented phenomena that include academic capitalism, technology transfer, and university contributions to economic development (Clark, 2000; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Additionally, innovation, risk-taking, resource allocation, and opportunity identification are processes and/or attributes of academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Academic entrepreneurship is not static yet constantly changing and responding to market conditions (Mars and Metcalfe, 2009). It is change that always
provides the opportunity for the new and different. Systematic innovation, therefore, consists in the purposeful and organized search for changes and in the systematic analysis of opportunities; these changes might offer economic or social innovation (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). The future of universities is dependent on their ability to change. Therefore, the study of modern academic entrepreneurship guides the building of institutional habits of change (Clark, 2004). To examine whether an institution exhibits habits of change, academic entrepreneurship emerged as a holistic conceptual framework. Built on the fundamentals of the broader entrepreneurship theory, it focuses on the role of the institutional entrepreneur and their influence on market and non-market like activity. Unlike other theories, academic entrepreneurship provides a template of conceptual filters to examine whether or not an institution has the ability to change and stands a better chance of remaining well into the twenty first century.

Summary

Students, faculty and the university as a whole can benefit socially and economically from innovative activities, “college campuses are fertile ground for entrepreneurial activity (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009, p. xi). The evolution of summer sessions historically requiring only managerial oversight by administrators has grown into a university session seen as a hot bed of innovation and entrepreneurialism (Alexander, 1997; Mars & Metcalfe). To better understand how summer sessions are perpetuating the university’s economic and social missions, academic entrepreneurship, a conceptual framework, will provide for a more focused study on innovative institutional entrepreneurs, programs, systems, structures and financial models occurring in summer session programs. These innovations will strengthen the argument summer
entrepreneurship should be adapted into the year round institutional calendar and will strengthen the overall institutional mission and strategy. In Chapter Two, the amalgamation of existing literature was presented to provide a programmatic background on a university summer session and narrow theoretical underpinnings to an educational entrepreneurship conceptual framework to better guide the research methodology in Chapter 3. The research analysis and findings are presented in Chapter 4. Presented in Chapter Five are the results of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Typically regarded as the third semester within a traditionally structured university, summer session programs have emerged as a critical component to balancing the year-round fiscal responsibilities of an institution (Schejbal, 1997). Summer session programs can be the core of university program innovation, self-sustainment, and flexibility (Alexander, 1997). Summer session administrators work with academic departments to research, develop, and incubate new programs to provide a sustainable future (Alexander; Schejbal). To drive sustainability, summer session program administrators and faculty accommodate typical fall and spring courses to a shorter period of time, calculate compensation based on enrollments, use summer months to conduct international and domestic study tours, create entrepreneurial courses (courses outside the scope of a degree program), conduct research, and refine processes and policies (Tuchman, 2009; White, 1999; Young & McDougall, 1988). Thus, institutions should consider adopting aspects of summer entrepreneurial activity into the university strategic plan. Stressing the importance of summer session entrepreneurism in the plan, will lead to more year-round inclusion and, as a result, boost the bottom line of an increasingly shrinking university budget.

The goal of this research study was to understand the phenomena of summer session entrepreneurial activity nurtured by faculty and staff, differentiate market from non-market or socially oriented activity, and understand what the benefits, limitations, and consequences are for supporting such activity; recognizing how institutions may adopt the activity into the broader university strategic plan. To explore the meaning of
academic entrepreneurship as ascribed by university summer session administrators and faculty, a qualitative multi-case study approach was selected to provide a thick, rich, and detailed description (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998). Detailed in this chapter are the purpose, research questions, data collection and analysis, assumptions, researcher’s role, and limitations of the study.

**Purpose of the Study**

The findings of this study should add to the body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship within public university summer session programs. Since summer sessions are typically administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters, particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Further, the researcher analyzed the benefits and barriers of supporting collegial summer entrepreneurial activity. Currently, limited research exists on educational entrepreneurship in summer session programs (Demetrulias, 2005; Langrell, 1990; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010); therefore, a multi-case study approach was selected to provide a detailed description of market and non-market or socially oriented activity occurring within different public university summer session programs (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005).

**Research Questions**

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How do university summer session administrators define innovation?
2. How do university summer session administrators foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape?
3. How do university summer session programs engage in the following entrepreneurial dimensions through market and non-market or socially-oriented activities?
   a) Creative disruption
   b) Innovation
   c) Value creation
   d) Economic (dis)equilibrium
   e) Opportunity recognition

4. What are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

5. What are the barriers to supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

**Design for the Study**

In selecting a design for this study, Creswell (2009) stated qualitative research is a means to explore and understand an individual or group problem within a natural setting. According to Hatch (2002), qualitative research “seeks to understand the world from the perspectives of those living in it” (p. 7). To illustrate this depiction of a social problem, a researcher must understand their own role and interpret phenomena in terms that people ascribe to them (Mertens, 2005). The research was a problem of practice analyzing the entrepreneurial aspects of a university summer session program. In this research study, a multi-case study approach was selected with the intent to provide an in-depth exploration of a program, such as university summer sessions, and the opportunity to build upon an emerging field of data which limited research exists (Creswell). The multi-case study
approach is particularly appropriate for investigating “complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance” (Merriam, 1998, p. 41) providing a holistic account of a phenomenon. Multiple cases provide for “extended engagement and rich data that lead to thick descriptions” (Hatch, p. 54). Purposeful based sampling was used for selection of the case studies based on a review of literature and the opportunity to understand entrepreneurial activity among different public post-secondary summer session programs (Hatch, 2002). To develop a rich and think description, the researcher invoked several methods of data collection to accumulate detailed information (Creswell). Data collection included personal interviews, focus groups, document review and national setting observations (Creswell). Consequently, the researcher utilized inductive logic to understand a problem and render substantial meaning from the situation (Creswell; Mertens, 2005).

Participants and Sampling Procedures

Since the goal of this study was to gain knowledge and understanding of educational entrepreneurial activity occurring during a university summer session program, purposeful sampling method was the most appropriate approach for selecting research participants (Creswell, 2009; Mertens, 2005). Purposeful samplings provided the researcher to select sites for richer and in depth study to better understand the problem and answer the research questions (Creswell; Mertens). The researcher selected three (n=3) participants from public institutions with a mostly centralized university summer session program within the North Central region as defined by the North American Association of Summer Sessions (NAASS). As the researcher is a member of NAASS and attends the North Central region conference, it provided the opportunity to
speak with summer session administrators who would like to be included in the study. Each site varies in size and has a mostly centralized summer session structure; administratively centralized and programmatically decentralized (Heikel, 2000).

To gather a breadth of responses, the multi-case study will include three administrators, their supervisors, and faculty/staff from public institutions. Further, each of the case studies included two personal interviews (administrator and supervisor) and one focus group comprised of five to seven (n= 5 – 7) individuals. Multiple cases and numerous study participants enhanced the richly descriptive narrative of this qualitative study (Merriam, 1998).

**Summer session administrators.** Using purposeful sampling, administrators were chosen by the role associated with the university summer session program and length of experience as an administrator as outlined in the study (Mertens, 2005). It was important the participants have overall day-to-day responsibly for a centralized summer session program and possess a minimum of three years of experience in program administration. A participant with prior experience is immensely helpful when the researcher is collecting significant statements, stories, and descriptions (Creswell, 2009). Prior to an interview each summer session administrator was contacted through an informed consent letter and form (Appendix B).

**Supervisors.** To provide an extensive view of entrepreneurial activity, the supervisor of the summer session administrator will participate in a personal interview. Supervisors with a minimum three years of experience can provide a broader view of campus entrepreneurship and will typically hold the position of Dean, Assistant Provost,
or Provost. Prior to an interview each administrator was contacted through an informed consent letter and form (Appendix B).

**University faculty and staff.** To cumulate the greatest amount of information on summer entrepreneurial activity, university faculty and staff were asked to participate in focus groups. Potential focus group participants were identified by the site summer session administrator as individuals that teach or have involvement during the summer sessions. The individuals identified were then invited to participate by the researcher through an informed consent form. Both university faculty members and administrative staff are a critical component to understanding entrepreneurial activity occurring during the university summer sessions. The total number of (n= 21) participants depended on availability (Krueger & Casey, 2009). Focus groups discussions provided a different kind of information than found in personal interviews and are typically comprised of similar subjects (Hatch, 2002). Prior to an interview each faculty or staff member was contacted through an informed consent letter and form (Appendix C).

**Data Collection**

An established data collection process includes setting the study boundaries, establishing a protocol, and collecting data through various methods (Creswell, 2009). This research design is a multi-case qualitative research study, collecting and analyzing data from several sources including semi-structured personal interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and institutional observations (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998). Prior to data collection, the research sought permission from the gatekeeper (Appendix A) at all three (n=3) institutional sites (Creswell, 2009; Mertens, 2005). Each site visit consisted of a two-day visit with the intention of assimilating with location routines and
establishing good rapport with study participants in an attempt to collect rich information (Mertens, 2005).

**Data collection procedures.** The primary source of data is from semi-structured interviews conducted with public university summer session administrators and their supervisors on-site at their home institutions (Hatch, 2002). For the purpose of this study, a summer session administrator included positions such as director, coordinator, associate dean, fiscal manager, etc. To increase validity of the qualitative study, interview participants were summer session administrators who self-identified as managing a mostly centralized summer session program. A centralized summer session program is defined as “one which operates within a single summer session office, is vested with decision making authority, and exists as a distinct entity on campus” (Heikel, 2000, p. 26). A mostly centralized summer session structure can also be administratively centralized and programmatically decentralized (Heikel, 2000).

**Interview protocol.** Prior to the interview, all administrators received and signed an informed consent letter and form (Appendix B) which provided the participants with their rights during the study (Creswell, 2009). The interviews were semi-structured to emphasize flexibility and were guided through the use of an interview protocol form (Hatch, 2002). The interview protocol addressed each dimension of educational entrepreneurship detailed by Mars and Rios-Aguilar’s (2010) framework that was categorized by each research question. Each protocol had four to five probing questions leading to sub-questions intended to have the participants elaborate on statements or explain in more detail their responses (Creswell, 2009). Each interview protocol (see Appendix D) was reviewed by summer session administrators and laypersons not
participating in the study to ensure content and face validity (Mertens, 2005). According to Mertens (2005), “the researcher needs to be certain that the [data instrument] covers the appropriate content” (p. 354). To uncover meaning ascribed by the participants to their personal experiences, the in-depth personal interviews were scheduled for forty-five minutes in length and all data were collected on an interview protocol form. The researcher ensured each interview session was audio-recorded for member checking and data analysis. To ensure validity with member checking, the researcher sent the common themes of the research to the participants for comments about the accuracy of the report (Creswell, 2009). Supervisor interviews followed a similar interview protocol as summer session administrators. In addition to the interviews, other data collection techniques helped reveal meanings (Hatch, 2002).

**Focus group protocol.** To explore dimensions of educational entrepreneurship more deeply, focus groups were conducted with faculty at each of the three institutional sites. A focus group “creates a permissive environment” that “nurture different perceptions and points of view without pressuring participants to vote, plan, and reach consensus” (Krueger & Casey, 2009, p. 18). Focus group participants, including three individual interviews (n = 21) received, prior to the interview, an informed consent letter and form (Appendix C) detailing confidentiality and anonymity rights. The focus group interview protocol (Appendix E) consisted of open-ended questions allowing participants to comment, explain, and to share experiences and attitudes (Krueger & Casey, 2009). The questions focus on the six dimensions of educational entrepreneurship and are framed around the research questions. Focus group responses were recorded on a focus group protocol form and each session was audio-recorded to ensure accuracy during data
analysis. In addition, face validity and member checking was also used to increase participant involvement and the credibility of the study (Creswell, 2009). These validity measures allow participants not involved in the study to review the protocols to ensure the content was appropriate (Mertens, 2005).

**Document analysis and observations.** For a holistic approach to data triangulation, the researcher gathered site and program documents and chronicle daily observations. Document analysis which included website, program brochures, university strategic plan and department mission statements, is not different than collecting data during interviews or observations; the researcher was sensitive to the specific data and relied on skills and intuition to find, authenticate, and interpret (Merriam, 1998). While on site, the researcher took descriptive notes through the use of an observational protocol (Creswell, 2009). Institutional observations included participant descriptions, a reconstruction of dialogue, a depiction of the physical setting, and accounts from campus events or activities (Creswell, 2009). The observational protocol (Appendix G) also included the researcher’s reflective notes and demographic information of each site.

**Human subjects protection and other ethical considerations.** Qualitative research requires open-mindedness for ambiguity, and the ability to distinguish, understand, and study an experience with the intention of finding meaning (Merriam, 1998). Since this study requires the collection and interpretation of information through human interaction the researcher requested and received permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at the University of Missouri Columbia (Appendix H) as well as the IRB at the collection sites to ensure that the anonymity and confidentiality of the
individuals involved in the study would be protected (Creswell, 2009; Hatch, 2002; Mertens, 2005).

**Data Analysis**

The framework for a qualitative research design is an intersection of a researcher’s philosophical worldview, strategy of inquiry, and research methods (Creswell, 2009). The social constructivist worldview best matches the assumptions applied to data collection and data analysis because according to Creswell, “constructivists hold assumptions that individuals seek understanding of the world in which they live and work” (p. 8). Constructivists understand how personal experiences will affect data coding and interpretation (Hatch, 2002), so the research focused on the participants’ interpretation of the questions, not the researcher’s personal held beliefs. The approach to this study is reflective of the constructivist research paradigm (Creswell; Hatch; Mertens, 2005).

In addition to the social constructivist worldview, the researcher used a framework developed by Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) on the dimensions of educational entrepreneurship to analyze the data from interviews, documents, and observations to help construct meaning for the findings (Creswell, 2009). Mars and Rios-Aguilar suggested a framework for identifying market and non-market or socially oriented entrepreneurial activity within an educational setting based on five dimensions. The five dimensions include: (1) creative disruption; (2) innovation; (3) value creation; (4) economic (dis)equilibrium; and (5) opportunity recognition (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). The researcher illustrated, Mars and Rios-Aguilar’s framework in relation to the interview questions in the protocols. (Appendix D & E).
Triangulation of the data was conducted to increase the transformability and validity of the findings of the study (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005). Further analysis was conducted on summer session administrative and marketing documents as well as researcher field notes (Creswell, 2009). To conduct an inductive process of data analysis, Hatch (2002) stated, “search for patterns of meaning in data so that general statements about phenomena under investigation can be made” (p. 161). Coding themes allowed the researcher to look closer at the data and provide a better sense of importance and richness (Hatch). Seidman (1998) posited, “the vast array of words, sentences, paragraphs, and pages have to be reduced to what is of most importance and interest” (p. 99). When conducting analysis on academic entrepreneurship, themes emerged. According to Creswell, themes that typically emerge within grounded theory are reflective of the participant’s views.

