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This is a qualitative study of the origin and history of the Association for
University Regional Campuses of Ohio. The purpose of the study was to provide a record
of AURCO’s founding and development. The study offers a description of the historical
circumstances that led to its creation; a historical account of its inception in 1993, and an
examination of the role that the organization has come to play among regional campus
faculty. This was done through a qualitative study involving interviews and
correspondence with founding members and other selected persons on Ohio’s regional
campuses, as well as a review of existing documents of the association. The interviews
were transcribed and analyzed for themes.

Interviews with three founders of AURCO revealed four themes that described
the founders’ perceptions of the purposes and roles that AURCO has played among
faculty of Ohio’s regional campuses: promotion of scholarship among regional campus
faculty; creating avenues for professional advancement; providing a venue for faculty
interaction and collegiality; and promotion of Ohio’s regional campuses. Three additional
interview participants agreed that AURCO had played a role in promoting scholarship,
facilitating professional advancement, and fostering collegiality. However they either
downplayed or disagreed that AURCO had played a significant role in promoting the interests of regional campuses.

The four themes were used as a guideline to analyze AURCO’s records to determine evidence of its effectiveness in achieving the goals as perceived by the organization’s founders. Although the records indicated some examples of promoting regional campuses, much information was revealed that supported instances of AURCO promoting scholarship, providing opportunities for professional advancement, and venues for collegial interaction. It appears that, at least on some campuses, AURCO has had sufficient penetration to support the claims by its supporters that it has contributed to the professionalization of faculty. Additional research is necessary to determine the extent of AURCO’s possible impact. However when the institutional affiliation of participants was examined, it became clear that AURCO’s penetration among Ohio’s 23 regional campuses has been uneven. Participation in AURCO has been intense on some campuses, spotty at others, and non-existent at the rest.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Background of the Study

In the 1960s, the state of Ohio began a policy of locating two-year campuses within commuting distance of every Ohioan (Ohio Board of Regents, 2005). In many areas of the state, this policy resulted in the creation of community or technical colleges, but for some areas this policy was carried out through the creation of regional branches of existing state universities. Today, Ohio’s 23 regional campuses are affiliated with eight institutions of higher education, and enroll nearly 40,000 students (Wolfe & Strange, 2003). Ohio’s neighboring states have similar levels of regional campus enrollment. Pennsylvania’s 25 regional campuses enrolled more than 40,000 students while Indiana’s eight regional campuses serve nearly 50,000 students (Wolfe & Strange, 2003).

The changing demographics of student populations would indicate that regional campuses will continue to attract students for the foreseeable future. Student populations have been increased by those who are older, tied to jobs and family, and less able to leave their home for a college education (Ohio Board of Regents, 2005). Many of Ohio’s regional campuses have seen considerable growth in recent years. In just five years, the student population at Ohio University Zanesville has gone from 800 to 1,400 (Fonseca & Bird, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

The fact that Ohio’s regional campuses are affiliated with eight different main campuses has led to perceptions that opportunities are limited for regional campus faculty, staff, or administrators to interact with their colleagues from other institutions.
Thus, two statewide organizations have been created that focus on interaction among regional campus personnel: an administrative group--the Regional Director’s Council, (also known as the Ohio Association of Regional Campuses) and a faculty group--Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio.

Through the auspices of the Ohio Board of Regents, regional campus administrators meet periodically for what is commonly called the Ohio Association of Regional Campuses. This gives them an opportunity to share issues and concerns that may be common to multiple campuses. In similar fashion, regional campus faculty members have formed the Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio (AURCO), as a professional development organization. AURCO coordinates an annual conference of regional campus faculty, and sponsors the *AURCO Journal*, an annual publication with article submission opportunities open to regional campus faculty.

Scholars of regional campus concerns have generally conceded that little research has focused on the two year branch campuses of higher education institutions (Hermanson, 1995; Fonseca & Bird, 2007). Muldoon (1992) stated that the origin and development of branch campuses of four-year universities are understudied areas. Wolfe (1995) found it puzzling that faculty of two-year institutions have been overlooked as a source of study despite their status as an integral part of higher education. Motter (1999) agreed that the number of regional campuses had dramatically increased within the last twenty years, yet research in higher education has not explored the complex relationships that exist between these geographically separate sites. Nickerson and Schaefer (2001) said, “The absence of a coherent body of literature dealing with branch campuses is an
inexplicable gap in modern higher education” (p. 56). In an online forum about regional campuses, Bird (2007) found little descriptive information that could be used to compare one institution's branches to another. This lack of research about regional campuses led him to use the auspices of NABCA (National Association of Branch Campus Administrators) to issue a call for more research about regional campuses (Bird, 2007).

Wolfe (1995), Motter (1999), and Hieber (2002) are among the few researchers who have examined the perceptions of faculty at Ohio’s regional campuses, while Cavanaugh (2007) used a quantitative analysis to depict differences between regional campuses and main campuses. Wolfe examined faculty role perceptions and culture at one of Ohio’s regional campuses as a case study that shed light on the seriousness with which regional campus faculty accept their role within higher education. Motter examined the faculty of a regional campus of The Ohio State University, and concluded that there were limited opportunities for faculty on regional campuses to interact with their main campus colleagues or with faculty from other regional campuses of the same institution. Hieber used the concept of hegemony as a way to describe the relationship between regional campuses and their main campuses. Cavanaugh determined that regional campuses had a higher percentage of female faculty, lower tuition costs, and lower faculty salaries.

AURCO may be an important means of communication among regional campus faculty, but no documents have been published about its creation and growth. Its history is relatively unknown outside of faculty members who have been affiliated with it. Exploring the history of AURCO might lead to information about the problems and
concerns of regional campus faculty in Ohio and elsewhere and about the effectiveness of this means of association for faculty on Ohio’s regional campuses and in other states to communicate their concerns.

**Purpose of the Study**

In order to provide a record of AURCO’s founding and development, this research has: a) described the historical circumstances that led to the creation of the Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio, b) provided information about the history of AURCO from its inception in 1993 to present, and c) explored the role that AURCO has come to play among regional campus faculty. This was done through a qualitative study involving interviews and correspondence with founding members and other selected persons on Ohio’s regional campuses, as well as an examination of existing documents of the association.

**Significance of the Study**

By providing information about a statewide organization created for faculty of all regional campuses, this study might add to the ability of those at regional campuses to better understand how AURCO became the organization that it is today. Also this study might shed light on the concerns and interests of Ohio’s regional campus faculty and how they have used AURCO to communicate those concerns and interests. It is hoped that this study has advanced general knowledge about regional campus faculty concerns and will be useful to faculty and administrators in other states that have regional campuses.

Such a study was particularly timely fifteen years after AURCO’s creation in 1993. Only two of the original founders are still active in higher education, and only two
additional people from its first seven years are still involved in AURCO and in higher education in Ohio (Kich, personal communication, April 14, 2007). Within the next five years it is likely that AURCO will undergo a complete generational transformation as members retire, thus making a permanent record of AURCO’s history even more necessary. A commonly quoted east African proverb reminds us that whenever a person dies, it is as if a library is lost (Swann, 2007; Wilson, 2003). The researcher hopes that this fate will not come to pass as the founders of AURCO leave active service in higher education. Conducting this research is one way to preserve some of this historical information.

AURCO appears to be unique as an organization whose membership consists of faculty members of regional campuses. The Ohio Association of Regional Campuses serves exclusively administrators of Ohio’s regional campuses. Four other associations of regional campuses have been formed to address administrative interests on a national level. The Regional Campus Libraries Discussion Group operates as an interest group of the American Library Association (ALA Meeting Notes, 2006). In 1987, administrators at a number of two-year branch campuses asked the American Association of Community Colleges to form the Council of Two-Year Colleges of Four-Year Institutions. In 1988, that organization met for the first time (Hermanson, 1995). Regional campus administrators began meeting on an annual basis more than thirty years ago through the auspices of the Regional Branch Campus Administrators Conference (RBCA conference, 2007). In addition, regional campus administrators have met on a regular basis as part of the Western Association of Branch Campus Administrators which was formed in 2001.
WABCA has since been renamed the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators to reflect its increased geographical scope (Welcome to NABCA, 2007).

In 2006, administrators at seven institutions in Florida formed a statewide association called FABCA, the Florida Association of Branch Campus administrators (About FABCA, 2007). Member institutions include: Florida Atlantic University, Seminole Community College, Edison College, Broward Community College, Central Florida State University, University of West Florida, and University of Central Florida. Despite the small number of such state or national associations focusing on regional campuses, the changing nature of higher education organization and funding makes their development likely, and thus, their history more important.

**Research Questions**

This study was guided by a major research question: What has been the history of the Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio from its inception in 1993 to present? Secondary research questions involve the determination of the factors that: stimulated the creation of AURCO in 1993; have sustained and challenged it since its inception; and have been influenced, if at all, by AURCO.

**Limitations and Delimitations**

This particular descriptive study is based on the historical recollections of a relatively small and select group of interviewees. They will have biases and may have erroneous recall. The researcher’s bias is also a potential limitation. This study examines one association in one state with no peers for comparative reference.
Definition of Terms

Regional campuses

A regional campus is a satellite campus of a university that offers a number of courses and programs of that university to a different geographical market. For purposes of this study the regional campuses include the institutions that are members of AURCO. These are Bowling Green State University Firelands, Kent State University Ashtabula, Kent State University East Liverpool, Kent State University Geauga, Kent State University Salem, Kent State University Stark, Kent State University Trumbull, Kent State University Tuscarawas, Miami University Hamilton, Miami University Middletown, The Ohio State University Lima, The Ohio State University Mansfield, The Ohio State University Marion, The Ohio State University Newark, Ohio University Chillicothe, Ohio University Eastern, Ohio University Lancaster, Ohio University Southern, Ohio University Zanesville, University of Akron Wayne College, University of Cincinnati Clermont College, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College, and Wright State University Lake.

Most of the campuses employ a naming system that uses the name of the four year institution followed by the name of the city or county in which the regional campus is located. But University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College, University of Cincinnati Clermont College, and University of Akron Wayne College use the designation “college” as part of their branding. The regional campuses do not utilize a hyphen. Avoiding or eliminating a hyphen has often represented a significant decision in establishing the identity of a campus (Hieber, 2002).
Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio

According to its published materials it is “devoted to the professional development of faculty throughout Ohio’s twenty-three regional campuses” (AURCO, 2005, inside front cover). AURCO was originally referred to as the Organization of University Regional Campuses of Ohio (OURCO) but the name was changed in 1995 when it was discovered that the OURCO acronym was already in use (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). Faculty from the 23 member campuses are encouraged to submit proposals for presentations at an annual conference held each year since 1995. Faculty have the opportunity to publish in the AURCO Journal, an annual publication. Until 1999, the AURCO Journal appeared in newsletter format and contained presentations from the previous year’s AURCO Conference that presenters wished to have published. Beginning with the 1999 AURCO Conference and the corresponding 2000 AURCO Journal, the editor and associate editors established a peer review process.