**Role of Researcher**

Qualitative research is interpretative research that requires researchers to immerse themselves in the research process (Creswell, 2009). Researchers conducting the qualitative research, serve as the primary instrument for data collection, and consequently bring their personal perceptions and biases with them (Creswell; Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005). Although the researcher made every attempt to reduce the influence of bias in this study, it is important to acknowledge that the potential for certain biases exist. Currently, the researcher is a vice provost of a self-sustaining continuing education unit at a Midwest four-year, public institution with direct administrative responsibilities for a mostly centralized summer session program. Additionally, the researcher is active in a national organization serving university summer session administrators; thus, the
researcher has a keen interest in entrepreneurial activity occurring at other public institutions. During the progression of the study, the researcher continually reflected on personal “values, assumptions, beliefs, and bias [through peer debriefing] to determine their impact on the study’s data and interpretations” (Mertens, 2005, p. 247).

**Trustworthiness**

To ensure the credibility and trustworthiness of the study, the researcher engaged in internal validity measures such as peer debriefing, member checks, and triangulation (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005). A peer reviewer (doctoral supervisor) helped the researcher confront personal values and bias during the study while triangulation ensured consistency of evidence across all sources of data (Creswell, 2009; Mertens). Member checks are the most important criterion for establishing credibility and were conducted by sharing the report with participants to verify the notes and transcripts accurately reflected the person’s position (Mertens). External validity or the transferability of the study is addressed through thick description and the use of multiple case studies (Merriam).

**Limitations and Assumptions**

Both the researcher and study participants hold philosophical assumptions that need to be brought to light and addressed during data collection and analysis. Reality is constructed by individuals interacting with their social environments (Merriam, 1998). The researcher has to be cognizant of the embedded meaning participants apply to their lived and felt experiences and how this meaning is interpreted through the investigators own perceptions (Merriam). The key to understanding and interpreting experiences is from the participants’ view (Merriam).
In addition to the philosophical assumptions, the human researcher can impose limitations on a qualitative study (Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005). As Merriam contended human instruments are fallible, that is “mistakes are made, opportunities are missed, and personal biases interfere” (p. 42). Qualitative case studies can also be limited by the sensitivity and lack of training the researcher has in interviewing and data collection. Additionally, the time allotted for the study and the money available to conduct the data collection was limited (Merriam). To provide a holistic picture of the findings, the researcher ensured not to oversimplify or exaggerate participant perceptions (Merriam).

**Summary**

A qualitative study is a process of inquiry to understand the meaning ascribed to a social or human problem as told by the participants and interpreted by the researcher in attempt to provide triangulated, holistic answers to the research questions (Creswell, 2009). To increase validity, multiple case studies challenged the research questions which are derived from Mars and Rios-Aguilar’s (2010) academic entrepreneurship conceptual framework.

The researcher visited three sites determined by institutional size and summer session program type with the intention of collecting data from personal interviews, focus groups, document analysis, and institutional observations. Upon collection, the researcher inductively triangulated the data to provide an interpretation of entrepreneurial activity occurring on the campuses of public institutions during the summer months. Presented in Chapter Four is the data findings and analysis of the findings. Conferred in
Chapter Five are the results of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this research study was to add to the body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010) within public universities summer session programs. Since summer sessions are typically administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters, particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Through the lens of academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilar), the research analysis was designed to understand the phenomena of summer session entrepreneurial activity nurtured by faculty and staff, differentiate market from non-market or socially oriented activity, and understand what the benefits, limitations, and consequences are for supporting such activity; recognizing how institutions may adopt the activity into the broader university strategic plan. Academic entrepreneurship theory (Mars & Rios-Aguilar) provides an appropriate conceptual framework for gaining a deeper understanding of experiences present during university summer sessions. An academic entrepreneurial lens provided a sense of what is occurring outside the traditional fall and spring calendar and how universities position the third semester to be entrepreneurial.

Since research on summer sessions offers compelling evidence that is not peripheral to the mission of universities, but rather it is central to the mission of educating students (DiGregorio, 1997) yet, with limited research on entrepreneurial activities, this
research study presents the perceptions of summer session administrators, faculty and staff on entrepreneurial, innovative activity supporting education of students.

Provided within Chapter Four is an overview of the study design, data collection methods, conceptual framework, research questions and analysis of data. Additionally, collection site profiles, descriptive information on the settings and participants of each case study are presented. Lastly, emerging themes will be synthesized through the use of qualitative data collection procedures of interviews, focus groups, document analysis and campus observations.

**Design of Study**

A qualitative multi-case study approach was utilized to gain knowledge of entrepreneurial activity occurring during the summer months at three public state universities. A qualitative approach is “designed to provide an in-depth description of a specific program, practice, or setting” (Mertens, 2005, p. 229). A case study presents a comprehensive account of a bounded case or subject within its natural setting (Creswell, 2009). When analyzing multiple cases, the researcher has an opportunity to collect generalizations and themes through various sources, consisting of interviews, focus groups, review of documents and site observations (Creswell). For this research study, three collection sites were chosen through purposeful sampling to understand entrepreneurial activity among different public post-secondary summer session programs (Hatch, 2002). Within each case study, summer session administrators, their supervisors and faculty and staff were interviewed individually or in a focus group and supporting documentation was collected on site.
Data Collection Methods

Prior to collecting data, the researcher received permission from the supervisor responsible for the summer session unit at each site (Appendix A). After receiving permission, the researcher completed the Campus Institutional Review Board (IRB) application at the University of Missouri – Columbia. Once the study was approved by IRB (Appendix I), the researcher visited each collection site and obtained signed consent forms describing the participant’s involvement and rights within the parameters of the research. One case study site required additional IRB oversight, review and approval prior to my visit. The site insisted their staff or faculty were not directly involved in recruiting interview or focus group participants. This process made it more difficult than the other two sites to recruit faculty and staff for the focus group. A total of three focus group times were offered, in addition, follow up phone interviews were conducted. All the interviews and focus groups were conducted at each location or on the phone as a follow up interview. All interviews were audio-taped and followed an interview or focus group protocol (Appendix D). To ensure accuracy, each summer session administrator received an outline of emerging themes. This process of member checking provided the participants the opportunity to revise or offer feedback on my research (Creswell, 2009). To the complete the data collection procedures, the data were triangulated using the transcribed interviews and focus group; recorded site observations (Appendix D) and document analysis (Appendix G).
Conceptual Framework

Utilizing an academic entrepreneurship conceptual framework, this study sought to understand how university summer session administrators as “institutional entrepreneurs” foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape and additionally, how university summer session programs engage in entrepreneurial market and non-market or socially-oriented activities (Mars and Rios-Aguilar, 2010, p. 442). Mars and Rios-Aguilar posited that to better understand the benefits and barriers of supporting and creating entrepreneurial activity in higher education, researchers need to apply the following conceptual dimensions when studying academic entrepreneurship: (1) creative disruption; (2) (dis)equilibrium; (3) innovation; (4) value creation; (5) opportunity recognition. Furthermore, this study examined what the benefits and barriers are to supporting entrepreneurship through summer sessions (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010).

Existing research on institutional entrepreneurship examines the phenomena rooted in management and economic constructs. Prior research also failed to observe and consider non-market or socially oriented activities; such as course delivery methods, instruction, and modifications in administrative processes (Demetrulias, 2005; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). A sound model for analyzing academic entrepreneurship is contingent on the inclusion of “non-market activities shaped by social, political, and economic forces and conditions” (p. 453). Utilizing academic entrepreneurship as a conceptual framework will provide a focused study on innovative actors, programs, systems, and structures occurring in summer session programs.
Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. How do university summer session administrators define innovation?

2. How do university summer session administrators foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape?

3. How do university summer session programs engage in the following entrepreneurial dimensions through market and non-market or socially-oriented activities?
   
   f) Creative disruption
   
   g) Innovation
   
   h) Value creation
   
   i) Economic (dis)equilibrium
   
   j) Opportunity recognition

4. What are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

5. What are the barriers to supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

Process of Data Analysis

When analyzing the data, the information was interpreted through a social constructivist lens, where multiple realities exist and the researcher has a connective relationship with the participants during the study (Mertens, 2005). Through this lens, the researcher relied on the participant’s perceptions to provide valuable insight for each case study (Creswell, 2009; Mertens). The analysis process consisted of triangulating the
data collected from interviews, focus groups, documents and site observations to recognize emerging themes (Creswell, Merriam, 1998). Each participant, document or observation was assigned a code (Appendix H): Summer Session Administrator 1 (A1), Summer Session Administrator 2 (A2), Summer Session Administrator 3 (A3), Supervisor 1 (S1), Supervisor 2 (S2), Supervisor 3 (S3), Faculty or Staff 1 (FS1), Faculty or Staff 2 (FS2), Faculty or Staff 3 (FS3), Faculty or Staff 4 (FS4), Faculty or Staff 5 (FS5), Faculty or Staff 6, (FS6), Faculty or Staff 7 (FS7), Faculty or Staff 8 (FS8), Faculty or Staff 9 (FS9), Faculty or Staff 10 (FS10), Faculty or Staff 11 (FS11), Faculty or Staff 12 (FS12), Faculty or Staff 13 (FS13), Faculty or Staff 14 (FS14), Faculty or Staff 15 (FS15), Faculty or Staff 16 (FS16), Faculty or Staff 17 (FS17), Faculty or Staff 18 (FS18), Faculty or Staff 19 (FS19), Faculty or Staff 20 (FS20), Faculty or Staff 21 (FS21), Document 1 (D1), Document 2 (D2), Document 3 (D3), Document 4 (D4), (Observations 1 (O1), Observation 2 (O2), and Observation 3 (O3). The transcripts, documents and site observations were read multiple times to ensure accuracy and consistency with the coding.

**Settings**

The sites used for this study were public higher education institutions located within the North Central region of the North American Association on Summer Sessions (NAASS). The North Central region consists of middle and northern states located within the Midwest of the United States. Each institution resided in a different state within the region and ranged from a rural to urban campus, research intensive to comprehensive state university.
**Site 1: Parker University (pseudonym)**

Located within a rural setting within the Midwest is Parker University, a state-funded public research university and the main campus of the Parker University system statewide. Parker University offers over 200 undergraduate and graduate programs and is well known for its curriculum in agriculture and engineering. Parker University enrolls the second largest student body of any university in its state, as well as the fourth largest international student population of any university in the United States and ranks within the top ten most innovative schools in the United States according to *U.S. News & World Report* (website). Total student enrollment is approximately, 40,500 (website).

The quasi-centralized university summer session office is housed within the Distance Education unit and physically located in College Hall, the central building on campus. Distance Education provides an extensive array of continuing education, professional development, and workforce training opportunities, offering classes throughout the year, including evenings and weekends, at off-campus locations, and online students around the world.

**Site 2: Cameron University (pseudonym)**

Cameron University is a state-funded public research-intensive university located in a Midwest urban setting. With one of the most diverse student populations in the nation, Cameron University provides a thriving and diverse environment for its students. Cameron University operates one of the largest medical school in the United States, and serves as the principal educator for the states’ physicians, dentists, pharmacists, physical therapists, nurses and other healthcare professionals (website). In the 2015 *U.S. News &
World Report's ranking of colleges and universities, Cameron University ranked as the 129th best in the "national universities" category (website). The 2015 Times Higher Education World University Rankings ranked as the 18th best in the world among universities less than 50 years old (website). The second campus established in the university state system, Cameron is the largest university in the urban area with an approximate enrollment of 29,000 students enrolled in 15 colleges (website).

The quasi-centralized summer session office (Heikel, 2000) is housed within the Extended Studies unit and physically located in a building a block south of the main campus. The building is very secure, passing through two separate locked doors to enter the main reception area. In addition to the administrative responsibility of summer session, Extended Studies works with the academic departments to increase access to learners of all ages, with particular focus on adult learners and working professionals. Academic departments and staff develop and delivery online undergraduate and graduate programs under a full cost recover model. A full cost recovery model ensures net revenue production on all degree programs offered in collaboration with Extended Studies, meaning tuition revenue must cover all instructional and operational costs.

Site 3: Willis University (pseudonym)

Willis University is a comprehensive public state university located within a rural setting in the upper Midwest. The mission of Willis University is to enhance the intellectual, social, cultural and economic vitality of the people and communities and serves approximately 8,500 students in 80 undergraduates, pre-professional, licensure, graduate, and doctorate programs on three campuses: Main Campus, West Campus
approximately 15 minutes from the main campus and the extended campus located 45 miles to the west of the main campus serving a more urban student population. The university is the oldest member of the state university system.

The quasi centralized summer session office resides within the Adult and Professional Studies Office and physically housed at Samsonite Hall. Samsonite Hall is the primary administrative hall at Willis University and houses the Office of the President, Office of the Provost and various other administrative offices. In addition to the administrative responsibility of summer session, Adult and Professional Studies offers both for credit and non-credit programs at the bachelor's and master’s level and professional development with non-credit courses and certificates, business training solutions and lifelong learning activities.

**Participants**

For this research study, participants were chosen to best represent activity that occur on or off campus during the summer session. These participants include the summer session administrator (n=3), their supervisor (n=3) who typically serves in a role as provost, vice provost or executive director and faculty and staff. Summer session administrators are key to influencing cross campus collaboration to develop or provide activities during the summer months. The faculty and staff (n=15) at the universities provide unique insight into how some activities are similar to Fall and Spring semesters but others can and should be adapted for year round inclusion.
Summer Session Administrators

The summer session administrator at Parker University is the director of accessible education and associate vice provost and manages a team of three staff members in the summer session office. He has been employed with Parker since 1984 and has held a range of administrative positions at the university level, including serving as associate vice president for research for centers and institutes, interim dean of the College of Science, and founding co-director of the university’s research center. He has been in his current role for the past three years and provides long-term vision and oversight of Parker’s accessible education (online courses and programs), as well as leadership for undergraduate programs serving the entire campus. In addition to summer session, he provides administrative oversight for the Entrepreneurship Center, Exploratory Studies, Learning Communities and Undergraduate Academic Advising.

The summer session administrator at Cameron University is the assistant director of the summer session within the Extended Studies unit where she has worked for eighteen years. She initially began as a Program Coordinator responsible for student services. In 2006, she became Assistant Director, managing the summer instructional budget and planning course offerings with the colleges, along with oversight of student services and marketing. She is very active regionally and nationally in a summer professional development organizations.

The summer session administrator at Willis University has been responsible for the overall direction and leadership for university summer sessions and professional education since 2008. She has spent most of her career in higher education with
experience in adult education, workforce development, business and industry outreach, marketing, public relations, grant writing, alumni affairs, and advancement, and student affairs. Her doctoral studies were focused in the area of Higher Education Policy and Administration with an emphasis in organizational leadership.

**Supervisors**

The supervisor at Parker University is the vice provost for instruction and learning, providing leadership for undergraduate education, academic planning, program evaluation, and general academic policy development and implementation. Responsibilities of the position include fostering program initiatives and providing guidance related to these areas: Career Success, Student Success, Undergraduate Academic Affairs, and Teaching Success at Parker, among others. He also reviews academic budgets and serves as the Office of the Provost liaison to the states Commission for Higher Education and the Educational Policy Committee. He is also the self-declared architect of the university summer session program and was a former faculty member.

The supervisor at Cameron University is the Executive Director of Extended Studies which oversees credit and non-credit programs. Programs delivered through Extended Studies is separate from the main campus offerings and engages in incentivizing model known as full cost recovery. The supervisor has been in her current role for two years at Cameron University but has served in similar roles at other universities within the Midwest for the past fifteen years. She was selected as an emerging leader by a leading distance learning organization and served as co-president elect for the State Council on Continuing Higher Education. Her doctoral degree is in
workforce education and development. Her research areas include enabling learner access and flexibility through innovative postsecondary education, including adult learning programs and Registered Apprenticeship Programs.

The supervisor at Willis University has served in the role of provost and vice president for academic affairs since 2013. She came to Willis University with 27 years of experience in various roles including positions such as college dean, academic department chair and instructional technology coordinator. In her role as provost, she oversees the five academic colleges, international programs, instructional support, adult and continuing and summer sessions.

**Faculty and Staff**

A total of 15 faculty and staff were interviewed for the study. Focus groups, individual interviews and a couple of follow-up phone interviews were conducted. Participants consisted of staff within the summer session office, academic department chairs and faculty teaching during summer session. Staff and faculty provided supporting context to the summer session administrators and supervisors perceptions of summer activity.

**Document Analysis and Observations**

Numerous documents were analyzed to support the perceptions of the participants in the study. Documents consisted of university and summer session mission statements, programming brochures, revenue share models, faculty and staff handbooks and announcements for summer innovation grants. Each collected document was reviewed for its applicability to the study and coded. Site observations were also included in the
study and help provide context to the interview and focus group participant’s perceptions of summer sessions and their universities use of summer sessions.

Themes

From this study, themes emerged that were synthesized from data collected and predetermined codes. These themes include emerged from the study: 1) Campus Collaboration, with subthemes of: a) Expanded Student Support Services, b) Facilities Usage; 2) Business Enterprise with subthemes: a) Incentivizing and Risk Management, b) Marketing, c) Data Analysis and Reporting; and 3) Enrollment Management with the subthemes: a) Outreach to New Audiences, b) Retention and Completion Efforts and c) Year Round School. These themes provide an understanding of the market and non-market like or socially oriented activities occurring on campus during the summer months.

Campus Collaboration

In this study, there was an overwhelming sense of campus collaboration between the summer session office, the continuing education unit, in which the summer session office resides within, and the rest of campus to provide a breadth of activities during the summer months. Campus collaboration provides a synergy for delivering services and opportunities to students during the summer. One data site faculty member stressed a large section of campus was being devoted to collaboration and interdisciplinary studies. “There’s a whole section of campus… “that’s meant to be interdisciplinary in nature. We’re very proud of that, and the ability we have as a university to work on big problems together” (FS6). When asked about collaboration with other campus support offices,
administrators, faculty and staff expressed expanded student services, utilization of facilities and shared branding. In an attempt to centralize student enrollment data, Parker University staff collect student enrollment or support data form several offices across campus and share a final report with top leadership. “We do have them [study abroad] as a dotted line to reporting. So, I’ll ask the director for their numbers and send that in the president’s weekly update during the summer” (FS2).

In addition to study abroad, Camps and Conferences is tasked with bringing new students to campus. They do a lot of camps…they have a tendency, of course, to bring in youth more so than college aged students” (A3). “We have a unit called conferences that brings in whole bunches of people for summer conference and some of them get continuing education units” (A2).

Academic advisors are an influential group on campus all summer session administrators suggested was very important to collaborate with. They are key to meeting and influencing students to enroll. According to a faculty member at Willis University, Advisor opinion is very much weighted in our minds. I’ll reach out to the head advisor and say, would you support my decision in guaranteeing this [course] filling, and help me market to students to fill it? If they say yes, that’s all I need to know because, if we have an advisor buy in, then we’re solid. (FS2)

The Registrar’s Office helped one institution distribute specific emails to students with particular needs. “The person we worked with in the registrar’s office probably got a little tired of us because we were sending in a lot of requests every week” (FS10).
“We’ve given them so much crap, though. Like, Diet Coke, I’ve brought over donuts, cookies. As long as we are good with them” (FS2).

Teaching is also collaborative, at Willis University faculty collaborated on a summer course integrating multi disciplines. “I’d say one thing unusual about the summer class they took this summer, the sustainability, was that multi instructor format. There were five faculty members from different departments that collaborated on this class we offered online in the summer” (SF15). The faculty member stressed why a collaboratively taught course is easier to deliver during the summer, “For many of us, if that was offered during the school year, we would get no compensation for it, it would be really difficult to do a brand new course in addition to our regular loads, through our own department” (FS15).

**Expanded Student Support Services.** Each summer session administrator spends a considerable amount of time working across campus to increase student service expectations. At Cameron University the summer session administrator stated,

> We have started partnering much more intentionally with student programming. There’s a unit called Center for Student Involvement and so help create event to build awareness about summer. It changed the profile of summer on campus” We did a movie night on campus, the Center for Student Involvement did the summer dance series and we helped co-sponsor that. I think it was actually very successful, so we’re going to continue doing that. (A1)

“Yep, they take on our brand. They [Parker Student Union Board] put on different events like concert on the lawn, move on the hill, you know. Trivia night, Olympic watch party,
just kind of more of that fun, de-stress piece” (FS9). “I am trying to get that to happen with things like conferences and events” (FS2).

Faculty are supportive of the increase in student services. According to a faculty member at Parker University,

The big summer people have worked with housing and they’ve done a lot of work behind the scenes that we don’t have to deal with to make sure the student are able to get housing and also social events and cultural events so that the campus feels like a place you want to be during the summer rather than just dead quiet”. (FS5)

Similarly shared by a faculty member at Willis University, “I think the summer office has done a great job with planning that kind of cultural, social events that you know, it makes college, college” (FS5).

Housing is a supportive unit providing additional student services and support for marketing summer sessions. “Housing has been a great ally to us during the year as we’ve tried to get word out to students who live on campus. They’ll let us come in and present on summer session and have a photo booth or fun things for them so that they think of summer and ask questions” (FS11). Another unit providing new service expectations are student recreation centers. “we have outdoor education and recreation center. They’ve been doing a lot and they’re involved in even rental of equipment: kayaks and other equipment that people can use in this area for hiking and biking and water sports” (A3).
**Facilities Usage.** At each site, there was an overwhelming sense from top leadership university facilities needed to be better utilized during the summer months. Millions of square footage will sit empty during the summer and the summer session administrators felt responsible for developing programming or work with other units on campus to utilize the space. For the university as a whole though, obviously it makes sense economically to have your buildings and your resources still running during summer. They need to get a much revenue as they can, so I would assume that would help the overall fund” (FS14). A summer session administrator stressed,

> One of the arguments that he [university president] have for why summer is really important is we have all these buildings and they’re empty in the summer, we have all of this fixed investment in facilities and we’re ignoring three months of the year that could be helping meet our goals and generating revenue. He wanted more students, more warm bodies on campus in the summer. (A2)

Additionally, supervisors are working with academic departments to share in the responsibility of better utilizing facilities. According to the supervisor at Parker University, “I think we’ve influenced the research facility in running labs and stuff like that. We’ve made them more available while the students are on campus” (S2). Utilizing facilities not only creates opportunities for faculty and student research, it is viewed as a function of the business enterprise. “There’s filling buildings and the only reason for filling buildings I to make use of that fixed investment so it’s really a new revenue source. Which is what most universities are looking at” (A2).
All three universities engage in a market like approach to tuition revenue both to incentivize the academic colleges and departments to offer smarter and possible more course choices to students. “Of course, every campus, and this includes Cameron, is concerned about the financial health of summer, and how it contributes to the university’s overall financial health. There is always tension on that. That’s definitely true at [Cameron University], even more so than it has been in the past, where summer’s looked at as a place to provide the campus with additional income through tuition revenue” (A1). Summer session administrators view themselves as fiscal opportunists, working with the academic departments to determine market demand, course offerings, facilitate faculty contracts, calculate net revenue and share the course profits. According to one administrator, “We are here to support the self-supporting operations of the university and summer sessions which is billed as a self-supporting type operation” (A2). A summer session administrator summarized the process involved ensuring the fiscal enterprise earns a profit:

Trying to take care of the market demand, and then we begin to track it and get information to department chairs and deans in terms of what is filling. We will then begin to issue contracts. About three weeks in advance of the term we will work with deans for what we would call “go, no go” decisions. We will have all the data available for them in terms of enrollment, projected tuition generation, what the costs are in terms of instructional costs, et cetera. (A2)
Faculty are also involved in determining course offerings that drive net revenue production and ultimately revenue for their department. “For us, it’s on two different levels. One, we have a department meeting and we vote on what classes to offer. Then, obviously, the second part of that is enrollment. If the enrollment is not above where it makes money, they cancel the class” (FS12).

Revenue share during the summer session is the “only way that a department in a college can have any sort of control over more revenue” (FS2).

Everything in fall, spring is a blanket paycheck. A lot of time, the department head will split 50/50 with the faculty members that are teaching. So then, the department has a slush fund. The dean has a slush fund. So, everyone kind of wins a little bit. It is amazing the amount of money they can make in the summer (FS2).

Because of the financial incentives provided to the departments, summer session administrators encourage the departments to “become their own marketers. We just supply them with the marketing resources” (FS2).

In some cases, incentivizing faculty can work too well but to the detriment of the students. “We have professors who will tell us in fall/spring, oh, I can’t have more than 25 students in this course pedagogically. Then, in summer, they have 85 because they want the money” (FS2). To turn a profit on courses, universities need to ensure expenses are less than revenue. For most classes this means negotiating faculty salaries:

“There’s a minimum salary amount, but then after that it’s a percent of your salary. If the percent of your salary doesn’t meet the minimum requirements, you get the minimum requirements. For example, if you are a first-year faculty, maybe
your salary percentage doesn’t work out to be that minimum. Typically, as referred to us old-timers, we get a lot more money. (FS12)

**Incentivizing and Risk Management.** Summer session administrators work closely with academic colleges and departments to maximize enrollment and minimize costs associated with instruction. Typically, this type of oversight involves calculating net revenue on each course and splitting the profit on some prearranged percentage by unit. Illustrating market like activity are documents (D1; D2; D3) each administrator shared detailing the profit sharing models they administer for summer sessions.

At Willis University, the summer session office manages a revenue share model. Staff create reports that calculate net revenue on individual courses. Net revenue is gross tuition revenue minus instructional cost (D1). The provost stated, “I’ve introduced another entrepreneurial model, 80, 20 model, is a shorthand for it. All the revenue is captured, expenses are paid, and then you share out 80% with the program to fund it, and 20% goes to the university for all the other background things that happen” (S3).

At Parker University, summer course revenue is also subject to a shared split if the enrollment produces a profit (D2). According to the summer session administrator, A revenue producing program and part of what we’ve done to sort of put summer on steroids here is make it more revenue producing for the units as well. Summer provided them a way to very easily see if I get some faculty to teach these courses, I get tens of thousands of dollars coming in to my department that I can replenish the S and E budget and make my faculty and staff happy because now they can actually afford to do things they wanted to do. (A2)
At Cameron University, departments are receiving twenty-five percent of the net revenue. Net revenue is calculated the same way as Willis and Parker except the summer session and provost office receives a portion of the net revenue (D3). My department [summer sessions] is getting fifteen percent net revenue. The provost’s office a five percent net revenue, and of course, the rest is going back to the university” (A3). “Under the incentive model, “we’ve taken away the risk” and “they actually are getting much more than what they ever had before” (S2). Managing risk and driving revenue for summer courses is viewed as a shared responsibly between the summer session office and academic departments. A faculty member stressed,

For our department it [summer session] is mainly a money generator. We try not doing anything that’s not going to generate money. How the university funding model works now, if we want to do innovative things during the school year, then we have to have a pretty good summer enrollment. (FS12).

Supporting this statement about shared responsibility and generating revenue, the administrator at Parker University stated, “Once the revenue return model was implemented, there was much more attention on making sure that we’re managing their courses wisely” (A2). Additionally the administrator at Cameron University stated, “I’m seeing myself as a steward of the campus’s money, so I want to make sure that we’re reducing our losses or spreading out that risk over multiple courses” (A1).

The supervisor at Parker University suggested the old budget allocation model did not work well; there was no accountability and risk associated with course offerings determined by the academic departments (S2). Once a department received their
allocation, “we didn’t ask them what they did with it and summer enrollment had been going down, down, down. There was no risk” (S2). Under the new model, the summer session administrators and supervisors determined what courses are guaranteed during the summer based on historically high enrollment.

You guarantee half the summer courses that you’ll cover their cost of instruction if they don’t run? So, that was a huge risk. We take risks on bringing freshman in for 5 weeks for 7 credit hours of credit varying classes. They’re all marginal students. That’s a risk, so now we have to prove that risk. (FS2)

Beyond the guaranteed courses, departments have the flexibility to offer additional courses that will earn them revenue share.