Outline of the Dissertation

Chapter Two consists of a review of the literature about regional campuses in the United States and regional campuses in Ohio. Chapter Three explains the methodology used in this study. The origin and history of AURCO will be detailed in Chapter Four. Chapter Five relates the details of seven interviews conducted with five faculty members active in AURCO and one administrator who assisted in the development of AURCO. Chapter Six explores four themes that emerged during the interview process. Chapter Seven examines documents and records in order to assess AURCO’s activities. Chapter Eight analyzes the role that AURCO has played among regional campus faculty.
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Despite the significance of regional campuses in Ohio, only a handful of studies focus on regional campus issues in Ohio. And, as has been noted, there have been no descriptive studies of the Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio. There is a lack of published information of any type about the history of AURCO including within the AURCO Journal. Nationally, some researchers have conducted surveys of regional campus practices such as distance learning and library usage, e.g. Bailey, (2002); Hermanson, (1995); and Hixson, (1975). Other researchers have compared some variable such as student performance or attitudes at a regional campus versus a main campus (Manges, 1966), while others have dealt with the history of a regional campus or a regional campus system (Inman, 1960; Rose, 1968; Singleton, 1971).

Regional Campuses in the United States

Lee and Bowen (1971) were the first to reach beyond a flagship institution and analyze multicampus university systems. Their focus was on the governance and administration of four-year institutions that fell under a unified statewide organizational structure (Lee & Bowen, 1971). They did not examine regional or branch campuses, and did not consider Ohio as having a multicampus system due to the autonomy of its state universities. They focused on the nine of the eleven systems that they viewed as multicampus universities: Universities of California, Illinois, Missouri, North Carolina, Texas, Wisconsin, the State Universities of New York, the City Universities of New
York, and the California State Colleges (Lee & Bowen, 1971). Those systems met four criteria the authors established to define a multicampus university:

1. Responsibility for only a portion of higher education in the state, in this case four year institutions.
2. Responsibility for more than one four-year campus.
3. System executives with the title of president or chancellor.
4. System executives who were not also chief administrators of one of the campuses (Lee & Bowen, 1971, pp. 5-6).

Romesburg (1972) surveyed chief administrative officials at 149 branch campuses, and created a typology that included such characteristics as course offerings, degrees available, enrollment, distance from the main campus, comparative tuition costs, faculty workload, and decision-making patterns. This research resulted in several conclusions relevant to the regional campus environment of 35 years ago:

1. Branch campuses were generally small in enrollment and generally operated on a two year level. They accounted for slightly more than two percent of all students enrolled in higher education institutions in the fall of 1971.
2. Tuition fees were generally lower at branch campuses than at the parent institutions.
3. Students at branch campuses often had to forego many of the conventional aspects of campus student life.
4. Approximately 68 percent of branch campus chief administrators held the doctoral degree.
5. Branch campuses operated as subsidiaries of their parent institution and did not enjoy a high degree of autonomy.

6. Branch campuses employed a smaller number of faculty members, with nearly as many part-timers as full-timers.

7. Branch campus faculty members had a relatively light teaching load in view of the fact that they were not expected to conduct personal research (Romesburg, 1972).

Creswell, Roskens, and Henry (1985) expanded on Lee and Bowen’s work of 1971 and 1975 to develop a typology of multicampus systems. They developed four generic types of multicampus systems: private, statewide, heterogeneous public, and homogenous public. None of these types of systems is descriptive of the branch campus system found in Ohio.

In one of the few studies to focus on the particular concerns of regional campuses of a single university multicampus institution, Hill (1985) examined the problems inherent in regional campus operations. She surveyed 125 branch and main campus administrators to test a hypothesis that the source of problems at branch campuses could be associated with certain organizational characteristics such as university size, position level of the branch campus administrator, and the degree of branch campus dependency. She noted that the main and branch campus administrators did not differ significantly in their perception about the frequency of the problems and the origin of the problems. Hill concluded that problems perceived by administrators were a function of a number of variables including organizational patterns, locus of authority, and decision-making
patterns. The most important factors related to organizational patterns were the campus status within the organizational hierarchy, university size, and the degree of campus dependency (Hill, 1985). In 2002, Stahley duplicated Hill’s study and added a consideration of technological advancements that had occurred in the seventeen years since. Stahley concluded that the degree of independent decision-making was the variable most likely to create perceptions of problems between branch campuses and their parent campuses. Typically regional campus respondents wanted more control over academic decisions (Stahley, 2002).

Hermanson (1995) contacted the state higher education governing agencies listed in the *Higher Education Directory* and the *College Handbook* in order to compile a list of 111 two-year campuses of four-year institutions. He then surveyed regional campus administrators and main campus administrators to examine their perceptions of the quantity and quality of their communication and interaction (Hermanson, 1995). He concluded that regional campus administrators were generally satisfied with the amount of attention paid to regional campus issues.

Nickerson and Schaefer (2001) conducted a national study of branch campus administrators in an effort to learn more about the characteristics and perceptions of branch campuses. The survey attempted to “(1) identify key branch campus characteristics, (2) validate a typology of branch campuses, and (3) ascertain the views of branch campus administrators on a wide range of subjects” (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001, p. 49.). They also developed a list of characteristics that distinguish branch campuses from main campuses:
1. one or more levels removed from the institution’s governing board
2. physical separate from the main campus
3. a limited mission vis-à-vis the main campus
4. dependence on the main campus for some or all credentialing and/or certification of students
5. dependence on the main campus for some or all accreditation
6. governance by some combination of main campus values, curriculum, and budgetary control, and faculty review/tenure factors (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001, p. 50).

As a result of the survey, Nickerson and Schaefer determined that the branch campus faculty members are more likely to be part-time, untenured, younger, more junior, and more female than their main campus colleagues. The study also indicated that branch campus faculty felt that teaching was undervalued and research overvalued. Most campus administrators reported that tenure was institution-wide, which made branch campus faculty feel more vulnerable due to their lack of interaction with main campus colleagues (Nickerson & Schaefer, 2001).

**Regional Campuses in Ohio**

In 1967, Corfias conducted a study that compared regional campuses in Ohio to community colleges and technical colleges. His research supported a premise that the three types of institutions had comparable patterns of programs, services, and resources, and this seemed to be appropriate based on their commonalities. He identified the first half of the 1960s decade as the period of greatest growth of new two year institutions and
increased enrollment. During the period from 1959 to 1964, the numbers of two year institutions in the U.S. increased by 113 to a total of 771, and enrollment more than doubled, reaching nearly 1.3 million by 1965 (Corfias, 1967). Corfias noted a diversity of opinion about what type of two year program best met the needs of students and community. This was illustrated in Ohio, where the growth of two year institutions resulted in community colleges, technical institutes, and regional branch campuses of four-year state universities.

Corfias visited sixteen institutions during the spring of 1966. He determined that the growth of all three types of institutions was due to the same factors: students, faculty, curricula, financing, and facilities. In addition, Corfias identified three waves of increased interest in establishing two year campuses: the swelling of student ranks after the Second World War due to large numbers of returning veterans; the need to overcome the shortage of elementary teachers in the 1950s; and the growing proportion of college educated people in the population of the 1960s (Corfias, 1967).

Hazard (1973) studied public expectations of one of Ohio’s regional campuses, Kent State University Tuscarawas, with the hope the results would be useful to the administrators of any of Ohio’s other regional campuses that wanted to assess their service to their respective communities. His study was designed:

1. To determine the extent of public support for the expansion of certain purposes and programs that might be ascribed to the campus.
2. To determine unmet needs for community services and programs.
3. To determine the extent to which the public has confidence in the performance
of the campus.

4. To determine a measure of public understanding and agreement with the alternate patterns and policies proposed for branch campuses in Ohio (Hazard, 1973, p.53).

Hazard trained 59 interviewers who conducted 920 interviews at randomly selected households within Tuscarawas County. The county auditor’s office was used to identify the households. Hazard found that area residents: had a high degree of awareness of the campus, were generally satisfied with the performance of the campus, and preferred the campus’s affiliation with the main campus over operating as an autonomous institution (Hazard, 1973).

Many years later, three qualitative studies shed light on the dynamics of faculty at three of Ohio’s regional campuses. Wolfe (1995), of Wright State Lake, explored faculty perceptions at a regional campus of a university in Ohio, utilizing the pseudonym “Park Campus.” He focused on four themes: institutional culture, campus size, faculty role perception, and the relative success of the branch campus faculty (Wolfe, 1995). Motter (1999) explored the relationships between the main campus department and faculty in several academic departments of one of the regional campuses of The Ohio State University. Hieber (2002), of Miami University Middletown, used the concept of hegemony to explain the exclusionary tendencies inherent in relationships between main campuses and regional campuses.

Wolfe (1995) constructed a case study of faculty life and culture at what might be Wright State Lake in Celina, Ohio, a two-year regional campus of Wright State
University in Dayton. Through a comprehensive questionnaire, followed by personal interviews with seven faculty members, along with document analysis and observations, Wolfe explored research questions such as “What does it mean to be a faculty member at a branch campus?; What are some of the accomplishments faculty experience at such an institution?; What are some of the advantages and frustrations they report in this role?; What values influence faculty members in this setting?” (Wolfe, 1995, p. 9). He concluded that four factors affected the dynamics of faculty at this regional campus: an isolated rural location, the campus’ small size, an emphasis on teaching, and a high level of importance placed on faculty roles.

According to Wolfe, the rural location and isolation of the campus resulted in a male-dominated faculty and a conventional student body with little ethnic or racial diversity. The small size of the campus resulted in one-person departments, increased roles for each faculty member, the tendency to become generalists, and a state of professional isolation. The job complexity of one-person departments was both fulfilling and stressful to the faculty (Wolfe, 1995). The professional isolation caused by one-person departments caused faculty members to regret their inability to interact with members of their discipline. This created an enhanced interest in participating in professional associations as a way of seeking camaraderie. The emphasis on teaching in a two-year campus created a teaching perspective in which faculty prized their good relationships with students. The faculty interviewed by Wolfe placed teaching as their top priority, followed by service and research in that order (Wolfe, 1995). All of these factors combined to produce a faculty that saw their roles as vital to the success of higher
education. Wolfe noted role differentiations based on whether faculty members were in a technical field or a humanities discipline. Those in technical fields had to add student recruitment to their list of multiple roles.

In 1999, Wolfe’s case study became more widely disseminated as he teamed with his dissertation advisor to publish a journal article recapping his 1995 findings (Wolfe & Strange, 1999). He also used this study as the basis for a presentation at the 1999 AURCO conference (Wolfe, 2000). Wolfe and Strange continued to use pseudonyms for the regional campus and its parent campus in their examination that focused on faculty morale and perceptions of campus life. They emphasized that regional campus faculty felt the small campus size contributed to their role complexity by making them generalists who performed duties not normally associated with faculty functions. With few or even no other faculty in their disciplines, they felt a sense of isolation and little collegiality. They also felt that their ultimate success varied by discipline, “with those in the technical fields being at a distinct disadvantage due to the equipment-intensive nature of their scholarship” (Wolfe & Strange, 2003, p. 356). This particular study also pointed out the contradictory nature of the mission of regional campuses to “serve both a community-based constituency and to comply with the standards of a comprehensive, doctoral-granting university” (Wolfe & Strange, 2003, p. 361). Wolfe stated that the more that is learned about faculty of two-year campuses in Ohio, the greater will be our understanding of how branch campuses function.