A revenue share model became the driving force behind Academic departments wanting to offer more courses. “I try to be creative and use it to incentivize the kind of behavior I want among the faculty and graduate students” (F3). “Putting a financial model in place that makes it doable for them. “This last year, we tried to go to every single department head on campus and have a half to an hour meeting where we sat down and said, “This is what you’ve been doing in the summer the last few years, this is how much money you brought in. Here are the courses we’ve identified that look like they’re really bursting at the seams during the academic year that we thing have high potential in the summer and, by the way, we’ll guarantee that you get at least enough money to pay for the instructor if you teach them in the summer. We increased credit hour production this past summer by 12% as compared to the previous summer” (A2).
In most cases, department chairs are responsible for recruiting and assigning summer teaching contracts. At Parker University, the provost and business office will guarantee teaching contracts regardless of enrollment. Thus, the department chairs suggested if the university was responsible for the salary of the instructor, “then they will assign a full time faculty person “even if the class itself doesn’t enroll enough students to cover that salary.” (F3). For courses eligible for revenue share, the department chair will recruit and assign graduate students to teach “you want the lower paid people in there, because that’s how the department makes money” (FS3). “We’re driven toward hiring people who earn less money because we get a certain amount of dollars back per credit” (FS6). Faculty believe the “focus becomes on paying the bills rather than are offering the best education to students” (FS3). We just are looking to generator as much money as we can. We always offer classes that we’re pretty sure are going to have high enrollment” (FS12).

At Willis University, they also have a quasi-centralized summer session office responsible “our department really works on the marketing, the data collection, the student outreach, all of that. We don’t determine the schedule. We report the data based on what deans have done, and give suggestions, or recommendations” (FS11). Willis University also tracks revenue share for the academic departments, according to the data (D2). The summer session office participates in an 80/20 split of revenue with the colleges and departments. Eighty percent of the net revenue is shared with the department offering the course and twenty percent remain in a general university budget.

Academic colleges and departments benefit from revenue share models, a portion of the summer revenue shared with the academic units typically right size department
operational budgets or individual faculty discretion accounts for research. According to a department chair at Cameron University, “we help support our TAs during the academic year. I don’t think our TA budget is fully funded at the college level so the summer support helps with that to some extent” (F4). Several faculty participants mentioned they spend the funds on the students. “Yeah, like to fund student research or student travel during the school year or different things like we buy some new equipment that all comes out of that fund” (FS12). Additionally, “there may be some professional development and travel, but it is primarily operational and the reason why is that over the years budgets have been cut as we’ve entered more difficult times” (A3). The provost at Willis University stressed,

The revenue share from summer is something departments find very useful because they’re buying equipment with it, our nursing programs do wonderful things with that additional money. They save up their assessment work and they pay themselves a few days so that they can get all of that done, other departments send students to different kinds of experiences. They use that money for their travel. Really wonderful work. (S3)

Additionally, the faculty believe the “focus becomes on paying the bills rather than are offering the best education to students” (FS3). One faculty member summarized the summer session revenue share model as “this is the entrepreneurial spirit. We have to say to the university, this is the entrepreneurial spirit. If you want to fill summer you’ve got to give us incentives” (FS6).
Marketing. In addition to attracting new audiences, summer session administrators and staff contribute a lot of time and energy marketing to current and prospective students. Participating in revenue share model drives focus on filling courses. Both the summer session offices and the academic departments feel a shared sense of responsibility to market and fill courses. According to the summer session office at Parker University, the staff sit “around a board or a table and came up with 120, 200 ideas” (FS2). They also send personalized email messages to current students. “Every month, we’d send in a new request to say, who else is not registered? and have a different message for them” (FS2).

We don’t want to be a large blanket email that goes out to every student on campus, but we want a specific group of student who maybe failed a certain class that’s going to be offered during summer. You know, let them know that. You know, why don’t you try retaking this during the summer time. (FS10)

Like old budget allocations models, previous marketing channels do not reach enough students or are not driving enrollment. “Hey, the flier on the elevator doesn’t work anymore. Like, we know the tricks and have the time, because you don’t” (FS2). A Willis University staff member credits involvement in professional associations as a main driver in developing new marketing for summer session:

I think that we’ve identified through going to conferences and talking to colleagues that students are less likely to read things that they maybe use to be. We’ve been doing a lot more to get out in front of them face to face. (FS11)
One of the most important aspects to the summer session office is developing a marketing strategy to reach student audiences.

That’s been I think an evolution of our strategy rather than just targeting our own students and hoping that summer is a priority for them. We’ve done more to broaden our scope and reach out to other schools and other that would potentially enroll. (FS11)

Supervisors viewed marketing as an opportunity to illustrate to the academic department that participating in recruiting students helps increase revenue share. According to the supervisor at Parker University,

We took over the marketing for 10 courses this summer. We just told the department and the professor. The professor, we said, we’ll do it, we’ll do it all for you. They say, great! So, they turned it over to us, and we increased the enrollment in those 10 courses by 43%. (S2)

Similarly, the supervisor at Cameron University stated, “I think getting folks to understand the relationship between what’s offered and who they’re trying to reach” (S3).

Additional marketing tactics to recruit new students include reaching new markets through radio and newspapers ads. “We do advertisements in our local newspapers, surrounding cities. We also do some newspaper advertisements in other school newspapers within our system and outside of our system. We do radio advertisements” (FS11). Direct mail is used to reach students. “We also send out a postcard to a list that we purchased, just about anybody can take a course during the summer and so many online opportunities that kind of thing” (FS11)
Administrators are finding new ways to reach student virtually; particularly popular is the use of digital and social media. “We have a summer session Facebook page that we push information out to. We drive students there, they get resource help and it also has just fun stuff about what you can do in [town] during the summer” (FS11). “We’ve been doing more online for advertising, Facebook ads, Google AdWords campaigns, those kinds of thing that target geographic regions that would have an infinity for our university and would potentially think about taking summer courses” (A3). In addition to reaching students virtually, administrators are also innovating how they reach and supplement faculty resources to assist with marketing. “Then we also have a faculty and staff tool kit that we host on our website where we give data reporting and we give them a marketing tool kit” (FS11).

Data Analysis and Reporting. Summer session administrators and their supervisors are very reliant on current and historical data to make decisions about how best to serve students. “I do a lot of data reporting, looking at enrollments, looking at trends, seeing how we’ve grown or we’ve gone down in different areas between online, all coursework” (FS11). Likewise, at Cameron University the administrator stated, “I’m looking at all those courses really almost on an individual basis, at their enrollment histories, do they have healthy enrollment or is it something new that they’re proposing that has no history of being offered in the summer” (A1).

Reviewing trend data and attempting to predict student enrollment behavior is a critical to producing new revenue. Administrators and staff in summer session office view this as part of their responsibility. “We’ve looked at trends, our typical trend years are within a three-year period, but sometimes we’ll stretch that to five to see everything’s
significantly different in that three years than they were five years ago and how are things trending” (FS11).

Summer session administrators assist departments with their course offerings based on data analysis of student enrollment behaviors for summer. According to Willis University staff member,

> We help departments decide if their course is going to generate revenue or if they have to make a go or no go decision. If it doesn’t turn out that they’re not going to generate revenue, then the dean has to decide if they’re going to take a look at some other course that they want to offer. (FS11)

Similarly, Cameron and Parker administrators conduct the same type of data analysis. “We work with the departments to figure out what classes really should be offered in the summer, looking at enrollment trends in the summer and making sure we’re responding to those so that we’re offering what really students need.” (A1). “We prioritize and so we’re looking for courses that are the biggest hurdles for students in terms of on time graduation completion and the ones that our market research shows to have the biggest enrollments in the summer” (A2).

Summer session administrators and academic departments work closely with Institutional Research to understand other student behaviors such as transferability of summer courses and service expectations. Academic departments,

ask for special reports whether that is us working with our institutional research folks to generate reports about credits that are transferred back to Willis
University after the summer, trying to identify where are students taking courses, what are those courses that they’re transferring back. (FS11)

Parker University, like the other sites, surveys their students to improve and develop new programming. A summer session staff member stated, “We’ll ask them about events, and if they attended. So far, the last 2 years’ worth of data has been very positive. Students have loved the events” (FS2). “They want more free food. More soft pretzels” (FS9).

The majority of data shared during the study detailed enrollment and revenue figures. Reports (D1) such as the one from Willis University, showed the breakdown of enrollment and revenue figures by college and then by academic departments to facilitate a revenue sharing model. To increase net revenue split at the end of summer session, administrators help departments understand course capacity with data.

We could pull up at any given time which of our summer courses were 80 to a 100% full already starting the week of registration march 1st, we could pull that a couple of times a week and use that data to give feedback to departments. You have two sections of this course, they’re already a 100% full, you have x number of students on the wait list. You could potentially open another section. That was something I thought that this year we really did a good job of trying to give faculty and deans real time data to make decisions. (FS11)

At the end of summer sessions, administrators reconcile enrollment and net revenue figures and share the information with the budget offices. “We will turn that over to the finance office. They will do the final reconciliation, so they will look at what the actual
benefits are per faculty member. They will reconcile that, and then at that point there will be a disbursement within a couple of months in terms of a revenue share” (A3).

**Enrollment Management**

The role summer sessions play has become increasing vital for enrollment management divisions of the university. In some cases, summer session administrators have become enrollment managers themselves serving as an extension of the enrollment management office. Enrollment managers who historically have focused on the recruitment of high school students should now focus on the use of summer sessions as a way to reach new audiences, to increase retention and completion rates as well as how to incorporate the third semester as a critical part of a program’s four-year plan. The discussion of increasing four-year graduations has increased so much that summer session administrators are devising how to develop year round schools. “People made assumptions that you’re just poaching students from the regular daytime for this. In recruiting new audiences, summer session administrators are continually defending against claims that additional programming cannibalizes current matriculating students. The supervisor from Cameron University stated, “No, actually we are not. Let me show you, these are students who wouldn’t otherwise be able to take those courses in the summer, or worse, they could take them from someone lese and transfer them in” (S3).

**Outreach to New Audiences.** In addition to incentivizing academic colleges and departments to attract matriculating students to summer session courses, administrators are also looking to attract new audiences with specialized programming. According to the data, programming included Summer Bridge programs for first generation or at risk
college students, visiting college students from other institutions, and summer camps aimed at attracting a wide range of audiences. At Parker University, the summer session office is serving students across a continuum based on year in college.

Summer start hits that high school senior going to be a freshman. Summer Stay hits the sophomore who didn’t stay on campus as a freshman to try to get them to stay. Summer Finish targets a senior who is graduating in December, or even Jan. or May, that could have finished in August by taking advantage of summer. (FS2)

The first student group on the spectrum are academically at risk students who are entering college as freshman. Parker University invites the students on campus for several weeks during the summer session to provide an opportunity to experience college before the fall semester begins. According to a faculty member, “They [summer session office] do the statistics and they know who these students are, that really in the past when they’ve come in have not been able to make it through our program” (FS7). In addition, the university also provides a success coach. The supervisor believes summer bridge programs increase retention and graduation rates.

So these students in essence for us predicted to be academically at risk. I said, so are you going to have a success coach for them or a peer mentor? Initially the administrator said, but if we do that, we’re not going to have as much profit. I said I don’t care if we have profit, if you don’t do that, you won’t graduate the student, right. (S2)
Another audience along the spectrum typically less engaged with summer sessions than other student types are sophomores. Parker University is providing a financial incentive to the sophomores with the hope they will enroll in summer sessions as juniors. The university provides full summer session scholarships to approximately 100 sophomores in the “it’s basically like a targeted sophomore scholarship program if you look at the data. We’ll incentivize you to do it, and then we’ll measure to see if they do that third year by themselves” (FS2). The supervisor reiterated the faculty member’s perception of the sophomore scholarship program.

The other idea I had was there are the state scholarships, so your low income state student, if you don’t earn 30 credits in the year, you lose your state funding. Well, these are low-income students, you lose your state funding, they’re gone. So we secured funding, and if they didn’t earn 30 hours fall/spring, they can go the summer for free. (S2)

In collaboration with enrollment management, Willis is also developing a bridge program “particularly for underrepresented students and students that we want to help be successful” (A3). The purpose of the program is “combine the outdoor education component with an academic component and get these students here settled in, creating friendships, becoming familiar with the environment before the school year starts” (A3). In addition to serving underrepresented students, Willis is also developing “summer bridge programs for international students” and “building out study abroad programs for our students in the summer” (A3). In addition to the youth audiences, Willis University is also targeting new adult students with online program development. “There is also a push
now to do more of that to attract adult learners and there have been some [summer] innovations funds, as I mentioned, that we’ve managed over the past few years to incentivize that” (A3).

Similarly, Cameron University is exploring a summer bridge program focused on urban core, first generation college students (A1). They are also focused on creating a one-stop shop mentality making accessing student services easier for visiting college students. Visiting college students are enrolled full-time at another university but will come home during the summer. Their hometown university such as Cameron are hoping to attract you to enroll in a course or other summer programming.

We have this visiting student population that we invite to enroll at [Cameron University] in the summer, we want to provide them a place to get information about how to apply as a visiting student, how to register, all the steps involved in the process so that they don’t have to go search around in multiple offices on campus, it’s kind of a one stop shop where they can get all the information they need to enroll. (A1)

Summer Camps targeting elementary, middle, secondary and college age are increasingly being developed to support specialized program growth. At Cameron University, Extended Studies is to develop new programming, which may include a new summer camp that going to be rolled out this year. This is an untapped market, we definitely know that it is, so that is something that Extended Studies has ventured into. The
mission of Extended Studies is to extend the opportunities that a campus can provide to a broad audience that goes beyond the traditional college age. (A1)

Academic department chairs and faculty participate in specialized programming because it increases their opportunity to attract new degree program majors. “Political science met with the folks who designed the bridge program because one of the things was to recruit diverse students and so they were consulting with some of our faculty on how you might do that” (FS5). Additionally, as part of the summer bridge program, “that class it was much more of a strategic, I’m not so much concerned about the money as I am, the program is just incredible I think, and trying to recruit majors or at least students who will come and take more political science even if they don’t become majors” (FS5).

Faculty are also a critical part of programming that is non-market like or socially oriented. Specialized programming does not necessarily require organizational profit but can have an economic impact. At Parker University, about 700 students from each college participate in “community service projects done all over the state but predominantly I’ll say within an hour of campus” (S3).