Motter (1999) used primarily ethnographic techniques such as semi-structured interviews, observation, and collection of materials to learn more about the relationships
between regional campus faculty and their home departments. She interviewed eleven
different faculty including department heads (Motter, 1999). Motter concluded that the
pattern of relationships varied widely by department. Some departments made
considerable effort to reduce any disadvantages of being located at a different
geographical location, while others did not even think of the regional campus faculty
members as fully a part of that department.

Motter hypothesized that the difference in mission statements was a major factor
complicating the relationship between regional campus faculty and their academic
departments. The mission of the regional campus focused on teaching while the
Columbus campus emphasized research (Motter, 1999). As a result, regional campus
faculty tended to have higher teaching loads and a more challenging task of juggling
teaching schedules with research and service responsibilities. This had its impact on the
promotion and tenure process. Two other factors impacted the promotion and tenure
process: the existence of an additional administrative level on the regional campus, and
the geographic isolation of the regional campus faculty. Motter perceived that regional
campus faculty members are not seen in their departments on a daily basis, and this
limited their ability to connect with the colleagues who will be reviewing them during the
promotion and tenure process.

Motter noted that different departments dealt with these issues in different ways.
One department made considerable effort to include regional campus faculty in its
activities, included regional campus faculty in its publications and website, and even took
the step of sending Columbus faculty to teach at least one quarter at a regional campus so
they would better understand the regional campus system (Motter, 1999). In contrast, another department displayed photos in its office of all Columbus faculty and graduate assistants but failed to include the regional campus faculty.

Motter found different degrees of satisfaction and motivation among regional campus faculty members. Much of the variance was due to the number of faculty members of a department assigned to the regional campus, and the variety of courses offered at the regional campus. Motter identified six motivating factors that had an effect on regional campus faculty: “opportunities to participate in decision making, opportunities to interact with graduate students, opportunities to teach upper-level courses, being recognized as a member of their department, having opportunities to interact with peers, and being recognized by their departments for their scholarly accomplishments” (Motter, 1999, p. 123).

Hieber (2002) explored regional and central campus relationships in an article based on his presentation at the 2001 AURCO Conference. He used the concept of hegemony to add to the understanding of the exclusion inherent in such an unequal status among campuses. Hieber used Miami University Middletown and the main campus in Oxford to illustrate his observation that the “unique positioning of regional campuses between belonging and not belonging complicates matters and has both positive and negative implications” (Hieber, 2002, p. 70). He pointed out that even the terminology used can imply differences in status. He identified the term “regional campus” as a more accepted descriptor than “branch campuses” particularly from the perspective of the regional campus, and chose to replace “main” campus with “central campus” despite its
lack of general usage (Hieber, 2002). According to Hieber, even elements as seemingly minor as punctuation can have an effect on perceptions of exclusion or inclusion. The campus used as the example in his case study was commonly referred to as “Miami University-Middletown.” But even the use of a hyphen could make the campus appear to be “an addendum, an afterthought” (Hieber, 2007, p. 79). “Miami University Middletown” became the preferred usage.

Cavanaugh (2007) used information from the National Center for Education Statistics to study differences between main campuses and what he termed branch campuses in Ohio. He determined that branch campuses had a more diverse student population with respect to gender, lower tuition costs, and lower faculty salaries. He stated that differences in tuition could not be explained by fewer faculty members or faculty-student ratios. The salary difference could not be explained by tuition differences or student demographic variables. Cavanaugh concluded that “almost the entire difference in tuition, and a significant amount of the difference in faculty total compensation, results from the campus being a branch campus (or having a different location)”. He added that compensation differences had been large since 1998 and predicted that the disparity would continue to grow (Cavanaugh, 2007, p. 19).

Cavanaugh’s finding were in line with those of an earlier study by Aubrecht (1995) that examined faculty salaries on the regional campuses of the Ohio state University compared to those of the main campus in Columbus. Aubrecht used a calculation that utilized a “salary statistic based on the mean salary in a department according to faculty rank. That number, when divided by the standard deviation of the
salaries of that rank within a department measured how far from the mean in standard
deviation a faculty salary was. He determined that significant salary differences existed
among regional campus faculty members who belong to different colleges. According to
Aubrecht, “there is no evidence for salary discrimination by sex. Little evidence exists for
the effect of starting salary on the differences” (Aubrecht, 1995, p. 28).

**Summary**

Literature about regional campuses in the U.S. of any type is limited. Much of the
existing literature deals with full-service universities that happen to be a part of a
statewide system of governance. These are the so-called multicampus universities.
Literature about Ohio’s regional campuses is also limited to a handful of studies, and few
have been conducted in the past twenty years.

A descriptive study chronicling the history of the Association for University
Regional Campuses of Ohio is significant because of the large number of Ohio regional
campuses and the lack of research about them. Such a study will add to the knowledge of
regional campus faculty and the important role they are likely to continue to play in
delivering education to Ohio’s citizens.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to describe the factors that led to the formation of AURCO in 1993 and to provide a historical analysis of its existence since then. This study also examined how faculty members utilized opportunities to present at AURCO conferences and publish in the AURCO Journal. This was done through a qualitative study involving correspondence and a series of interviews with some of the founders of AURCO and others who have played a role in its subsequent growth and development or who could provide expert commentary related to its existence. Much useful information was gained through the researcher’s activities as a participant-observer. In addition, careful attention was paid to the historical records related to the founding and subsequent activities of AURCO.

Rationale for Qualitative Design

This was a qualitative case study of the history of a particular organization. Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006) defined qualitative research as the “collection, analysis, and interpretation of comprehensive narrative and visual data in order to gain insights into a particular phenomenon of interest” (p.399). The broad purpose of this study, as qualitative research, was to capture the story of the founding of AURCO, while participants in that event are still available, in order to gain an increased understanding about its activities and significance in regional campus education in Ohio.

It is not uncommon for qualitative researchers to use some of the same data as historians (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Qualitative research in general and historical
analysis specifically, provides a means of learning more about an organization when there is a lack of previous research. From a social science perspective, “history is an account of some past event or series of events” and historical research is “a method for discovering from records and accounts, what happened during some past period” (Berg, 2007, p. 264). Bogdan and Biklen (2007) used the term “historical organizational case study” to refer to the study of an organization over time by tracing its development (p. 60). This type of analysis focuses on how the organization came into being, why the organization came into being, what changes occurred over time, and what it is like now. The focus on the question of “how and why” enables the researcher to form suppositions about the case study for future researchers to follow (Yin, 2003, p.5).

**Data Collection**

The primary source of information for this history was a series of interviews with founders, others who have been involved with the organization, and others who provided additional perspective about the association and regional campus issues since AURCO’s founding in 1993. Two founders of AURCO were still active in the organization and they were contacted for interviews and additional electronic correspondence. One other retired founder was located and was interviewed. Two other faculty members were interviewed who were active in the first few years of AURCO. In addition, an interview was conducted with an administrator who has supported AURCO since becoming a regional campus dean in 1994. These six individuals formed the core of participants in this study.

The two active founders were identified through the researcher’s participation in an AURCO conference in 2006. The other four participants were identified through a
snowballing technique in which all interviewees were asked to name others who played a critical role in AURCO’s formation and development. Snowballing, also known as chain sampling, added to the information richness of research by continually asking interviewees for the names of others who played a role (Patton, 2002). A concerted effort was made to identify any interview subjects, including non-faculty, who had knowledge of the history of AURCO.

The interviews were conducted in three stages that conformed closely to a process of discovery, confirmation, and expansion of the meaning of AURCO. “Discovery” was conducted through interviews with three faculty members present for AURCO’s organizational meeting in 1993, two of whom are still active participants. These interviews provided considerable background information about the circumstances that led to the creation of AURCO, the participants in the formation of AURCO, and the role that the founders of AURCO felt the organization could play in the lives of regional campus faculty members. “Confirmation,” also known as member checking, was accomplished by arranging a second interview with the two active faculty members together. Besides seeking clarification of dates and names, four themes that emerged in the first round of interviews were presented for their commentary and confirmation. “Expansion” occurred as interviews were conducted with two faculty members who became active in AURCO after its formation, and one regional campus dean who remains supportive of AURCO. All three were named by the initial three interviewees as key contributors to the growth of AURCO. Information from the regional campus dean provided a different perspective as he indicated ways in which he felt AURCO had
benefited regional campus faculty under his direction. This interview also provided information about the regularly scheduled meetings of the deans of each of the 23 campuses. This information was useful in detecting parallels between the interactions of regional campus faculty and regional campus deans.

Documents related to the founding and existence of AURCO provided a significant amount of useful data. Much of AURCO’s activity is centered on an annual conference that features a call for papers from regional campus faculty. AURCO subsequently publishes some of these presented papers in an annual journal. This study included an examination of all issues of the *AURCO Journal* from its initial issue in 1994 as a newsletter through the 2007 edition. Beginning in 2000 the *AURCO Journal* became a reviewed publication. In addition to the *AURCO Journal*, other published materials available for analysis included newsletters, meeting agendas and minutes, and printed programs from annual conferences.

Data from the National Center for Educational Statistics provided additional data to corroborate and embellish the material from the interviews. A basic overview of each campus of the 23 regional campuses in Ohio was developed from the IPEDS COOL Institutional Details (NCES, 2005). The IPEDS data included basic information such as mission statement, website address, and degrees offered. This was used to identify and give perspective to the campuses that have faculty who are members of AURCO.

As an attendee at two AURCO conferences and two AURCO business meetings, the researcher functioned as participant-observer. In participant-observation, “the researcher participates in the situation while observing and collecting data on the
activities, people, and physical aspects” (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). These experiences provided background on the workings of AURCO. Attendance at the conferences was useful in assessing the level of social interaction among faculty from different campuses. Attendance at the business meetings was useful in assessing the level of political activity and strategic planning that took place among AURCO leadership.

**Interview protocol**

Personal interviews provided a rich source of data about the history of AURCO. With one exception, participants were interviewed in a campus setting, often in their normal working area or other comfortable environment. Interviewing participants in a familiar natural, comfortable setting is referred to as naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). It has the benefit of allowing a degree of observation that could allow the capture of additional data relevant to the study.

Video-tapes were made of the interviews with all six participants. A second taped interview was conducted with the two active founders together. Although audio recording would have been less intrusive, video recording was chosen because of the historical nature of these interviews. It is hoped that video recordings may serve as a permanent record of AURCO’s history. All participants agreed to be recorded with no restrictions on the subsequent use of the tape. Field notes were taken during the interview and served as a guide for follow-up questions. All interviews were transcribed and those transcriptions were printed and reviewed within two weeks of each interview.

A semi-structured interview technique was used. Several questions were developed that were asked of all interviewees as a way of creating a means of comparing
responses. Additional questions were developed, based on the results of the initial series of questions, in order to expand on responses and focus on issues that may be unique to one of the participants. Each participant agreed to an additional interview if necessary to clarify details or obtain additional information.

The semi-structured format is an appropriate protocol for less-experienced researchers because respondents can reply with more in-depth answers (Stage & Manning, 2003). An open-ended question format allows respondents to offer facts as well as opinions of events. This insight into events has the potential to produce topics for further inquiry (Yin, 2003). This format also encouraged snowballing, by allowing the respondents to suggest “other persons to interview as well as other sources of evidence” (Yin, 2003, p.90). According to Yin (2003) this transforms the respondent’s role into that of an informant who can also supply access to other potential interviewees as well as other sources of corroborating evidence.

These interviews utilized the main types of interview questions that Spradley (1979) used in his Developmental Research Sequence (DRS) of ethnographic interviewing. The D.R.S. is useful when the researcher has sufficient access to the respondent to be able to conduct multiple lines of questions over time. Initially, descriptive questions solicit general information about the sequence of events. Structural questions can uncover how informants organize their perceptions. Finally, contrast questions focus on how an informant might differentiate roles or terms (Spradley, 1979).

The initial interviews with each informant began with a series of descriptive questions asking participants about their recollections of the formation of AURCO or
other key events in its history. All participants were asked “What are the measures that you would use to evaluate AURCO?” Within each of the interviews and also in subsequent follow-up interviews with two of the founders, more personalized or structural questions were asked to help fill in the blanks and create more complete lists (Spradley, 1979). An example of a structural question was “Can you think of the names of others who were participants in those early meetings?” Finally, contrast questions were posed to determine how one term or concept is different from a similar term or concept. Contrast questions can clarify or verify information. An example of a contrast question is “How does publication in the *AURCO Journal* differ from publishing in a national journal of the faculty member’s discipline?” By the use of these three types of questions identified by Spradley, it was possible to construct the history of AURCO as well as gain an assessment of the role it plays in the professional life of its members.

**Interview guide**

All six of the participants were asked the following nine questions as part of the interview process:

1. What is your recollection of the founding of AURCO beginning from even before it became an organization?
2. When do you think AURCO and its conference reached some stability or permanence?
3. Who else (besides yourself) is significant from the early years of AURCO?
4. Is there anyone else that comes to mind?
5. To your knowledge, is there any other similar organization outside
Ohio?

6. There is not much research about regional campus issues. Even the AURCO Journal doesn’t contain many articles specifically dealing with regional campus issues. What are your thoughts about that?

7. What would be the measures you would use to evaluate AURCO and how does it measure up?

8. Who have been the critics of AURCO?

9. My research so far seems to indicate that the development of AURCO has been due to the individual efforts of a relatively small group of people. Would you agree with that?

In most cases these nine questions were interrupted by clarifying or follow-up questions resulting from respondents’ answers. Occasionally the questions were asked out of this order as the content of the answers may have led into other specific questions. The question about significant persons was deliberately asked a second time in order to allow ample time for the respondents to think of others and to assist in the snowballing technique of identifying other potential interviewees.

**Data Analysis**

The data analysis process consisted of two parts: data summary, and data interpretation (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2006). Summarizing the interview data after collection required accurate interview notes, interview transcriptions, and field notes. This information was then combined with data from the printed materials and organized
by theme. Data interpretation answered the question of what was important and why it was important.

Analysis of the data followed the three iterative steps outlined by Gay, Mills, and Airasian (2006): reading, describing, and classifying. Reading is a necessary step of familiarization with the data with an eye toward creating initial impressions. Describing is necessary to illuminate the perspectives of the interview participants, and to put other observational data into the context of the research focus. Classifying is used to develop a list of the key characteristics of the descriptive history.

Methods of Verification

The quality of this study depended on the researcher’s ability to gain in-depth and reliable information for the historical analysis. Two aspects of qualitative research are related to this need: thick description and triangulation. Information gathered from the initial interviews was used to craft additional questions and topics for further research. Interviewing the founders of AURCO in person allowed for observation of their display of enthusiasm and emotions in retelling historical events. The subtle evidence observed in the personal setting was a form of “thick description” which provides clues to the culture of an organization. Originating in ethnography, thick description can involve the embellishment of information with nonverbal cues that may otherwise be ignored (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). The thick description obtained through interviews helped confirm the meaning of AURCO to its founders.

Triangulation is defined as establishing historical facts with greater certainty by requiring more than one source of information (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). Berg (2007)
identified triangulation not only as a means of verification but also as a means of obtaining a “richer” picture of reality (p. 5). Some researchers have expressed disdain for the use of the term. They advise that researchers should simply use multiple data collection techniques without trying to portray their collection as a goal in itself (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007). In addition to the interviews with five regional campus faculty, the other means of data collection included examination of the publications and artifacts of AURCO, insights gained through participant observation, and an interview with an administrator who was not a member of AURCO.

In summary, this study included the methods of interviewing, participant-observation, and examination of documents and artifacts as a means of verifying facts. Multiple interviews and additional correspondence with more than one participant provided a means of checking the overall trustworthiness of responses. The joint interview with the two active founders of AURCO offered a means of clarifying answers and confirming themes that emerged from the previous interviews. This also was a way of producing further information that was not thought of during the initial interview (Yin, 2003).

**The Researcher**

The researcher is a twenty-five year veteran of regional campus instruction. I have taught at five regional campuses affiliated with three of Ohio’s state assisted universities: The Ohio State University Mansfield, The Ohio State University Marion, The Ohio State University Newark, Ohio University Lancaster, and the University of Akron Wayne College. In addition, I taught at the main campus of The Ohio State University, two other
four year universities, and four community or technical colleges. Since 1986, I have been affiliated with The Ohio State University Mansfield, which, since 1994, has been my primary academic assignment. As an auxiliary faculty member I am familiar with the regional campus system, but have had limited contact with the faculty culture.

An interview with a chief institutional advancement official in 2004 led to the understanding that faculty of OSU’s four regional campuses had little opportunity to interact with each other, leave alone with faculty from regional campuses of other institutions of higher education. My first exposure to AURCO was seeing copies of the *AURCO Journal* in the faculty lounge at OSU Mansfield. This led to questions about the function of AURCO and how it served as a venue for interaction among faculty of Ohio’s 23 regional campuses. I attended the AURCO Annual Conferences of 2006 and 2007 and two AURCO business meetings in 2006 and 2007. However, my contact with AURCO in 2006 had not been extensive enough to develop a preconceived notion about the activities of AURCO or its overall effectiveness in meeting its stated goals.
CHAPTER 4: THE HISTORY OF AURCO

The Origins of AURCO

In July of 1992, the Ohio Board of Regents released the report of a task force that was charged with devising a strategy to maintain a high degree of quality among Ohio’s institutions of higher education, while dealing at the same time with reduced funding from the state. The overall recommendation of the task force was a more systematic approach to planning and coordination, with the Board of Regents playing a more significant role. Among the many proposals designed to improve efficiencies and eliminate duplication, was one recommendation to create a comprehensive community college system out of the two year colleges and campuses in the state. Specifically the Managing for the Future Task force proposed that the state

Convert all technical colleges and university regional or branch campuses into comprehensive community colleges. Where this action would result in more than one campus serving a geographical region, the campuses should be consolidated into a multi-campus district with one governing board. All community college districts should be supported with at least a one mil tax levy to secure local financial support.

Consolidate university regional or branch campuses and technical colleges in the seven locations in the state where they are co-located, creating comprehensive community colleges with their own governing boards. The seven locations are Canton, Lima, Mansfield, Newark, St. Clairsville, and Zanesville (Managing for the Future, 1992, p. 51).
People on the regional campuses thought that this spelled the end of their existence as branches of a four-year university. Dr. Martin Kich, an English professor at Wright State Lake Campus, attended the 1992 annual conference of the Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges and saw that those in community colleges were quite excited about the task force’s proposals. They were looking forward to expanding their course offerings after the implementation of the task force report (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007). Dr. Kich saw the threat to Wright State Lake as well as other regional campuses and began talking with colleagues to decide how to respond. After talking with Arthur Molitierno, a colleague from the English Department, they decided to call a meeting of interested regional campus faculty from throughout the state. In an effort to make this effort look like something other than a project of the English Department, they enlisted Humphrey Gill of the Psychology Department who agreed to add his name to the invitation that would be sent to each of the campuses. Finally, they obtained permission from the dean at Wright State Lake to hold the meeting there.

Invitations went out to the 26 regional campuses that existed at that time, typically addressed to the faculty chairs, and requesting that at least one faculty member attend as a representative of their campus. When the meeting was held on November 12, 1993, it attracted 20 participants from 16 of Ohio’s regional campuses:

- Dale Schnetzer, Bowling Green State University Firelands
- Jon Roncone, Kent State University East Liverpool
- Robert Sines, Kent State University Trumbull
- Robin Lashey, Kent State University Tuscarawas
Robert Baer, Miami University Hamilton
Allegra DeLaurentiis, Miami University Middletown
Marty Stevens, Miami University Middletown
Gordon Aubrecht, The Ohio State University Marion
F. Lee St. John, The Ohio State University Newark
Jon J. Arnold, Ohio University Zanesville
Karin Billions, University of Akron Wayne College
Cliff Larrabee, University of Cincinnati Clermont College
Linda Long, University of Cincinnati Clermont College
Dick Long, University of Cincinnati Clermont College
Patti Ellison, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College
Ken Koehler, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College
Humphrey Gill, Wright State University Lake
Martin Kich, Wright State University Lake
Arthur A. Molitierno, Wright State University Lake

Before the meeting ended, the attendees decided to create a formal association they would call the Organization for University Regional Campuses of Ohio (OURCO Journal, January, 1994). It would not be until 1995 that the name was changed to Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio because the organizers discovered that the OURCO acronym was already in use (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).
The initial meeting in November of 1993 yielded four outcomes. First, a decision was made to create a permanent organization to represent regional campus interests. Second, a slate of officers was elected. Third, a committee was formed to draft a set of bylaws with plans to meet in Marion in January of 1994. Finally, plans were made for future meetings including a second general organizational meeting scheduled for the spring of 1994 at The Ohio State University Marion and a two-day conference that would be open to all regional campus faculty members throughout the state.

The conversation at that first meeting was dominated by concerns about the Managing for the Future Task Force (First OURCO Organizational Meeting, 1994). One of the concerns was the fact that the Task Force did not have any representatives from university regional campuses, but did have a community college president (Initial concerns, 1994). There was also great concern about the linkage of performance toward service expectations with the allocation of instructional subsidy. Those in attendance felt that it was unfair to hold regional campus programs to the same standards as those on central campuses because the regional campuses faced a continual challenge of a limited student population base. These concerns strengthened the attendees’ drive to create a mechanism to give voice to the concerns of regional campus faculty.