Faculty and students sign up to serve community clients during the summer such as the food pantry in a consulting role. They’ve done dozens of things for the food pantry. Here’s a new inventory system for you, her is a new refrigeration system for you. Here’s a new ordering system for you. I’ll say the community has noticed that there’s more student in town, so it is that there are more businesses around campus, you know, so is that a-, well it’s certainly a benefit to the community. (S2)
Retention and Completion Efforts. There was an overwhelming sense of how important summer sessions can contribute to student retention and degree completion efforts. The data affirmed there is a focus on entrepreneurial programming to increase retention and graduation rates. This focus is typically regarding as student success efforts. Willis University recently tasked the Vice President of Enrollment Services with prioritizing summer programming to assist with retention and graduation rates. “She’s really been prioritizing and pushing summer as an opportunity for the university to retain students and boost their four year completion rates for sure” (FS11). At Parker University a staff member shared, “I know the university is looking hard at the graduation rate, in 5 or 6 years. The summer session could be very helpful to have student graduate on time. In case they fail the class in spring or fall, they can do that in summer” (FS4).

To further increase graduation rates, universities are creating a sense of shared responsibility. Academic and administrative departments are being incentivized with revenue to share in meeting graduation metrics. “My number one goal for all the stuff I do and so the people I talk to, we’ve got to increase our retention and graduation rates” (S2). “You feel the pressure that still they need the course for graduation” (FS4). “Some of the benefits like staying on track or accelerating your progress to degree completion” (FS10). “The relevant number of students to chase for anything is 25. If you had a retention effort that you said you thought could affect 25 students on this campus, okay, I’m interested” (S2).

Administrators equally feel a shared sense of responsibility to retention and graduation efforts. “we know that’s always a factor, providing opportunities, even for graduate students, to have the opportunities to teach in the summer and balancing that
with what the student need to help them progress to graduation” (A1). “There’s a strong demand for on-time graduation for a whole bunch of reasons including formula based funding” (A2). Cameron University administrator stated, 

there is a batch of students that are juniors in this major and they need this class to graduate. There is something that has to with the flow of curriculum, and students progressing to graduation. Usually if I hear that, then that’s persuasive to me to offering it. (A1)

Student success – “I look at summer as an opportunity to help student get ahead so they can graduate on time.” It’s an opportunity to provide student with some different experiences than they might have access to during the academic year. Students are number one in my world and that’s to me the main reason that we do so much in summer” (A2).

**Year Round School.** According to the summer session administrators, there has been encouragement from top leadership that universities should consider moving to a year round model. The summer session office at Parker University is tasked with developing a year round academic year. “Right now, the strategic plan is to create the Year-round University” (FS2). “We’ve had a president or two who got excited about the idea of a year round university, where the summer wasn’t any different from the rest of the academic year. I think a very robust summer with lots of opportunities for students and so student could be choosing to do an internship in the fall instead of the summer” (A2). The supervisor explained how a year round plan would operate at Parker University:
We’ve actually got a white paper on looking at a calendar for a year round school, what it would look like. Fall and Spring, right now, we’re running on a 17-week calendar, in essence. You shrink it to a 14-week calendar. Yeah. In essence, you have three 14-week terms in the year, because you could take the two 7’s of summer and collapse them into one. (S2)

Parker University believes a year round academic plan will increase retention and graduation rates. “Eventually move to a year round calendar for our campus students to increase four-year graduation rates” (A2). Academic advisors play a major role in facilitating a year round academic plan for students. “Our advisors meet with our students in fall, in November to plan for spring, and we have over the past few years instilled with them the idea that you also need to be advising them for summer at the same time so that they have this year round plan” (FS10). Another office critical in making a year round academic plan successful is Financial Aid. At Willis University, the provost has emphasized summer is the leading term and not the trailing term. This has implications on how students and financial aid counselors will plan for aid distribution. “Working with financial aid to help them understand that for some students, and more and more students, summer is a leading and not a trailing term, and what implication does that have for them as they plan their financial aid” (A3).

The data suggested a revenue share model has been discussed as part of a year round plan. According to a faculty member at Parker University, “first the president wanted to basically explore the idea of a year-round calendar and make a trimester
system and there were a lot of meetings and studies about that. I think the goal was to have the current summer budget model in place but bring in a trimester system” (FS8)

At Willis University the provost stated, we have a few that are starting to talk about a year round program, and that is very exciting. We have the ability to hire faculty in a staggered way, it is still in the contract, where we can hire them for fall and spring, but we can also hire them for spring and summer or summer and fall. That is a really different way of thinking of the contract” (S3). Likewise, at Parker University, the president’s office has also considered switching faculty contracts to year round. “He’s [president] talked about maybe switching faculty contracts to year-round” (FS3).

Outside of summer sessions, the only break longer than three weeks is during the winter holiday. University administrators are now talking about how to fill that gap between Fall and Spring semester with courses. The gap or term is referred to as winter session. According to Cameron University, “There are new ideas that are in the very early stages of planning, adding a winter session to our campus” (A1). The administrator at Parker University is also engaged in discussions about developing a winter term. “We had a meeting today about something that could be really innovative, it’s called winter session. We’ve never had winter session” (A2).

The themes represent university activities occurring during the summer months specifically focused on the role of the summer session office and the lead administrator and the influence they have over the activity. The researcher was interested in the perceptions of the summer session administrators, their supervisors and faculty and staff
involved in university summer session program. The themes serve as evidence of an academic academy engaged in entrepreneurial activity.

**Summary**

The study design, data collection methods, conceptual underpinnings, research questions, and process of data analysis have been discussed in Chapter Four. Additionally, an institutional profile of the university case study sites and the themes that emerged from the data collected from participants and documents data to fully understand the activities occurring in summer sessions. Presented in Chapter Five are the findings and conclusions based on the data analysis. Additionally, discussed in Chapter Five are the implications for practice and recommendations for future study.
CHAPTER FIVE
Summary, Recommendations, and Conclusions

Introduction

This qualitative, multi-case study was designed to investigate market and non-market like or socially oriented activity occurring on campus during the summer months. Academic entrepreneurship theory provides an appropriate conceptual framework for gaining a deeper understanding of experiences present during university summer sessions. An academic entrepreneurial lens provided a sense of what is occurring outside the traditional fall and spring calendar and how universities position the third semester to be entrepreneurial (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). The researcher utilized academic entrepreneurship as a lens to analyze campus summer activity to understand the perceptions of summer session administrators, their supervisors and campus faculty and staff have on market and non-market like activity occurring during the summer months (Mars & Rios-Aguilar). Data were collected and triangulated through interviews, focus groups observations and document review (Creswell, 2009). To ensure credibility, the researcher used peer debriefing and member checking, which provides the participants to review the major themes and provide feedback (Creswell). Through data analysis, three themes and a number of subthemes emerged: 1) Campus Collaboration, with subthemes of: a) Expanded Student Support Services, and b) Facility Usage; 2) Business Enterprise with subthemes: a) Incentivizing and Risk Management, b) Marketing c) Data Analysis and Reporting; and 3) Enrollment Management with the subthemes: a) Outreach to New Audiences, b) Retention and Completion Efforts and c) Year Round University.

Discussed within Chapter Five is a summary of the findings and conclusions that are
based on the analyzed data. Additionally presented are implications for practice and recommendations for future study.

**Summary of Findings**

The findings of this research study examined market and non-market like or socially oriented activity occurring on campus during the summer months. Presented in this section is an analysis of how summer session administrator plays an influential role in creating entrepreneurial activity and what activity should be considered for inclusion of the traditional Fall and Spring semester. The conceptual theory of academic entrepreneurship provided the framework and lens for data analysis. Mars and Rios-Aguilar (2010) posited that to understand the benefits and barriers of supporting and creating entrepreneurial activity in higher education, researchers need to apply the following conceptual dimensions when studying academic entrepreneurship: (1) creative disruption; (2) (dis)equilibrium; (3) innovation; (4) value creation; (5) [and] opportunity recognition. Academic entrepreneurship. The purpose of the study was to understand what entrepreneurial activity occurs during the summer months on university campuses and to determine if any of the entrepreneurial activity should be adapted for Fall and Spring semester.

The following three themes related to summer session activity as suggested through the perceptions of summer session administrators, their supervisors and faculty and staff emerged: *Campus Collaboration, Business Enterprise, and Enrollment Management*. Within the boundaries of the study, as developed from the conceptual
framework on academic entrepreneurship, these research questions served as a guide for this study:

1. How do university summer session administrators define innovation?

2. How do university summer session administrators foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape?

3. How do university summer session programs engage in the following entrepreneurial dimensions through market and non-market or socially oriented activities?
   k) Creative disruption
   l) Innovation
   m) Value creation
   n) Economic (dis)equilibrium
   o) Opportunity recognition

4. What are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

5. What are the barriers to supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?

A summary of the major themes was presented in Chapter Four. Furthermore, the study framework served as a guide to interpret the data. Below is the researcher’s analysis of how the data applies the study’s research questions.
How do university summer session administrators define innovation?

Drucker (1985) defined innovation as “the specific instrument of entrepreneurship; it’s the act that endows resources with a new capacity to create wealth” and innovation (p. 31). Administrators, faculty and staff espoused multiple definitions of innovation using terms such as risk, new, creative and revenue. According to a faculty member at Parker University, innovation is “being creative, doing something new, thinking outside the box” (FS5). A fellow faculty member stated, innovation is “the end goal of improving from the baseline, it improves the outcome, it improves the process, it brings efficiency into the system” (FS3). At Cameron University faculty viewed innovation similarly, “I wouldn’t say innovation is necessarily something that has never been done before, but, you know, tailoring something that has maybe worked somewhere else and end up tailoring to where, okay, how’s it going to work here” (FS10).

In addition to new, risk is another term used to describe innovation. A summer session administrator stated, “innovation as the willingness and the ability to take calculated risk in attempt to create new programs, services, revenue streams. It is an opportunity to infuse new energy into an institution and opportunities for mutually beneficial partnerships and collaborations” (A3). “The first word that came to my head is risk. You cannot be innovative unless you are just willing to go against some statistics” (FS2). “I see innovation as looking at things differently to address challenges and opportunities. Not using what has been traditionally done, going against the grain, taking a risk, and having outcomes that are really…I don’t know, just different” (FS11).
Drucker (1985) also stressed the importance of technology in driving innovation. “I’d say trying new things, whether it’s technology or teaching techniques or pedagogies, like trying new things that are more modern” (FS12). Innovative in technology or innovative in student learning, you’re hoping that whatever you did, it was something different than what the student had in the past so they’re successful. Sometimes I kind of look at coming up with some different, creative topics other than the same old, same old stuff” (FS13).

**How do university summer session administrators foster innovation and entrepreneurship within a university landscape?**

The role of summer session administrator is all encompassing and requires extraordinary skills such as being creative, a visionary, collaborator, recruiter and revenue generator. Administrators reach across campus to multiple constitutes to drive collaboration and innovation. They recognize opportunities and create innovative strategies for social transformation or create efficient opportunities (Chiles, Bluedorn & Gupta, 2007; Lackmann, 1971; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Higher education administrators are increasingly more entrepreneurial in their work and strategic in accessing resources (Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). Institutional entrepreneurs use the rules, negotiate in the bureaucracy, and adapt to environmental changes to create entrepreneurial activities (Hansson & Monsted, 2008). In the spirit of working within the rules to create additional opportunities, summer session administrators spend a considerable amount of time meeting with various stakeholders across campus to encourage participation and promote the benefits of summer session to drive market and non-market like opportunities.
We’ve had to kind of meet individually with as many department heads as possible because a lot of people aren’t really familiar with just how much they can kind of earn from the funding model during the summer. We have tried to sit down with them. Even if we were not able to meet in person, we just tried to send emails with videos on how they can go and see, you know, historically what their role in that department has been. You know, where maybe they left some money on the table, and where they could kind of recoup some of that this coming summer; what courses they could look at that have been offered during the summer that might be beneficial to them in terms of funding. (FS10)

At each site, faculty and staff were eager to support the assertion; administrators are collaborators that drive innovation. At Parker University, one faculty member stated the summer session office has “done an excellent job, overall, in trying to help us think creatively, through what different options are and presenting it. Not shoving it down our throats but giving us what we need to be able to think about how that would work in our case” (FS7). Additionally, Willis University faculty suggested, “It is clear the university has put a lot of money and resources and time into developing this. You’ve got to have people who are dedicated worriers about summer” (FS5).

As Drucker (1985) stated, “Innovation is a tool with which organizations wield to create new products and services to ultimately serve new markets. The Summer Session Office “has been very, very helpful, on a number of things” (FS3). New tools include the creation of videos for department chairs and faculty. Summer session administrators are utilizing a screen capture software to “show them, here’s what your enrollment and your
utilization has been in the past few summers, and the revenue that you’re department has brought in as a result” (FS10).

Another innovative idea to service more students in the summer is to sell an entire academic year at one time. According to the supervisor, “I would sell you 40 hours, and I don’t care when you take them. I think that would encourage more students, so, and you’ve got to discount them a little bit relative to buying, you know, spring and fall, whatever, but my hunch is that would encourage more student to go in summer. The plan could include housing as well” (S2).

At Cameron University, the summer session administrator was concerned with the level of student engagement and suggested faculty should develop themed learning communities around several course topics. “You can get those instructors together and they can agree that we have the Olympics this summer let’s all put the Olympic theme in this and we’ll link it together and they’re going to be doing the Communications of Olympics and the Math of Olympics and the Marketing of Olympics. You can do things like that in the summer when you know who is in what course. We have that information to know that too during the academic year. We just don’t do it” (A2).

How do university summer session programs engage in the following entrepreneurial dimensions through market and non-market or socially oriented activities?

Creative disruption. Creative disruption occurs when the newest technological idea disrupts the bigger and better model, while bringing to market a product or service that is typically more affordable or easier to use or access, typically resulting in attracting a new
audience (Christensen & Eyring, 2011). “The technology allows them [faculty] to do different things. I taught a joint summer course with Stockholm University for example. There are things you can do that technology allows and that’s often migrated into summer” (A2). It is the combination of disruptive technology and increased focus on student outcomes (Christensen, 2008). “I definitely think that technology has helped us broaden our scope of courses that are offered in the summer. Because we do have many more options for online and hybrid during the summer. I don’t think that we could possibly do what we do, without that” (FS11). “One of them [innovation grant proposal] was to develop an online advising tool that was launched in summer but will have implications for fall and spring as well” (A3).

Innovation. National or regional pressures encourage university faculty and staff to introduce innovation (Levin, 2006; Mars & Metcalfe, 2009). As the first research question indicated, the majority of administrators, supervisors and faculty and staff simply viewed innovation as tweaking or creating something new. In response to the pressure to innovate, the supervisor at Parker University stated, “it’s okay to fail, but fail fast, all right and then get on and try something else” (S2). Innovation or change within an academic organization can be the direct result of new products, models, or services applied technologically, economically and/or socially (Drucker, 1985). An administrative innovation can include a new policy for recruitment purposes, reallocation of resources, and the restructuring of tasks, authority, or rewards (Llano, 2010). At Parker University, the Economics Department responded to a revenue share model by creating and delivering a summer only minor. “They are being very creative in developing things like a summer only minor. There’s such a demand on their courses
they are saying “Hey, if you aren’t one of our majors and you want to take a minor, go take it in the summer” That’s both to get more minors but also it drives more students into the summer where they make extra money” (A2). Additional examples of innovation included a flipped classroom approach, “flipping a class was an innovation as opposed to the way we typically [teach class] and investing in electronic textbooks or open source materials “going to an e-text instead of teaching from a book” (S2).

**Value creation.** Creation of financial profits from external funding is the most important dimension for generating internal legitimacy and resources (Hansson & Monsted, 2008; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Internal legitimacy is occurring as a direct result of revenue share models. Academic units and faculty are an integral part of the value creation process during summer session. They determine the course schedule, negotiate salaries to keep expenses low and share in the profits. According to a faculty member at Willis University, “there was that benefit of having time, and having compensation for that being in summer that would not occur during the year. If there was another way to provide both of those things during the year, it would encourage more during the year” (FS11). Additionally, value creation can be derived from an institution’s engagement in socially oriented activities which contributions to economic development or student eco entrepreneurship. At Parker University, about 700 students from each college participate in “community service projects done all over the state but predominantly I’ll say within an hour of campus” (S3).

**Economic (dis)equilibrium.** Organizational (dis)equilibrium occurs when innovation alters complacent structures or redistributes resources (Drucker, 1985). New technological advances that disrupt the way universities conduct business creates
economic disequilibrium. Recognizing and acting on disruption can create market opportunities which bring greater efficiency (Drucker, 1985; Etzkowitz, 2011; Guskin & Marcy, 2003; Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). To drive greater efficiencies of facilities, student services and metrics, Parker University is creating a plan for year round degree programming. “Right now, the strategic plan is to create the Year-round University. He’s [president] talked about maybe switching faulty contracts to year-round” (FS2).

**Opportunity recognition.** Universities can empower their faculty and staff to recognize opportunity, harness it and benefit from it fiscally or socially (Mars & Rios-Aguilar, 2010). Opportunity recognition requires more than a philosophical statement; universities also have to recognized intellectual entrepreneurship and celebrate it (Beckman & Cherwitz, 2009). Although there were a couple of cases where some summer session activity was recognized, it was not with the intention around promoting and encouraging entrepreneurship. One university celebrates faculty teaching by running online showcases and a campus forum every six weeks. “We’re trying to shine a light on teaching as much as we can” (S2). Collaboration across disciplines and partnerships will also help create market and non-market like opportunities (Cherwitz, 2005). In response to how revenue from summer is allocated, an administrator said, “we also use some of that money to fund partial positions in other departments, so we fund partially a position in the registrar’s office and in the distance teaching and learning department” (A3).

What are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?
Benefits of supporting entrepreneurship differed based on stakeholder. The majority of perceived benefits included monetary gains for the university, college, academic department or faculty member. Financial incentives are beneficial to the colleges and academic departments particularly the deans and chairs. “Letting them share the revenue stream I think is pretty important to the department heads” (S2). For our department, if we teach it when we run summer classes, then that gives us more money to use throughout the year to do other things” (FS12). Faculty also benefit “Faculty really like it. It [summer] is one of your chances to earn extra money” (FS13).

In addition to the gains in the university budgets, faculty pay, facility utilization and students also benefited. Study participants suggested students could take advantage of smaller class sizes, which increases faculty interaction and can focus on one or two course load. Faculty and student interaction Scott (1993) stated summer course formats and faculty load led to better interaction and stronger relationships with students. There is a reciprocal relationship between the traditional academic year and summer. Relieving over capacity of general education courses during Fall and Spring. “I’ve got some courses that are so full, that the only way I’m going to be able to get them is student are going to have taken them in the summer” (S2).

Another benefit for universities and students are increased retention and graduation rates. “We have a 4-year graduation rate at Parker of 51%. A 6-year at 75%, which is pretty good, but not great still. So, half of the students who get out in 4 years have taken summer. So he [president] likes those stats and he wants credit-hour accumulation. So, I would say that’s the main focus” (FS2). “I think students like it [summer], because they can get a lot of their gen ed credits out of the way (FS12).
Another benefit of summer sessions is to offer programming differently than fall and spring. A traditional fall and spring semester is 16 weeks in length but the summer sessions in this study are 8-week sessions or less. To build upon what summer session administrators have encouraged the development during summer, such as 8-week courses. “Joe [pseudonym] has already started doing more 8 week courses. So I mean the half of fall, I mean those are some of the things that we’ve pulled in, because we see kids dropping things in the first half of the term, and now we can get them back to a full load” (S2). “If a professor does an 8-week…those courses roll into fall and spring really well because they’re already 8-weeks built, and fall and spring is 16 weeks. At Parker, you can do a first 8-week course or a second 8-week course. So, then [students] could add another course to be a second 8-week course in the fall/spring, keep their financial aid dollars, and try again to keep over 12 [credit hours]” (FS2).

**What are the barriers to supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?**

The overarching barrier to supporting entrepreneurship on university campuses in summer is culture change. The mindset, affirmed in elementary and secondary school, is that summer is for a break from academic studies. Most university students are entrenched in traditional educational models with having summers to return home and engage in full or part time work. Similarly, to the habits of K-12 educational model. For faculty and staff, summer is better spent vacationing or conducting research outside of the classroom. “There is a cultural thing there. Then there is also a larger cultural thing and that is we live in [northern state] and it is a cold weather state, and when summer comes we want to play. Our mind shifts in terms of what we want to do with summer” (A3).
Parker university faculty echoed this mindset, “I think the academic culture for so long has been predicated on the regular academic year, and then summer is used for other things so to try to get everybody who works at the university to think about being more engaged during the summertime is sometimes difficult” (FS8). “I think many of our faculty want a change in their work schedule. They want that freedom to be able to do a variety of other things during the summer, whether that’s research, whether it is personal family time, whatever it is” (A3). A supervisor concluded,

Changing mindset is probably-, I think universities are really bad, it is just not the faculty, it’s the entire, the advisors are as bad as the faculty as bad as the administration—no, that how we do it. When you start talking about doing something different, there is a very almost I am going to call it a passive aggressive resistance to change, if you will. Bringing along change is probably the hardest thing to do. (S2)

In addition to changing the mindset of administrators and faculty, students and parents also view summer as a break period or a time for remediation. “Shifting the mindset of students and their parents from, they’re so used to taking a break from school during the summer. You know, taking summer classes is really stigmatized in the K-12 system. Like, oh, I had to take summer school. That must mean that there’s some type of remediation that was needed” (FS10). “Students don’t necessarily see summer especially their first couple of years as being something that they want to do because it’s not fun for them to have to use their summer in a way that they haven’t necessarily had to use their summer in the past” (FS11).
Along with the traditional educational calendar, residential and traditional business models are a barrier. According to a summer session staff member, “the biggest barrier is that they [housing] make’em move so much. They make’em, and now we’re trying to start a winter session. So, that’s whole another conversation, but that student would have to move like, 4 times in a year. Like, they make’em move out to a new winter one and then move out of that to their spring one, and then move from their spring to their summer, and then summer back to a different room” (FS2). In addition to housing, advisors are viewed as a barrier to summer entrepreneurship and activity. “Some of our advisors think summer students shouldn’t be in-, I don’t get it. Sometimes they think we are wearing students out and they should go home” (S2). “I would say half of our advisors don’t advertise summer because they don’t think it’s worth it in the cost and the burnout. There are people bringing up issues of won’t student burn out? They do fall and spring and summer as well, and then winter you know they’re all going to end up in counseling” (FS2). “Objections come up that underlie why people sort of work slowly on things. It is not insurmountable, but when you’ve been doing it a certain way for many decades, changing is difficult” (A2).

The condensed summer schedule causes logistical challenges to summer sessions. Many faculty are concerned about the condensed class time as compared to traditional fall and spring semesters. “We offer quite a few courses on an eight-week model but the summer bridge thing is five weeks. That’s getting pretty tight” (FS6). “For them to have 15 weeks of material in three weeks, their brains really have to be clicking along. That’s really tough for them” (FS13). “The pace is so fast; we couldn’t figure out how many courses have labs. It’s just difficult for the student” (FS4). Scheduling the condensed
courses can also be a challenge, “Classroom scheduling in terms of adapting an eight-week course for Fall and Spring “that’s an obstacle, the classroom, and the scheduling. “Availability of classrooms and scheduling is, that’s not so much an issue in the summer” (FS6).

Faculty availability during the summer is another barrier to supporting entrepreneurship in the classroom. Although research can be considered as an activity supporting entrepreneurship, the data suggested faculty spend time producing course revenue and was a barrier. A department chair from Parker University described the situation as, “finding people to teach is a challenge for my department. None of our regular faculty had offered summer courses in recent years because it’s a big commitment, eight week courses” (FS4). “Faculty are not incentivized to the extent that they would actually teach in the summertime, because they don’t get paid at the same rate” (FS7). This issue is exacerbated by faculty promotion and tenure guidelines as one department chair stated, “I am hesitant to the extent that I would not ask my assistant professors to teach a summer class because they’re not evaluated based on that. They are evaluated, then promoted, tenured based on their research. That’s what they should be doing in the summertime” (FS3). At research-intensive universities during the summer “faculty do research and it is inappropriate to encourage faculty to do anything else because if they want to get tenure and promotion they need to be working all summer doing research” (A2).

Competition from community colleges is another barrier. Students are taking advantage of low cost alternatives to higher education during the summer. Most students will take a course through the community college to save money on tuition. Community
colleges are I feel like have upped their game too, so we are competing, if they want to go home for the summer, they are going to a community college” (FS13). “They are paying less at the community college” (FS12). “The competition between us and the community college in [the state] is a very, very robust and national award-winning community college campus called ID Tech. It is a third of the cost there in the summer than ours is” (FS2). “A lot of competing forces in the marketplace in terms of other options. For us, our big competing thing right now is, there is college in the schools. Our kids are taking their college class in high school. [Willis University] has not bought into that model” (FS12). Another administrator shared the same view, “we never really worried much about summer or about enrollments at any time of the year and now we are not panicking but now we are having to work for it” (FS1).

Each year Willis University conducts student focus groups. One of the primary barriers cited in the student focus group was cost. Students are not eligible for financial aid in the summer so students reduce the cost of attendance by attending community colleges. Unfortunately, universities cannot control the issuance of financial aid during the summer sessions because it is “more of a federal thing than a campus issue” (S2). Similarly, at another site, a staff member stated, “The financial aid piece because of the loss of the Pell Grant for this summer. I think that impacts a lot of people” (FS9). “With financial aid the way it is and how it’s evolving, it’s harder for them to be able to take courses in the summer and work full time so that ty can actually pay for school and get done with their degree period” (FS11).
Conclusions

A qualitative research study is the best method to understand the phenomena of university summer session entrepreneurial activity in their natural setting (Creswell, 2009). The purpose of this research was to add to a body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship (Mars & Rios-Aguilars, 2010) within a public university summer programs. Since summer sessions are typically administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters, particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Creswell posited qualitative research is a means to explore and understand an individual or group problem within a natural setting. According to Hatch (2002), qualitative research “seeks to understand the world from the perspectives of those living in it” (p. 7). A multi case study approach provided a breadth of data on a summer session program and the role of the summer session administrator in influencing entrepreneurial activity; thus, building upon an emerging field of data, which limited research, exists. Through the process of collecting data, the following conclusions resulted from the study’s finding on summer session activity at public universities.

Campus Collaboration

Collaboration across disciplines and partnerships can create market and non-market like opportunities (Cherwitz, 2005). One of the biggest changes of a university summer session and administration in recent years is the attitude towards a service mentality (Martin, 2002). Because of its condensed often flexible formatting, summer
sessions have led the way for alternative delivery, scheduling options, removal of procedural barriers, and the creation of new forms of services (Martin, 2002). “These activities that have transformed summer sessions from a barely visible university enterprise to a session seen as an institutional “cash cow” (Schejbal, 1997, p. 3).

From the data, summer session administrators are increasingly working across campus with offices that provide student support services. The intent is to work across service silos and present a united front to student, meeting service expectations year-round rather than just fall and spring semester. Universities, and specifically summer session administrators, spend a considerable amount of time and resources developing a summer brand. The data suggested the summer brand is being adapted by other offices including academic advisement, financial aid, camps and conferences and study abroad. Using the university summer brand represents the support of common goals and service expectations. “Yep, they take on our brand. They [Parker Student Union Board] put on different events like concert on the lawn, movie on the hill, you know” (FS9). “I am trying to get that to happen with things like conferences and events” (FS2).

Emerging summer service goals include the development of a summer bridge program, which requires the involvement of numerous student support offices. Summer bridge programs typically target students who are most at risk of not persisting toward a degree. Each site location described various stages of summer bridge development. In response to building a bridge program at Parker University, the summer session administrator stated, “we have to build a very holistic program that supports those students and it’s going to be cross institutional, intra-institutional in order for it to be successful” (A3).
To encourage campus support for summer service goals, Willis University developed an innovation grant fund, which student support offices could apply for money to develop new service tools and programming.

There were many workshop [proposals], there were some trying to get high school students in. I think overall we want to have activity on our campus in the summer. A lot of the proposals that we got were faculty wanting to try thing that they couldn’t otherwise do because they don’t have the funding to do it. (FS11)

According to Cherwitz (2005), a university-industry collaboration and platform will drive social change and transformation while encouraging civic responsibility. To support the assertion of a service mentality, one of the funded proposals was the development of an online advising platform for students with summer innovation funds.

According to the provost from Willis University, the first step in developing service goals is to survey students. Students will help define service level expectations.