Faculty whose primary end is to serve students in the classroom usually do not have the time or resources for considering such administrative and fiscal concerns. Yet clearly such concerns affect the quality of the institutions which faculty serve. For practical purposes it is thus obligatory for the regional campuses to form an organization to promote a public forum for the presentation
of ideas related to the educational purposes of regional campuses and how they may continue to flourish and contribute to Ohio’s higher educational structure. Such an organization can coherently address the particular differences (regional campuses as opposed to community college, for example) which give regional campuses their identity through mission and structure. Additionally, regional campuses need to advance the distinctions which complement the campuses to which they are affiliated. The above and other concerns may be seen as the impetus for forming OURCO, Organization for University Regional Campuses of Ohio (Initial concerns, 1994).

Those in attendance elected a slate of officers for a one and a half year term that would end in July 1995. Subsequent terms were set at two years. Marty Stevens of Miami University Middletown was chosen as President. The Vice President was also designated as President-Elect and this spot was filled by Karin Billions of the University of Akron Wayne College. Arthur Molitierno of Wright State Lake became the Secretary/Treasurer (First Items, 1994).

A Governance and Bylaws Committee was formed to write a mission statement and develop governing principles and rules. John Arnold of Ohio University Zanesville and Humphrey Gill of Wright State Lake were named to this committee. A third member was to be designated later, and this slot was filled by Arthur Molitierno (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). The Bylaws committee was scheduled to meet on January 14, 1994 with its recommendations presented to the general organizational meeting scheduled for February 18, 1994 (First items, 1994).
The campuses were encouraged to send multiple participants to the second organizational meeting, but it was determined that only two representatives of each campus would be designated to vote (First items, 1994). Martin Kich was appointed chair of the committee that would hold a two-day conference at a yet-to-be-determined date. A tentative agenda for the conference was drafted with a theme of “Educating for the Future.” Several panels were planned, including one to discuss the impact of the Managing for the Future Task Force Report; a panel dealing with regional campus issues such as retention, faculty excellence, and cohesion with the broader university community; and a panel highlighting regional campus achievements. In addition, planners scheduled a networking session by discipline (Proposed conference agenda, 1994).

**AURCO Bylaws**

John Arnold and Humphrey Gill met on January 14, 1994 in order to draft a set of bylaws for what was still called OURCO. Their draft document was then mailed to the participants from the November 1993 meeting and other campus representatives so they could offer their feedback prior to the business meeting that had been scheduled for February 18, 1994 (Proposed OURCO bylaws, 1994). The members at that meeting approved the bylaws, and established an ad hoc committee to organize the first conference, which was now scheduled for the spring of 1995 (Membership approves, 1994). A request was made for anyone to review the bylaws and make corrections or suggestions. The bylaws for the newly named association, AURCO, would be subsequently re-approved by all in attendance at the first conference on April 22, 1995.
The bylaws (Appendix A) stipulated provisions for election of officers, establishment of committees, and holding of meetings, and spelled out the intended purposes of AURCO:

A. To pursue a pro-active educational and political direction, stressing the relevant independent educational vision and purpose of regional campuses while at the same time stressing the vital importance of remaining an integral part of their universities.

B. To encourage communication through varied channels among regional campus faculty.

C. To take note of, study, and provide guidance in meeting the special needs of students attending regional campuses.

D. To deepen the commitment of faculty to the educational and cultural well-being of their respective regional campus communities and make the communities aware of the rich resources provided by Ohio’s regional campuses (Membership Approves Bylaws, 1994, p.2).

The AURCO bylaws have been amended twice since that time: once to enlarge the executive committee to include the journal editor and newsletter editor, and once to create the position of past president to improve the organizational continuity as officers changed (M. Kich, personal communication, December 29, 2007). Appendix B contains the amended bylaws as of 2000.

The First AURCO Conference

The First AURCO Conference took place on April 22, 1995, at Kent State Stark, nearly one and a half years after it was announced at the first organizational meeting.
Martin Kich of Wright State Lake served as the conference program chair. One month prior, a newsletter went out with the conference agenda, directions, maps, and a registration form. The registration fee was twenty-five dollars (Ohio’s regional campuses, 1995). Attendees were welcomed by Myron S. Henry, Provost of Kent State University, and a keynote address was presented by Howard L. Gauthier of the Ohio Board of Regents.

The 88 paid attendees represented all eight university systems, and 21 regional campuses (only Ohio University Southern and Ohio University Lancaster were not represented). Also present that day were eleven regional campus deans who met separately that afternoon as part of the previously mentioned regional campus deans group OARC (Ohio Association of Regional Campuses). The Fall 1995 issue of the *AURCO Journal* made it a point to publish the institutional affiliations of all 53 conference presenters (see Table 1). This provided visual evidence that the conference brought together Ohio’s regional campuses.

Table 1

*Institutional Affiliation of Presenters at the 1995 AURCO Conference*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number of presenters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Ashtabula</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University East Liverpool</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Geauga</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Salem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kent State University Stark 9
Kent State University Trumbull 6
Kent State University Tuscarawas 1
Miami University Hamilton 3
Miami University Middletown 3
The Ohio State University Marion 1
The Ohio State University Newark 1
Ohio University Chillicothe 1
University of Akron Wayne 1
University of Cincinnati Clermont College 1
University of Cincinnati University College 1
Wright State University Lake 3


The Fall 1995 issue of the *Journal* contained the text for sixteen conference presentations, including the welcome and the keynote address. The remaining presentations were published the following year. The entire Spring 1996 issue of the *AURCO Journal* was devoted to 23 presentations from the 1995 AURCO Conference (Molitierno & Kich, 1996). The 1996 issue inaugurated the format for the next several years. It became exclusively a vehicle for reprinting the conference presentations at the previous year’s AURCO conferences. A separate newsletter was created to disseminate information about AURCO business and events.

The first AURCO conference was considered a success. Dr. Martin Kich was surprised how well it came off, being the first conference and the first time he had ever
run a program. The crowd was larger than expected. It represented the different systems and individual campuses, and the participation by the regional campus deans was a “plus” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007).

**The Threat to Regional Campuses Diminishes**

By 1996, it was becoming clear that the recommendations of the Managing for the Future Task Force were not going to be adopted and that the threat to regional campuses had subsided. AURCO played no direct role in affecting the adoption or non-adoption of the proposals, but the founding members of AURCO encouraged people to show up at hearings that were held around the state. For example, about eight people from Wright State Lake attended a hearing in Lima.

The initial hearings were held in large cities where urban community colleges were supported. But as the hearings moved to more rural areas such as Lima, it became clear that there was a strong preference for the *status quo*. Dr. John Riedl, who at that time was dean of The Ohio State University Mansfield, agreed with this assessment. He was personally responsible for having one of the hearings held in Mansfield, where the testimony was all in favor of the *status quo*. He recalled that students testified that they simply would not have attended college if it were Mansfield Community College instead of The Ohio State University (J. Riedl, personal communication, January 8, 2008).

Dr. Kich pointed out that the 23 regional campuses had at least 23 state representatives eager to preserve any institution in their home district. Adding neighboring state representatives within the campuses’ service areas created a bloc of support from nearly one-third of the Ohio General Assembly (M. Kich, personal

**AURCO Struggles to Maintain Its Momentum**

Many ceased their participation as the immediate threat to regional campuses from the Managing for the Future Task Force subsided. Others left AURCO because they were senior faculty who, by 1996, were retiring from higher education. In 1996 Marty Stevens of Miami University Middletown ended her tenure as president and Karin Billions, a professor of communication at University of Akron Wayne College was elected. A second annual conference was scheduled at Miami University Middletown with Sondra Clooney of Kent State Stark as the conference program chair.

**Second AURCO Conference 1996**

The second AURCO Conference was less successful than the first. Interest waned because the threat to the regional campuses had abated, and the marketing effort was not stepped up to account for this. In addition, the second conference did not have the state-wide representation that was a feature of the first conference.

There were only 75 attendees and according to Dr. Kich, about 50 percent of the presenters were from the two Miami University campuses. He estimated that only about fifteen percent of the attendees were from outside southwest Ohio: the Miami campuses, the Cincinnati campuses, and Wright State Lake. An examination of the 1997 *AURCO Journal* corroborates this estimate. The texts of the 1996 conference presentations reveal that 13 of 26 presenters, including co-presenters, were from the two Miami University campuses. Even accounting for multiple-person presentations, nine out of the twenty
published presentation were from faculty affiliated with the two Miami University campuses, and a total of only nine campuses were represented by presenters (In this issue, 1997).

**Third Annual AURCO Conference 1997**

The third AURCO Conference took place at Bowling Green Firelands under the direction of program chair Lee Fox-Cardamone of Kent State Stark. Attendance, at 65, was lower than either of the first two conferences. Some of this could be attributed to the Firelands campus’ remote location on the shores of Lake Erie, certainly a considerable distance from many of Ohio’s regional campuses. According to the Spring 1998 edition of the *AURCO Journal*, nine regional campuses were again represented by presentations, but the campuses were more spread out. Seven presenters were from the host campus of Bowling Green Firelands, five were from OSU Marion, four each from Wright State Lake and Miami Hamilton, three apiece from University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College and Kent State Ashtabula, two each from University of Akron Wayne College and Miami Middletown, and one from Kent State Stark (In this issue, 1998).

**AURCO Hits a Rough Patch**

In 1998 the fourth AURCO Conference was scheduled to take place at Kent State Trumbull, another campus near the edge of the state and a considerable distance from most of Ohio’s other regional campuses. The conference was also challenged by disruptions in the AURCO leadership. As Karin Billions’ term as president entered its final months, president-elect Myra West, a professor of Physics at Kent State Stark was slated to become president and Dr. Robert Howell, a professor of Chemistry at University
of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College, was to become vice president. When it came
time for the new officers to serve, it was determined that Dr. West had retired and was
unavailable to serve. Dr. Howell was thrust into the presidency nearly two years ahead of
schedule.

Shortly after Dr. Howell took office, he learned that the checks received for
conference registrations for the previous two years had never been cashed nor deposited,
in part because AURCO had not received legal status as a 501c3 organization. For the
first few years the funds were deposited into a Wright State Lake account. Attempts were
made to have some of the attendees write new checks and as much as 80 percent of the
funds were eventually recovered (M. Kich, personal communication, December 29,
2007).

A number of factors had combined to slow AURCO’s momentum. The
elimination of an imminent threat to Ohio’s regional campuses had reduced the
participation of some of the activist-motivated members. A poorly-attended second
conference had weakened the perceived need to get together on an annual basis. A wave
of retirements had depleted the organization of several of its founding members, and the
loss of elected leadership diminished the political and organizational continuity of the
organization. Finally, the loss or unavailability of conference registration fees, the major
source of revenue, created a financial crisis for the organization.