My thought is that many of our faculty have shifted some things differently, and we’re not really going back and listening to our learners. This is the year we’ll be doing a lot of that kind of work, going back in and analyzing who are we really trying to serve in the summer, and to shift the culture to consider summer as its first session, not its last session. (S3)

**Enrollment Management**

Concluded from data findings, enrollment management issues such as retention and graduation rates are increasingly reliant on the success of summer sessions.
Administrators play a vital role in shaping enrollment goals, fee structures and advising infrastructures for their organizations (Sims, 2007). Young and McDougall (1988) stressed that the ability of summer sessions was to attract and retain students, earn a profit and “consequently become functionally part of the regular ongoing educational experience for degree-oriented students” (p. 39).

All data site administrators noted the need to recognize summer as an integral part of the academic year or program plan or as the term considered first and not as slack, remedial last term.

I think the concept that summer is a leading term and not a trailing term, which is a new concept here. It is becoming more and more apparent to people particularly I would say leadership at the cabinet level, provost, and enrollment manager, vice president that if we have a healthy summer we’re much better positioned for a healthy academic year. (A3)

In addition, an aspect of an entrepreneurial program, like summer sessions, is the ability for the administrator to see their role as enrollment manager. Since the 2000s, administrators have studied the enrollment motivation, satisfaction for students and faculty in an attempt to attract new students and provide new programming (Donnelly & Kessler, 2000; Fish & Kowalik, 2009; Kowalik, 2005). “A great deal of attention has been turned to the changing demographics of postsecondary enrollees” or also known as non-traditional student (Pusser, et. al, 2005, p. 27).

An enrollment manager is keenly aware of the changing student base and to be successful, a university must attract new audiences. According to Dev (2005), “although
planning and developing summer programs may seem daunting, institutions will be greatly rewarded for strategically expanding” (p. 56). “We are much more aggressive about going after visiting students in our marketing” (A3).

We’ve talked about how we attract more people to this campus: visiting students: special populations, and so on, for summer. I think part of the journey is that we need to see summer within this sort of holistic view and how it fits into academic progress and student success. (A3)

Serving different audiences requires administrators and faculty to continually evaluate and augment their course modalities and length. Course lengths are often experimented with during summer sessions. University summer sessions usually range from three to twelve weeks in length but the most popular lengths are six and eight weeks. Eight-week courses created and delivered in summer sessions can be easily adapted for fall and spring semester. According to a faculty member, making second eight-week courses available during the fall semester provides enrollment managers an opportunity to “pick up the students who drop a class and need something to graduate. It goes back to this focus on graduation rates” (FS5). Incentivizing faculty to experiment more on different teaching modalities is creating opportunities for enrollment growth. “Virtually all the growth in summer enrollment has been from online” (FS5). “We’re offering more online sessions” (FS4).

An important function of enrollment management is driving efforts on retaining and graduating students. Retention and graduation rates are increasingly important statistic most likely due state performance metric funding is becoming reliant on actual
data. More and more institutions are cognizant of incorporating summer sessions into a four-year plan. A four year plan can be used a guide by students and advisors to increase retention and graduation rates for students. Institutions become more efficient with programming aimed at increasing retention and graduation rates. Institutions may even see a dip in credit hour production. “They don’t realize that only half of our students are graduating in 4 years, and 75 percent are graduating in 6 years. People automatically just think that 4 years for a bachelor’s degree is an end. So, getting them to change the way that they look at summer and see, you know, Oh! I can. This can really help me get ahead and I can finish in 3 years instead of 4” (FS10). “This past year tow of our service faculty developed an online advising tool for summer which was launched and now will be implemented year round” (A3). Although the issues of retention and graduation rates and summer bridge programming involved undergraduate students, graduate students are seen as a potential growth opportunity during summer. Most graduate students are working adults looking to complete their studies as quickly as possible. They are most likely to enroll in summer courses.

Quasi-centralized summer session offices have advantages and disadvantages. Summer administrators may not dictate all summer course offerings but they provide a level of accountability for enrollment and course net revenue.

The deans really do work with their department chairs and their faculty in each department to determine what they’re going to offer, when they’re going to offer it, how long course are going to run, how many seats they’re going to have available if they’re going to run a second section if things fill up quickly. All of
that is determined at the department level not at our level. We don’t have control beyond just the data we collect, and how we distribute that. (FS11)

**Business Enterprise**

Summer session administrators managing a quasi-centralized program have control of budgetary and fiscal operations, which will “potentially maximize cost effectiveness and income production” (Heikel, 2000, p. 39). These administrative structural changes of centralizing summer session programs bolster revenue and addresses shrinking institutional allocations (Heikel, 2000; Hentschel, 1991). According to the data, a business enterprise dependent on revenue will be aware of competing market forces, will use data driven decision-making and utilize incentive models to drive entrepreneurial culture.

Market forces such as the competition from community colleges continually confront universities. Summer session administrators monitor enrollment and revenue data and create a system to understand what students or audiences need or expect in course scheduling or programming. “We have a market driven system, an entrepreneurial system for summer it really is strongly influenced by what students enroll in, so they definitely have an impact on what is offered” (A3). Faculty feel the pressure to compete yet are still compelled to teach in a traditional face-to-face format. A faculty member at Cameron University stated, “We need to do all sorts of things, but we do need to focus on certain topics more, and we do need to probably consider one or two more of our nursing courses to be online, to be competitive. We want the professional socialization, students love that, but we don’t have to do that in every course” (FS14). “I have some, what we
call innovation dollars, and that could be really anything. I am primarily interested in the departments taking full programs into this different delivery mode for summer. What it really means is redesigning what you have specifically for that audience” (S3).

To make fiscally responsible business decisions, universities are increasingly relying on data. Data driven decision-making requires technological software and full cooperation from Institutional research. Summer session administrators and supervisors are utilizing videos to show departments how to pull reports and interpret them from databases. According to Cameron University staff member, the summer session office tailors spreadsheets so the academic department can track utilization of their summer courses and net revenue production.

We heard some responses back like, oh, this was great! I mean the reporting that we’ve been able to develop with our institutional research staff is advanced. There are excel spreadsheets…they auto populate and there’s things that are pulling from all over the place, and with pivot tables. (FS11)

Revenue generation or wealth creation is a vital part of creating an entrepreneurial program. Universities may be unique in the way they share the responsibility and revenue with their organizations. To drive campus wide buy in, each data site participated in a revenue sharing model. Each model consisted of sharing the net revenue produced by summer classes back to the academic colleges and departments. A summer session staff member stated, “It’s seems like they all figured out how to change their courses because they want the revenue. It is still money. The revenue. It’s always the carrot” (FS2).
Fairly rapidly departments figured out that the revenue share model was going to provide some funds for them that they just would not have access to, so we saw more and more departments switch to the revenue share model which is a market driven model based on enrollment. (A3)

The provost from Willis University is changing culture by supporting the assertion summer sessions will be the first and not the trailing term during the academic year. She also believes that incentivizing the campus and particularly the academic departments provides a fiscally healthier campus.

A healthy summer is a healthy academic year. That seems to be proving itself. The better we do in summer, the better we do for the rest of the year, because even though we are profit sharing, many of those monies, revenues coming in, support other things as we go through the academic year. It is just kind of a no-brainer. The fact that we share it out with the departments helps them” (S3).

Concluding thoughts from administrators, staff and faculty member suggested producing entrepreneurial activity is a balancing act. See figure one below.

![Figure One: Entrepreneurialism as a Balancing Act](image)
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In a way for innovation in an environment where you have to worry about costs and resources, when I hear about things that are innovative here, I have this balancing question. What are we going to not do, or do less of so that we can do the new stuff? (FS8)

There is a belief both academic and administrative departments cannot create and administer innovative programs without reducing effort on existing programs. Additionally, the faculty and staff support shedding programming that does not build on their organizational strengths and skill sets. “There’s not a lot of excess capacity in terms of the things we do” (FS6). Conversely, a faculty member stressed organizational energy should focus on current programming:

Part of the underlying reasoning behind that is that whoever is making an experiment has a lot of energy, they have a lot invested in this, they are going to put a lot of energy into it, and so it is probably going to be better, right. But it probably be better if you used that same amount of energy and enthusiasm in what you’re already doing. (FS7)

**Limitations**

In a qualitative study, a researcher serves as the primary instrument for data collection, and consequently bring their personal perceptions and biases with them, which can lead to mistakes and missed opportunities. In addition to personal bias, lack of training in interviewing and data collection may have also led to missed opportunities (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 1998; Mertens, 2005). Additionally, the time allotted for the study and the money available to conduct the data collection was limited (Merriam).
Although the researcher made every attempt to reduce the influence of bias in this study, the researcher does have direct administrative responsibilities for a mostly centralized summer session program. Additional, the researcher serves in a leadership role within a national organization serving university summer administrators; thus, the researcher continually reflected on personal bias that may affect the study’s data and interpretations (Mertens, 2005).

Another limitation is with the use of qualitative research design. Individuals interacting with their social environments (Merriam, 1998) construct reality. The researcher was cognizant of the embedded meaning participants apply to their lived and felt experiences and how this meaning was interpreted through the researchers own lens (Merriam). During data analysis, the researcher ensured not to oversimplify or exaggerate participant perceptions (Merriam).

Additionally, the use of one conceptual framework for the study is a limitation. A conceptual framework may limit the inductive approach when exploring a phenomenon. To avoid deduction, the researcher peer debriefed with a doctoral advisor and fellow colleagues to ensure analysis and the framework did not limit interpretation of the data (Mertens, 2005).

A final limitation included size and location of collection sites. Utilizing purposeful sampling the researcher chose site locations by convenience and within a certain geographic area. Purposeful sampling in qualitative research does not provide a sufficient breadth and depth of data collected from sites (Patton, 1990). Sites resided within the North Central Region as identified the North American Association on Summer Session.
Implications

The findings suggested the occurrence of market and non-market like or socially oriented activity during the summer sessions. From the study, the researcher gleaned future implications on how summer session administrators can foster and encourage entrepreneurial activity and its adaptation to fall and spring semesters. Within the study, several implications resulted from the data.

Summer session administrators can encourage a variety of course formats and course lengths that can be adapted for fall and spring semesters. Typically, universities struggle to provide second semester courses for students to enroll in. “We have a shortage of second eight week courses so that’s one of the reasons that we’re pushing second eight-week because it meets summer and academic needs” (A2). Second semester courses begin after the start of the traditional semester and allow for late enrollment or an opportunity for a student who is struggling in one of their semester courses to drop the course and add another one. This is option is critically important to a student who is receiving financial aid or an international student because both types of students cannot drop below twelve credit hours. If a student is receiving, financial aid and they drop below twelve credit hours they are in jeopardy of losing funding for additional courses. The consequences for an international student are direr, if they drop below twelve credit hours and there are no other course enrollment options then they are required to return home. This results in lost revenue for the university.

A subsequent implication is incentivizing faculty to experiment with different modalities during the summer months. Universities are investing monies into distance
learning and active learning spaces in the hope to reach a broader audience at further
distances and possibly provide flexibility to students who reside on campus. As suggested
by the study’s participants, pedagogy experimentation during the summer months on a
smaller number of students is the best method. “Using the summertime as a way to
innovate on the smaller number of students to figure out what works and what doesn’t
work. If that was incentivized so that our faculty would actually maybe look at summer
and summer teaching not as this horrible last resort kind of activity but some ways to try
something that they’ve always wanted to do and haven’t been able to and could get some
summer salary for doing it on a smaller number of students. Wow, would that be
amazing” (FS7). Faculty could also experiment with their students on the impact of the
teaching and learning program. “When I started here, a faculty member in my department
said use summer to experiment. I did that trying out a new concept or a new book or
something like that so I used it more as of a laboratory to solve some of those objectives”
(FS1). Staff can encourage faculty to utilize the impact teaching and learning program to
improve the efficiency of their condensed summer class.

A final implication is risk management. Risk was mentioned several times during
the study as it relates to innovation and evaluating the business enterprise. To minimize
risk, summer session administrators can be more methodical and weigh a return on
investment on new programming before replacing or reducing efforts on existing
programs and before launching new ones. “What are we going to not do, or do less of, so
that we can do the new stuff? (FS8). Conducting a cost benefit ratio on new
programming, administrators can make hard decisions about the addition or removal of
programs. Higher education institutions tend to burden faculty and staff current workload
rather than hire additional resources. A new program cost benefit ratio will provide administrators the data to decide appropriate resources such as human capital. A data driven decision-making approach provides universities the credibility and rationale to adapting new programming.

Recommendations for Future Study

The results of this study provide a rich and think narrative of entrepreneurial activity occurring during a university summer session program. As the literature review suggested, limited research exists on educational entrepreneurship in summer session programs (Demetrulias, 2005; Langrell, 1990; Mars and Rios-Aguilar, 2010); thus the opportunity for a variety of research studies exist to bring awareness and understanding of this type of phenomena. Three recommendations for future research are provided within this section.

An initial recommendation to further understand summer phenomena occurring on university campuses involves research beyond the summer session administrator, supervisor and faculty and staff. The current study suggests numerous offices support faculty and students during the summer. Support offices include financial aid, housing, conferencing services, study aboard, student activities, and more. Amalgamating additional perspectives from other student support offices will add to a rich and thick narrative and produce a broader account of entrepreneurial activity during the summer.

A secondary recommendation is to understand more about the cultural barriers to attending summer sessions. From the study, students viewed summer as a break from their academic programs and an opportunity to move home and earn money for the next
academic year. A summer session supervisor and economist at Parker University conducted the cost benefit ratio of summer break for students and suggested it was in their best interest financially to stay at the university and complete additional courses towards their degree. A future study can explore qualitatively the perceived barriers to year round school and more in depth exploration of the cost benefit ratio. Faculty also viewed summer as an opportunity to conduct research outside of the classroom. Future research can explore academic research occurring during summer and conduct a cost benefit analysis of research versus credit hour production.

A final recommendation is to conduct a program evaluation on summer bridge programming serving students most at risk of graduating college. In this study, there are many assertions about what is best for students during the summer months. Assumptions included breadth of student services, course offerings, off campus study abroad and research opportunities, housing options, and breaking with academic studies and moving home and working full time. Studying the effectiveness of summer bridge programs will provide data supporting or refuting the above assumptions. A researcher may also study the diversity of at risk students typically invited to participate in summer bridge programming.

Concluding Overview

The purpose of this study was to investigate the occurrence of market and non-market like or socially oriented activity during a university summer session. Since summer sessions are typically administered differently than the traditional fall and spring semesters, particular attention focused on the summer session administrator and how that
role influences and interprets university entrepreneurial activity. Further, the researcher analyzed the benefits and barriers of supporting collegial summer entrepreneurial activity. Through a qualitative multi case research design, utilizing an academic entrepreneurship framework and a constructivist lens, the researcher’s analysis process consisted of triangulating the data collected from interviews, focus groups, documents and site observations to recognize emerging themes. Three overarching themes emerged that encompassed the majority of activity occurring during the summer months. Most of the activity is unique to summer yet could be adapted for Fall and Spring. Adapting summer session into the traditional calendar provides universities new teaching formats, new operating procedures and policy opportunities and transparency in data driven decision-making resulting in fiscal gain. The future of summer sessions maybe where students attend universities year round and summer is no longer viewed as the “third semester” operating outside of the traditional academic calendar.
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Appendix A

University Gatekeeper Permission for Employee Participation Letter

Dear <Name of Administrator>,

I would like to please request your permission to invite applicable faculty and staff at {enter University name} to participate in a research study, entitled: *Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship*. The study is a requirement of the dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis from the University of Missouri-Columbia.

For this research study, a sampling was selected of individuals who have served as Summer Session administrators for more than three (3) years at a public university and reside within the North Central region as defined by the North American Association of Summer Sessions. I am seeking your permission to contact the administrator and applicable university personnel, including: the administrator’s supervisor and staff, and a select group of faculty who teach during summer sessions to participate in the study. A copy of the interview protocol, consent letter and informed consent forms are attached for your review.

Participation in the study is completely voluntary. The participant may withdraw at any time without penalty, including in the middle of interviews or after it is completed. Participants’ answers will be confidential and remain anonymous in the reporting of results. The participant or corresponding institution will not be listed in my dissertation or any future publications of this study. Risk for this research study is minimal, all audio tapes and transcripts will remain confidential, anonymous, and separate from any identifying information.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns about granting permission either by phone at (816) 304-5955 or by electronic mail at laurelkhogue@gmail.com. In addition, you are also welcome to contact the dissertation advisor for this research study, Dr. Barbara Martin at (660) 543-8823 or by electronic mail at bmartin@ucmo.edu.

If you choose to allow me to contact faculty and staff at your institution regarding participation in this study, please complete the attached permission form. A copy of this letter and your written consent will be provided to you for your records.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Sincerely,

Laurel K. Hogue
Doctoral Candidate
Gatekeeper Consent Form

I, _____________________________________________, agree to allow employee participation in the study Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship. This study is being conducted by Laurel K. Hogue, doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

I understand the following:

- Employee participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point, including in the middle of interview or after it is completed.
- Employee responses will be used for dissertation research and for potential future journal publications.
- Employees will have been given the opportunity to ask questions prior to the research study and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
- Employee identity and affiliation will be kept confidential in all phases of the research.
- The interview will take approximately forty-five (45) to sixty (60) minutes to complete.
- Participants’ identity will be protected in all reports of the research. Employee names or the institution’s name will not be listed in the dissertation or any future publications of this study.

Please keep a copy of this consent letter for your records. I have read the statement above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signed: ________________________________ Date: ________________________

Title: _____________________________________________________________

College/University: _________________________________________________

Contact Information:

Email: ________________________________

Work Phone: __________________________

Please return to: Laurel K. Hogue, 1020 N.E. Serenity Lane, Lee’s Summit, Missouri 64064

Home Phone: 816-304-5955 • FAX: 660-543-8333 • Email: laurelkhogue@gmail.com
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Administrator Informed Consent Letter

Thank you for considering participation in a research study. This form requests your consent to participate in a research study, entitled, *Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship*. This study is a requirement of my dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

**Researcher:** Ms. Laurel K. Hogue, University of Missouri, Doctoral Candidate, please contact the researcher by email at laurelkhogue@gmail.com or by cell phone at 816-304-5955.

**Dissertation Supervisor:** Dr. Barbara Martin, University of Missouri – Columbia, please contact Dr. Martin by phone at 816-543-8823 or at bmartin@ucmo.edu.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to add to a body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship within public university summer session programs.

**Procedures:** If you provide your consent to participate in this study, the researcher will conduct a thirty (30) to forty-five (45) minute interview on your campus, in a designated room or office. The interviews will be audio-taped. The questions are constructed for the participant to provide open ended answers. There are no foreseeable factors within this study that will cause risk or discomfort to the participants. In addition to being recorded, all interviews will be transcribed verbatim for use by the researcher. As a participant, you have the opportunity to review the transcript to ensure accuracy.

**Participation:** You have the right to decline participation and to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns about your participation at the contact information listed above.

**Confidentiality:** All information from the interviews will be kept confidential and accessible only to the researcher and the doctoral supervisor. Transcripts will remain confidential, anonymous, and separate from any identifying information. Only the researcher and the dissertation supervisor will have access to identifiable data. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the University of Missouri-Columbia campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585.

**Consent:** To participate in this study, please sign the attached consent form indicating you understand and agree to participate in the study. A copy of this form will be provided to you for your records.

Sincerely,
Laurel K. Hogue, Doctoral Candidate
University of Missouri – Columbia
Administrator Informed Consent Form

I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the study *Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship*. This study is being conducted by Laurel K. Hogue, doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

I understand the following:

- My participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point, including in the middle of interview or after it is completed.
- My responses will be used for dissertation research and for potential future journal publications.
- I have been given the opportunity to ask questions prior to the research study and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
- My identity and affiliation will be kept confidential in all phases of the research.
- The interview will take approximately thirty (30) to forty-five (45) minutes to complete.
- Participants’ identity will be protected in all reports of the research. My name or my corresponding institution will not be listed in my dissertation or any future publications of this study.
- Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.

Please keep a copy of this consent letter for your records. I have read the statement above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signed: ______________________________ Date: ______________________

Title: _______________________________________________________________

College/University: ____________________________________________________

Contact Information: Email: ________________________________

Work Phone: ______________________________

Please return to: Laurel K. Hogue, 1020 N.E. Serenity Lane, Lee’s Summit, Missouri 64064
Home Phone: 816-304-5955 • FAX: 660-543-8333 • Email: laurelkhogue@gmail.com
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Focus Group Informed Consent Letter

Thank you for considering participation in a research study. This form requests your consent to participate in a research study, entitled, *Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship*. This study is a requirement of my dissertation research for a doctoral degree in Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

**Researcher:** Ms. Laurel K. Hogue, University of Missouri, Doctoral Candidate, please contact the researcher by email at laurelkhogue@gmail.com or by cell phone at 816-304-5955.

**Dissertation Supervisor:** Dr. Barbara Martin, University of Missouri – Columbia, please contact Dr. Martin by phone at 816-543-8823 or at bmartin@ucmo.edu.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to add to a body of knowledge on university summer sessions with an attempt to explore the dimensions of academic entrepreneurship within public university summer session programs.

**Procedures:** If you provide your consent to participate in this study, the researcher will conduct a forty-five (45) to sixty (60) minute interview on your campus, in a designated room or office. The interviews will be audio-taped. The questions are constructed for the participant to provide open ended answers. There are no foreseeable factors within this study that will cause risk or discomfort to the participants. In addition to being recorded, all interviews will be transcribed verbatim for use by the researcher. As a participant, you have the opportunity to review the transcript to ensure accuracy.

**Participation:** You have the right to decline participation and to withdraw from the study at any time without any negative consequences. Participation in the study is completely voluntary. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or concerns about your participation at the contact information listed above.

**Confidentiality:** All information from the interviews will be kept confidential and accessible only to the researcher and the doctoral supervisor. Transcripts will remain confidential, anonymous, and separate from any identifying information. Only the researcher and the dissertation supervisor will have access to identifiable data. If you have questions regarding your rights as a participant in research, please feel free to contact the University of Missouri-Columbia campus Institutional Review Board at 573-882-9585.

**Consent:** To participate in this study, please sign the attached consent form indicating you understand and agree to participate in the study. A copy of this form will be provided to you for your records.

Sincerely,
Laurel K. Hogue, Doctoral Candidate  
University of Missouri – Columbia

Focus Group Informed Consent Form

I, ________________________________, agree to participate in the study Innovation in Summer Sessions: A Qualitative, Multi-Case Study of Public Universities Summer Session Programs through the Use of Academic Entrepreneurship. This study is being conducted by Laurel K. Hogue, doctoral candidate at the University of Missouri-Columbia.

I understand the following:
• My participation is voluntary, and may be withdrawn at any point, including in the middle of interview or after it is completed.
• My responses will be used for dissertation research and for potential future journal publications.
• I have been given the opportunity to ask questions prior to the research study and those questions have been answered to my satisfaction.
• My identity and affiliation will be kept confidential in all phases of the research.
• The interview will take approximately forty-five (45) to sixty (60) minutes to complete.
• Participants’ identity will be protected in all reports of the research. My name or my corresponding institution will not be listed in my dissertation or any future publications of this study.
• Your consent or refusal to participate in this study will not affect your employment in any way.

Please keep a copy of this consent letter for your records. I have read the statement above, and I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Signed: _________________________________ Date: _______________________

Title: ____________________________________________

College/University: ____________________________________________

Contact Information: Email: ________________________________

Work Phone: ________________________________

__________________________________________

Please return to: Laurel K. Hogue, 1020 N.E. Serenity Lane, Lee’s Summit, Missouri 64064
Home Phone: 816-304-5955 • FAX: 660-543-8333 • Email: laurelkhogue@gmail.com
Appendix D

Program Administrator Interview Protocol

Date: 
Start Time: 

Introduction:
Good afternoon. Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions focusing on your experiences with the university summer session program. The purpose of today’s discussion is to get information from you about entrepreneurial aspects of a summer session program. My name is Laurel Hogue, and I will be conducting the interview. In order to ensure accuracy, I will be audio taping the interview.

Remember, there is no right or wrong answers. If you want to follow-up on a question or give an example, feel free to do so. I want this to be more of a conversation between professionals. Our session will last about 45-60 minutes and we will not be taking a formal break. Please let me know if you need to leave the table for any reason. Let’s begin by finding out more about each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me your name and the role your position serves on campus.</td>
<td>Learn about the Participant Q1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is your experience with a university summer session program? Probe: Do you have any previous experience with other universities and/or summer session programs? Explain Please describe your role as it relates to summer session? Briefly describe your university summer session program including reporting structure. What do you feel are the most important aspects of a university summer session program?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Are you or your unit directly involved in program creation? Probe: If so, how do you decide what to develop? Explain. Do these program(s) earn revenue? How do you support any programs that don’t produce revenue? How do you support program development outside of your unit? How do you work with faculty to deliver programming not typically offered in the fall and spring semester? Is any of the programming non-revenue producing? Is there any programming offered during summer sessions that you would like to see adopted for fall and spring? Have you been involved any modifications to the universities summer session program? If so, what and why?</td>
<td>Q1 and Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. What would you say are the benefits of supporting entrepreneurship through a university summer session program?  
**Probe:** What would you say are the benefits of supporting new programming?  
How has technology helped in the development of programming?  
What is your favorite aspect of summer session?  
Do you recognize any outstanding programming or contributions to summer session? If so, how.

5. What would you say are the barriers to supporting program development through a university summer session program?  
**Probe:** Did you have a program that didn’t get developed because of university bureaucracy such as policy?  
Explain.  
Any technology barriers to program development?  
Any technology barriers to operating summer sessions as a whole?  
What is your least favorite aspect of summer session?

6. Is there anything else you would like to share with me that I have not asked?

---

Thank you for your time and participation.
Appendix E

Focus Group Interview Protocol Form: Faculty

Date: 

Start Time: 

Introduction:
Welcome. Thank you for taking the time to discuss your experience with university summer session programming. My name is Laurel Hogue, and I will serve as the moderator for today’s focus group. The purpose of today’s discussion is to get information from you about the market and non-market like or socially-oriented activity occurring during the summer sessions. Please remember, there are no right or wrong answers but rather differing points of view. Feel free to share your point of view even if it differs from what others have said. If you want to follow-up on something that someone has said, you want to agree, disagree or give an example, feel free to do that. I want this to be more of a conversation among yourselves, so don’t feel like you have to respond to me all of the time. I am here to ask questions, listen and make sure everyone has a chance to share. I am interested in hearing from each of you. Please speak up and remember only one person should talk at a time. Our session will last about 60 minutes, and we will not be taking a formal break. Feel free to leave the table for any reason if you need to. While the nature of a focus group makes it impossible to provide complete anonymity, your confidentiality will be maintained by the evaluator during future reporting. No names will be included in any reports. Let’s begin by going around the room and finding out more about each other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Tell me your name and what role you serve at the university?</strong>&lt;br&gt;What is your experience with summer sessions (i.e. teaching, administration)? How would you describe the university summer sessions program as a whole?</td>
<td>Learn about participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. How are you involved in the creation or delivery of session programming?</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Probe:</strong> How do you decide what to develop? Do these program(s) earn revenue? Explain. Do you develop any programs that don’t produce revenue? If so, explain. Do you collaborate with other faculty to deliver programming not typically offered in the fall and spring semester? If so, explain. Is any of the collaborative programming non-revenue producing? Is there any programming offered during summer sessions that you would like to see adopted for fall and spring? Have you been involved any modifications to the universities summer session program? If so, what and why?</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do you feel are the most important aspects of a university summer session program?

### 3. What would you say are the benefits of supporting new programming?
**Probe:** How has technology helped in the development of programming?
What is your favorite aspect of summer session?
Are you recognized for any outstanding programming or contributions to summer session? If so, how.

### 4. What would you say are the barriers to supporting program development through a university summer session program?
**Probe:** Did you have a program that didn’t get developed because of university bureaucracy such as policy?
Explain.
Are there any technology barriers to program development?
Are there any technology barriers to operating summer sessions as a whole?
What is your least favorite aspect of summer session?

### 5. Is there anything you would like to add to the discussion you feel is important that I did not ask about?

Thank you for your time and participation.
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Document Review Form

Name of Document ____________________________________________________

Document # __________________________________________________________

Date Procured _________________________________________________________

Document Received from ______________________________________________

Notes:
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On-site Observation Form

Location of Observation

Date of Observation

Notes:
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Coding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Summer Session Administrator</td>
<td>(A1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Summer Session Administrator</td>
<td>(A2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Summer Session Administrator</td>
<td>(A3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Summer Session Supervisor</td>
<td>(S1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Summer Session Supervisor</td>
<td>(S2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Summer Session Supervisor</td>
<td>(S3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Faculty or Staff</td>
<td>(FS15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>(D1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>(D2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>(D3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Document</td>
<td>(D4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>(O1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>(O2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>(O3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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