**AURCO Rebounds**

Even though some of the original members were retiring or losing interest in
AURCO due to the changed political landscape, newcomers were taking an interest in the
organization. They tended to be younger, less interested in political activism, and more interested in scholarship and networking than their predecessors. This “second wave” of new AURCO members included several people who would become leaders in the organization, among them: Robert Howell of University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College; Lee Fox-Cardamone of Kent State Stark; Miki Crawford of Ohio University Southern, Lacey Curtis of Ohio University Southern; Tracey Hawkins of University of Cincinnati Clermont College; Joe Cavanaugh of Wright State Lake; Leslie Heaphy of Kent State Stark; Jerry Obiekwe of University of Akron Wayne College; Scott Minar of Ohio University Lancaster; and Michael Nern of Ohio University Zanesville (M. Kich, personal communication, December 30, 2007).

Two factors initiated AURCO’s rebound over the next four years. First, the new members would assume leadership roles, with three people in particular playing critical roles (Robert Howell, Lee Fox-Cardamone, and Tracey Hawkins). Second, the AURCO Journal would take steps to become a reviewed journal. The first reviewed edition appeared in the Spring of 2000, and was based on the review of conference presentations from the Spring of 1999.

**New Leadership Emerges**

Despite being thrust into the office unexpectedly, Dr. Howell would go on to do an excellent job as president and get the organization’s momentum restarted. He was particularly successful in recruiting others into leadership roles, most notably Dr. Fox-Cardamone and Dr. Hawkins. He also took AURCO’s political role seriously, by monitoring state policies and writing letters on behalf of AURCO when appropriate. Dr.
Howell served a two-year term as president and was succeeded by Lee Fox-Cardamone, another of the new members. She served for two years as well (1999 to 2001), and was succeeded by Gordon Aubrecht and then Martin Kich, experienced members who had been there since the beginning. Aubrecht and Kich each served one two-year term (2001-2005).

Lee Fox-Cardamone was program chair of the annual conference for two years in a row, which provided continuity and consistency to the annual program and seemed to increase attendance because the conference was managed by an experienced chair. The 1998 conference at Kent State Trumbull attracted 75 paid participants despite its location in the northeastern corner of the state and the tumult of the leadership. That was the last conference that was chaired by someone off-site, and subsequent conferences benefited from on-campus coordination.

Martin Kich served as program chair for the 1999 conference which took place at his home campus of Wright State Lake. It hosted 85 participants, and included presentations from faculty at 17 of Ohio’s regional campuses. That conference carried the theme of “Looking toward and beyond the end: The Regional Campuses at the Millennium” (AURCO Conference Program, 1999). In 2000, the former president, Dr. Howell, served as program chair for the AURCO Conference at his home campus, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College. This conference attracted 90 participants.

The following year, after completing two years as president, Lee Fox-Cardamone returned as chair of the 2001 conference at her home campus of Kent State Stark. It drew
100 registered participants. The theme of this conference was “Regional Campuses and their Communities,” and the presentations were arranged in six categories: partnerships with the community, assessment, diversity, innovations in teaching, technology, and special initiatives.

Meanwhile, Tracey Hawkins, appropriately a professor of accounting at the University of Cincinnati Clermont College, took over the treasurer’s office and put the organization’s financial affairs in order. Dr. Hawkins would also serve as program chair for the 2003 AURCO Conference which took place on her home campus and attracted 90 participants. The emergence of a cadre of effective leaders gave AURCO stability in leadership and programming.

The *AURCO Journal*

The *AURCO Journal* had consistently been criticized as a publication with limited benefits to those who contributed to it. From 1995 to 1997, the *Journal* was published once or twice per year in newsletter format and simply reproduced some of the presentations that had been made at the previous year’s conference. Mr. Molitierno had been editor of the *Journal* from its inception in 1994 as a newsletter. In 1996 the newsletter function of the *Journal* was separated from the publication of conference presentations. Mr. Molitierno remained editor of the *AURCO Journal* while Dr. Kich assumed responsibility for the newsletter. Steps were taken, beginning in 1998, to improve the appearance of the *Journal*, to establish it as a reviewed publication, and to make it financially self-supporting.
The 1999 *AURCO Journal* was the first to be published in a bound format. Then presenters at the 1999 AURCO Conference were told that they would have to submit articles for review if they wanted to publish in the *AURCO Journal* of 2000. A committee of the editor (Mr. Molitierno), associate editors, and a team of other reviewers was established to determine which articles would be published.

Wright State Lake remained the *Journal*’s campus home and main financial supporter of the publication costs (Molitierno, 1999). The dean of Wright State Lake, Dan Evans, felt that he could justify paying for the expenses of a reviewed journal because it was important for his faculty (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007). The journal editor began to solicit support from other campuses, and, beginning with the 2001 issue, regional campus advertisements began appearing in the *Journal*. Today, these ads are the sole financial support for the *AURCO Journal*.

In 2005, the *AURCO Journal* became available online through the efforts of Editor Arthur Molitierno of Wright State Lake and Terry Quinn, mathematics professor of Ohio University Southern. Dr. Dan Evans gave permission for the *Journal* to be hosted on the website of Ohio University Southern (Molitierno, 2005). Dr. Evans had left Wright State Lake to become dean of OU Southern in 2000 but he carried with him his support and encouragement for AURCO and its activities.

**AURCO Stabilizes**

By 2001 the components were in place that constitute the present-day structure and procedures for AURCO. As an aftermath of the 1997 surprise ascension to the presidency by Robert Howell, the vice-president has been reminded that he or she also
serves as president-elect, and this has provided some important continuity in the leadership team. For example, in 2005, President Terry Quinn of Ohio University Southern assumed an out-of-state position. The vice president (and president-elect) Brad Shepherd of Kent State Stark was ready and prepared to step in. Beginning with the 2000 issue, the prestige and perceived value of the *AURCO Journal* was enhanced after papers presented at the AURCO Conference were required to be submitted to a review panel before they could be published as articles. Steps were taken to make the *Journal* financially self-sufficient and the improvement of AURCO’s accounting systems led to greater financial stability. Since 1999, the program chair for the AURCO Conference has always been a faculty member at the host site.

**The 2002 Conference at OSU Lima**

The 2002 Conference took place at The Ohio State University Lima, marking its only appearance at any of the OSU campuses. It was chaired by Mohamed Yousif, professor of mathematics. It attracted 120 participants, the largest crowd so far, and continued the momentum of increased conference participation that had begun in 1997 after the disappointing 1996 conference. The theme of the conference was “Regional Campuses in the 21st Century” (Eight Annual AURCO Conference, 2002). Faculty presentations were arranged in five tracks: assessment of teaching and learning, innovations in teaching and scholarship, technology, diversity issues, and special partnerships and initiatives (AURCO conference program, 2002). Like other AURCO conferences, the theme was used in the marketing effort but was not reflected in the topics of the presentations. According to Arthur Molitierno, “We didn’t decide or
instigate…a call for specific papers in that order. What we did in the conferences is generally outline a theme for presentations and faculty were free within that general realm of idea of looking at the community and the impact of faculty in the community. They were free broadly to do whatever kind of research or presentations that they wished” (A. Molitierno, personal interview, October 22, 2007).

The Conference in New Places

As mentioned, the 2003 conference at the University of Cincinnati Clermont College, chaired by Tracey Hawkins, attracted 90 participants. The theme of this conference was “Regional Campus Identities: Building Educational Communities” (AURCO Conference Program, 2003). The 2004 conference at Ohio University Southern, chaired by Miki Crawford, drew 75 participants. It marked the tenth anniversary of conferences and used the theme, “Celebrating a Decade of Collegiality” (AURCO Conference Program, 2004). The concurrent session tracks were assessment of teaching and learning, diversity issues, innovations in teaching and scholarship, library, partnerships with the community, special initiatives, and technology. There was also a session for student papers.

Past trends indicated that attendance dropped when the conference was held in one of the less-central campuses, and these two conferences suffered that fate, both being located in counties bordering the Ohio River. In fact, OU Southern is located in Ironton, nearly the southernmost point in Ohio. With a typical starting time of 8am on a Saturday morning, anything more than two hours away from a potential attendee necessitates arriving the day before and the additional time and expenses that entails. When the
conference returned to more central locations, attendance rebounded. The 2005
conference in Zanesville under the direction of Sheida Shirvani hit 100, and the 2006
conference at Akron University Wayne College under the direction of Gary Bays had 125
participants. As if to emphasize the shorter driving time, the Zanesville conference used a
theme of “Centering on Education: In the Center of Ohio (AURCO Conference Program.
2005). The Wayne College conference used the theme entitled “Lessons Learned: In the
Classroom, on Campus, in the Community” (AURCO Conference Program, 2006).

The 2007 AURCO Conference: A Record Attendance

In 2007, under the direction of program chair Rachelle Hippler, the AURCO
Conference at Bowling Green Firelands drew a record crowd of 175. The theme of the
2007 conference was “Innovations: Shattering the Box” (AURCO conference program,
2007). Presentations were arranged in four tracks: teaching, service, scholarship, and
engagement. In addition, there were four student presentations and a student poster
session. Following the pattern established by previous conferences, the theme was part of
the marketing effort rather than a guide for presentation submission.

Exceeding all previous attendance records by more than forty percent, the 2007
conference was regarded by AURCO leadership as a major accomplishment (M. Kich,
personal interview, October 26, 2007). And the growing opportunities for student
scholarship continued to add a new dimension to AURCO’s promotion of scholarship on
Ohio’s regional campuses. Members looked ahead to 2008 and the return of the annual
conference to University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College.
CHAPTER 5: THE INTERVIEWS

Discovery, Confirmation, and Expansion

Seven interviews were conducted from October through December of 2007. These interviews fell into three stages that represented a process of discovery, confirmation, and expansion of the meaning of AURCO. “Discovery” was conducted through interviews with three faculty members present for AURCO’s organizational meeting in 1993, two of whom are still active participants. I interviewed Martin Kich on October 5, 2007, Gordon Aubrecht on October 9, 2007, and Arthur Molitierno on October 22, 2007. These interviews provided considerable background information about the circumstances that led to the creation of AURCO, the participants in the formation of AURCO, and the role that the founders of AURCO felt the organization could play in the lives of regional campus faculty members. At the completion of these three interviews, four themes emerged to explain the purposes that the founders saw AURCO serving.

“Confirmation” was accomplished by arranging a second interview with the two active faculty members. On October 26, 2007, I conducted an interview with Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht together. Besides seeking clarification of dates and names, the four themes (scholarship, professional development, collegiality and promotion of regional campuses) were presented to the interviewees for their commentary and confirmation. Both participants confirmed that these themes represented their concept of the roles that AURCO plays in serving Ohio’s regional campuses. Additionally, they offered more supporting information specifically related to how they felt AURCO had carried out these
purposes. As a result of the first four interviews, another round of interviews was scheduled with three additional participants named by the original three participants.

“Expansion” occurred as interviews were conducted with two faculty members who became active after its formation, and one regional campus dean who remains supportive of AURCO. I interviewed Lee Fox Cardamone of Kent State Stark on November 5, 1993, Dean Dan Evans of Ohio University Southern (formerly at Wright State Lake) on November 26, 2007, and Robert Howell of University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College on December 10, 2007. Information from the regional campus dean provided a different perspective as he indicated ways in which he felt AURCO had benefited regional campus faculty under his direction. This interview also provided information about the regularly scheduled meetings of the deans of each of the 23 campuses. This information was useful in detecting parallels between the interactions of regional campus faculty and regional campus deans.

Martin Kich

Martin Kich is a professor of English at Wright State University Lake in Celina, Ohio. He began in the English Department in 1990, was granted tenure in 1995, and achieved the rank of full professor in 2001. Dr. Kich received his Ph.D. from Lehigh University in 1989, and had several adjunct teaching positions in Pennsylvania before coming to Wright State Lake. He has written numerous articles and book reviews, and in 2000 was the recipient of the Award for Faculty Excellence from the trustees of Wright State University (Meet contributor, 2007). Kich was one of the original participants in AURCO’s organizational meeting. He was program chair for the first AURCO
conference at Kent State Stark in 1995 and the fifth conference at Wright State Lake in 1999. He also served as secretary and president, and still edits a periodic newsletter. Dr. Kich (along with Gordon Aubrecht) is one of only two original AURCO members still active today.

Because he lives in Lima, Ohio, Dr. Kich offered to meet me for an interview somewhere between Mansfield and Lima. I arranged to use the conference room of the Crawford County Economic Development Director in Bucyrus, Ohio. We met first at the Pelican Coffee House, and then walked to the Crawford County Courthouse for the interview.

Dr. Kich provided a wealth of information. He talked nearly nonstop for 90 minutes (the amount of time on the video tape). He seemed genuinely eager to tell the story of AURCO, and enjoyed the opportunity to reminisce about the early days. He seemed to have a great recall of the key events and the people involved. His knowledge of the early history of AURCO was “encyclopedic.” Dr. Kich downplayed his role in AURCO and indicated that his contribution was due more to the number of years he has put in rather than any great abilities on his part. He was clearly proud of the organization and the role he felt it has played over the years in serving regional campus faculty.

It was primarily from this interview with Dr. Kich that the narrative of the founding of AURCO emerged. He related how he became concerned after attending a meeting of the Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges in the fall of 1992 and gained a better understanding of how the recommendations of the Managing for the Future Task force could impact two-year colleges and university regional campuses:
I got the impression from the people at that conference that there was great enthusiasm for this development among the community and technical colleges and it raised dread (probably not too strong of a word) among the regional campuses. In fact the keynote speaker at the OATYC that year referenced the Managing for the Future Task Force and went down a list of about ten reasons why it was going to be a boon for Ohio’s technical colleges in particular, but even for the community colleges. It would allow them to expand their general education offerings into areas that were, on co-located campuses, primarily delivered by the regional campuses like at OSU. Lima Technical College, I think at the time, had not delivered liberal arts classes, and that type of thing, and now they were going to expand into that (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007)

According to Dr. Kich, he returned to Wright State Lake and began sharing his concerns with others in an effort to develop a way to respond:

So I came back to our campus. And I was concerned about this, and I was talking about it, and how the organization had its agendas, in the conversation between myself and Art [Molitierno] who volunteered his office. We had offices across the hall from each other and we were talking about what could be done about this. And it became clear that OATYC was not going to be a venue for regional campuses to assert their distinct identity so he suggested that we contact people at other regional campuses and see if they shared the same concerns and perhaps start talking about ways in which we could find a distinct identity. I think almost
from the start there was the idea of a distinct organization for regional campuses, not necessarily supplanting OATYC, but offering some kind of alternative venue for the regional campuses themselves. We were a little concerned that this was just two English people at one of the smallest regional campuses in the state, so we tried to recruit some other faculty that might be interested. Humphrey Gill, who was a psychology faculty at our campus at the time, agreed to put his name on the letters and we approached our dean and asked him if he would be willing to host a meeting on our campus, just to kind of explore the possibilities of what regional campuses might do to solidify their identity, maybe define their identity for the first time, in a clear way. So we sent letters out to the faculty chairs at the twenty--I think at the time it was twenty-six--regional campuses, and nineteen of them sent at least one representative; many of them two or three representatives to this meeting. It was very well attended. Everyone was very concerned about the Managing for the Future Task Force and its implications and that dominated probably half of the discussion. But there was a sense that, yes, we need to organize (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007).

Dr. Kich also spoke extensively about the impact of the *AURCO Journal*, and attributed its success to Arthur Molitierno, who served as editor from its inception until 2006. For the first three years, when the Journal was in a newsletter format, he and Mr. Molitierno were co-editors. Dr. Kich also recognized the support from Dean Dan Evans as crucial to the Journal’s existence:
One of the things that happened was the *Journal*, which became a key part of the organization, didn’t really start until about the third or fourth conference and it really started in kind of a newsletter format. And after we did it several years like that we approached Dan Evans, who was the dean at our campus when we held the initial meeting there. And he agreed to fund a professional looking journal…Dan Evans as the dean of the Lake Campus probably did more than anybody to insure that this organization got to wherever it is today because he funded an awful lot of things. For instance, not only the journal to begin with; and I think for the first year and a half all of the cost of the journal was absorbed by our campus. And he never questioned any bill that Art took to him. Art was conscientious about how he tried to contain cost on things, but never was questioned about what it cost. All of the AURCO mailing costs were absorbed by our campus for about the first five years. So one dean that had a tremendous amount of foresight about what this organization could mean made a huge difference (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007).

Kich believed there had been an increase in scholarly research among regional campus faculty in Ohio, and he attributed it to the AURCO conferences and the *AURCO Journal*. He recounted how, as newsletter editor, he routinely received newsletters and memos for all of the regional campuses and then used this information to compile lists of faculty publications so that they could be publicized in the AURCO newsletter. According to him, the *AURCO Journal* articles dominated the publication list in the
1990’s. But he has noted a steady increase in the numbers of other publications originating among regional campus faculty.

Dr. Kich also related how many participants complained that the presenters were “just reading their papers” in the early days of the AURCO Conference. Dr. Kich felt that many of the regional campus faculty had never been to a professional conference in which that was the practice. By the fourth or fifth conference, those complaints had dwindled. Dr. Kich felt this example was an indication of the professionalization of the regional campus faculty that had occurred.

Dr. Kich believed that the *AURCO Journal* had played a role in the recent improvements to the journal produced by OATYC, the Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges. He noted that the journal published by OATYC became thicker and more professional looking after about the third issue of the *AURCO Journal*. He attributed this to the *AURCO Journal* raising the standard for in-state publications.

Dr. Kich spoke very positively about his experience with AURCO. He has enjoyed meeting colleagues from around the state and visiting the different regional campuses. He saw the AURCO Conference as an important element in his own development as a professional. He has attended all but one AURCO Conference, missing the 2003 conference due to a back injury. He also saw the *AURCO Journal* as having transformed the level of scholarship at regional campuses. According to Dr. Kich, “the regional campuses have gone through a transition that has been expedited by the availability of the *AURCO Journal*. And the AURCO Journal has contributed to a professionalization of regional campus faculty that has narrowed the gap between the
regional campus faculty and main campus faculty. Certainly it’s done that at Wright State.” He went on to refer to a professor of geology who had nine peer reviewed journal articles when he was tenured and promoted. According to Kich, “I am not saying every faculty is that productive, but there is a trend towards that, and I think this organization can take some of the credit for that” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007).

Gordon Aubrecht

Gordon Aubrecht is a professor of physics at The Ohio State University Marion. He received his Ph.D. from Princeton University in 1971, and is the author of Energy, a textbook now in its third edition from Prentice Hall. Dr. Aubrecht has been active in the American Physical Society, the American Association of Physics Teachers, and the Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (Gordon Aubrecht, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht served as president of AURCO and has attended every AURCO conference except the 2005 conference in Zanesville. He has closely followed political issues, and has tried to keep AURCO members informed about state policies that may adversely affect the regional campus systems.

During the Fall Quarter of 2007, Dr. Aubrecht’s duties were primarily on the Columbus campus of The Ohio State University and at OSU Marion’s Delaware County Center. We arranged to meet in Columbus at The OSU Faculty Club on October 9, 2007. After meeting for lunch we adjourned to a small conference room for the interview. Although Dr. Aubrecht’s recall of detail was somewhat fuzzy, he was very passionate about the role he believes AURCO has played in serving the faculty of Ohio’s regional campuses. He was very adamant about the importance of regional campuses as part of the
state’s system of higher education and saw the protection of the regional campuses as one of AURCO’s primary missions. He offered an eloquent explanation of the role of regional campus faculty:

I believe the faculty of the regional campuses offer something unique. We are scholars and we are bringing our interest in teaching, which is a very special interest in teaching. That is why we get to work on the regional campuses. We give up things to work on the regional campuses, like salary. But we have a dedication to teaching from our own internal driving force, whatever that may be for faculty members, and that centrality of teaching is what certainly got me to become a faculty member of the regional campus--the fact that I didn’t have to give it up for research. I didn’t want to give up research. But I also felt a calling to be a teacher and I thought that OSU’s regional campuses offered in some sense the best of both worlds--that I got to do the teaching and I still got to do research. And in some sense I would have liked to do a little less in teaching and a little more in research. But the alternative would be just doing research and not very much teaching and that was not very appealing to me, and I believe that is not appealing to the rest of the faculty who are in the regional campuses. We have a calling and we’re there because we think that teaching is important. We think that people who live in Ohio should have the opportunity to have an education by people who are scholars and who have some sense of what scholarship is, who are demanding of their students in a way that perhaps people in community colleges or technical colleges are not (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).
Dr. Aubrecht referred to Ohio’s regional campuses as “a jewel that Ohio doesn’t necessarily realize that it has” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Several times he diverged from the topic of AURCO to discuss the role of regional campus faculty, the issues unique to regional campuses, and differences between Ohio’s regional campus structure and that of other states. By his own admission, he gave some very longwinded answers. He was a champion of Ohio’s regional campuses in general and of the role of AURCO in particular. He made the case that teaching on one of Ohio State’s regional campuses is the best of all worlds because of the emphasis on teaching coupled with the ability to engage in research.

In addition to seeing Ohio’s system of regional campuses as unique within the United States, he viewed the regional campuses of The Ohio State University as being unique within Ohio:

Certainly the OSU campuses are unique. There are no other campuses to my knowledge that are really like us--being part of the university and being tenured in the university and still working on the regional campuses, but being promoted through the departments the way everyone else is with the proviso that we are teaching a lot more in general. At least, certainly, I am teaching a whole lot more than my fellow physicists in Columbus and they therefore expect us to be somewhat less productive of scholarship. But if we had no scholarship we wouldn’t stay and I think that’s a really good thing. It puts us a level above the liberal arts colleges in some way because we have a more intense commitment to research. But it puts us with the liberal art colleges in the sense that we have the
smaller classes generally and a lot more personal attention to students than there
would be at a place like Columbus where the classes are often very much larger
and the amount of interaction with a faculty member is much less intense. So we
kind of combine, for the people who go to the regional campuses, the best features
of the small college or liberal arts college, and the university. I think that’s
something that is different. There are some campuses that may have similarities:
The University of Wisconsin two-year campuses though are less so. I think the
University of Wisconsin four-years campuses are much more like our regional
campuses than the University of Wisconsin two years campuses. I would say that
Wisconsin and Pennsylvania have the closest situations to our regional campuses
in OSU because it varies across the state in terms of the connection of the regional
campuses and how loose it is to the mother campus, or whatever you want to call
it--the main campus. And certainly with OSU we have a really intense tight bond
within the departments of the people who are on the regional campuses and in
their departments and a commitment to scholarship that is more evidenced than
would be if we were liberal arts college faculty. We have somewhat more
emphasis on research and that makes it a more important part of our lives. And we
take this job as opposed to one at a liberal arts college because we do feel that
importance of research in our lives as active scholars and as active teachers. And I
believe that the two serve each other. I know that some people think that is not
true, but I firmly believe that being a scholar and being a teacher at the same time
may feed off one another and that I bring insights into my classroom from my
scholarship and I bring insights into my scholarship from my classroom and that is a wonderful situation (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht described a sense of urgency about the proposed revamping of Ohio’s higher education system that affected the organizational meeting in November of 1993. Although those plans for reform never materialized, the participants at the meeting felt that there should be annual conferences for regional campus faculty as a way of discussing issues and sharing commonalities:

We thought it was important to have an organization of faculty for various reasons; to support our faculty and to provide a foundation for a united response to challenges to the worth of regional campuses, which are, no matter which way you cut it, and no matter whose university system we’re looking at, they’re more expensive than the community colleges because the teaching load is lighter on the regional campuses. Even the regional campuses where it’s heaviest, it’s lighter than it is for the community colleges professors and for the technical college professors. And of course the technical college professors don’t have to have anything like even an intermediate degree to be hired. A bachelor’s degree in many cases is what they ask for. And I’m not saying that that means they couldn’t be effective teachers for technical college purposes. In fact somebody who has a bachelor’s degree and is out earning a living doing something might be a person to train other people to do what they’re doing. But I consider what the regional campuses here in the state of Ohio are doing is teaching and not training. There is a huge, huge difference that is not appreciated by many people in Columbus,
between teaching and training (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht saw Ohio’s regional campuses as providing a unique “value added” proposition. “There’s a payback to the state from having an educated electorate. It is a different kind of payback and that’s the real payback that the Morrill Act was meant to provide. Not the payback of necessarily trained people who are going to earn a lot of money and then pay taxes; but the payback of having people who are knowledgeable about whatever they are doing be part of the electorate of the state and have it affect on enlightening programs of government and I think that’s such an important part of what we do.” He went on to conclude that “Most of our students are first generation college students and the second largest group are the people that are place-bound and mothers who have children in school. They can’t leave the community. That’s where they are because their husbands have jobs there or they’re men whose wives have jobs, that are coming to school to better themselves and in some way we provide that kind of education to those people. And I think it’s really important that they do that. We need to work together to insure the advantages to the citizens of Ohio of having these kinds of campuses that belong to them, and that the distinction between a regional campus and a community college and a technical college is clear to the powers to be in Columbus. And I don’t believe that it generally is” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht has been one of the most prolific presenters at the conference and contributors to the AURCO Journal. An examination of the AURCO Journal from 1994 to 2007 reveals that he has authored or co-authored thirteen submissions. But he saw
AURCO as a mechanism to protect and further Ohio’s regional campuses more than anything else.

Arthur Molitierno

On October 22, 2007, I interviewed the last of what I considered to be the “big three” founders of AURCO, Arthur Molitierno of Wright State Lake. Mr. Molitierno was a professor in the English Department at Wright State Lake from 1969 until his retirement in 2006. He has remained in St. Mary’s, Ohio and has recently taught again on an adjunct basis at Wright State Lake. He did his undergraduate work at Villanova University and master’s work at the University of Dayton. He also did doctoral work in American literature at Miami University of Ohio, and completed all the doctoral course work in history at Bowling Green State University. He taught at the University of Dayton as a graduate assistant in English composition and at Immaculata University as an instructor in world literature and composition before the onset of his career at Wright State University (A. Molitierno, personal communication, December 23, 2007).

Molitierno served as Secretary-Treasurer of AURCO for its first four years and as the editor of the AURCO Journal from its inception until 2006. Besides being the editor of the AURCO Journal, he served five years as the editor of TEXT Technology, an international academic quarterly journal of computer text processing, and was co-editor of AURCO Mathematics, a publication from Kent State University. He also developed Etude & Techne, a journal for essay writing for students and faculty of the regional campuses.
I arranged to meet Mr. Molitierno on the campus of Wright State Lake in Celina, Ohio, and the interview was conducted in the library conference room. Although somewhat reserved, Mr. Molitierno was very proud of the *AURCO Journal* and its impact. He did not seem to have as much detailed knowledge about the historical and political aspects of AURCO as his colleagues, Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht, but he did offer his assessment of the threat to regional campuses that existed in 1993:

I can’t recall the politics of the day. It’s been some years, but there was some push that looked at branch campuses in terms of economics. And so for example, if you came down and did a study of our campus and you found that at ten o’clock in the morning 30 or 40 percent of your classrooms were empty what would that show you? Well it would show you that there’s underutilization and so either the Board of Regents or some delegate of them or someone from the governor’s office is looking at the statistics and says “well you know there’s underutilization there, maybe these places shouldn’t exist.” Now, I don’t know who or what drove that. I’m not party to whatever went on at the time. But there was definitely a feeling that the branch campuses were in danger of some of them being eliminated and since we are, I think, the second smallest of the campuses in the state of Ohio, that danger has always existed because we’ve run through a lot of two-year programs...And we had state directives that wanted us to go into certain forms of technology. We had automotive here, for example, for some time. In fact this is the building in which we housed the automotive section, which simply didn’t pan out. We had an electronics program that didn’t pan out either. And so when you
run through programs like that, it seems like you’re running into a very defeatist attitude and you’re on the downward slope. Added to that, there’s a lot of competition locally from different colleges and many colleges coming into the area now. I mean, we had competition from our sister universities also, notably Ohio State Lima, for example, and other colleges coming down to Greenville and so forth. So the future did not look all that bright and it didn’t look bright for a number of reasons. And that was—I think people weren’t aware of contributions of these small branch campuses to the entire community. So then I think there were a number of studies done that showed the economic impact of local colleges also—with salaries, with meeting the needs of local communities and so forth. And so I think the establishment of the Association of University Regional Campuses of Ohio did a great deal in its professional way of confronting some of those issues and showing that “yes there’s significant work being done and we do make an impact on our students’ lives and the community,” when you start showing, for example, the involvement of faculty in actual community work which had not been done before either. So, that’s my recollection. I don’t have facts or statistics that I can readily recall and names either, but the general tendency at the time was that it was very “iffy” if we were going to continue (A. Molitierno, personal interview, October 22, 2007).

Most of Mr. Molitierno’s insight focused on the role of the Journal, and his many years of stewardship of that publication gave him a keen insight of its workings and significance. This was not surprising in that both Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht had
emphasized how critical Mr. Molitierno had been to the success and even the existence of the Journal. He related how the Journal began as a means of promoting scholarship among Ohio’s regional campuses:

We discussed other means of presenting faculty work and so we held yearly meetings and then we developed a journal. The initial journal came out, I edited it of course, and I edited it ever since up to 2006 when I retired. But it was not a refereed journal and after about two or three years of editing a journal we started a refereed journal. To my knowledge that’s the only refereed journal representing branch campuses in the state of Ohio. I’m not sure about the rest of the country, but it is certainly unique within the state of Ohio and has been a major contribution to scholarship for regional and branch campus faculty throughout the state ever since (A. Molitierno, personal interview, October 22, 2007).

He viewed AURCO as a vehicle to protect Ohio’s regional campuses against the threat of governmental bureaucrats who don’t fully understand their role:

People like to look at growth as an indication of progress and if you look at our communities, of the potential for rapid and sustained growth, it is not there in some communities. But stability is there and people don’t want to look at stability as a prime incentive for keeping something going. Many of our students are local, they’re homebound, they’re work bound and so forth, and they do represent a stable community for example. But we don’t have a great deal of influx of people coming into the community. Also we don’t have a great deal of out flux. So there’s an element of stability there. But the population base can only support a
certain amount of numbers for that and when people like to count beans and look at numbers then they look at “well you only have 500 full-time students or you only have 800 full-time students,” things of that sort. It seems to indicate that you’re not growing; you’re not achieving a certain kind of potential. They don’t look at where you are, what you’ve done with what you had, and that’s often a case in point. People are not interested in those kinds of stories of success. And I think with AURCO, for example, even furthering the ends of student work and student writing and scholarship, that has helped to increase our impact in the community and the scholarship of the students as well (A. Molitierno, personal interview, October 22, 2007).

**Martin Kich and Gordon Aubrecht Together**

The interviews of these first three gentlemen resulted in a consistent account of the formation and early years of AURCO. Not only were there no inconsistencies in the historical account, but there was also uniformity in the perceptions about the overall purpose and impact of AURCO. An analysis of the transcriptions of the three interviews revealed four themes that emerged about the purposes and function of AURCO: promotion of scholarship, professional advancement, collegiality, and promotion of regional campuses. These themes will be fully explored in Chapter Six. In order to confirm and further discuss the four themes and to clarify the detailed historical information provided in the first three interviews, I scheduled an interview with Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht together.
On October 26, 2007, the semi-annual business meeting was scheduled to take place at The Ohio State University Marion. I asked Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht to arrive two hours prior to the meeting. The purpose of this interview was to clarify information contained in the first round of interviews, allow a second opportunity to mention any additional significant data, and confirm the themes derived from the content analysis of the first round of interviews. This interview took place in a small conference room near Dr. Aubrecht’s office.

The interview was very cordial with much laughter interspersed among the comments. Both men seemed to truly enjoy retelling stories they had forgotten and talking about people they had not seen in years, including some who had passed away. Although both men shared an interest in AURCO and had interacted for a decade-and-a-half, they were not personal friends and had not really spent time with each other outside AURCO. This interview seemed to give them a much appreciated chance to talk about AURCO and their thoughts. There were several digressions into more recent events and articles that they promised to send to each other. They even commented on the eventuality of others watching the videotape of the interview, and how comical they might come across because of the light nature of many of their comments and their laughter.

They went into great detail about the circumstances that led to Dr. Howell becoming president. Myra West of Kent State Stark had agreed to become president and even though Howell was attending one of his first few AURCO meetings, he was nominated for vice president. He was hesitant to take it because of his newness to the
organization, and because he realized that this position was also considered president-elect. Everyone assured him that he would have two years before becoming president, so he reluctantly agreed. It then turned out that Myra West retired before assuming the office and Dr. Howell was called upon to be president immediately. Both Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht agreed that he served AURCO well.

They also retold the story of Tracey Hawkins becoming treasurer after the officers had discovered that no money had been deposited into the account for two years. The previous treasurer, Dale Schnetzer, had neglected to deposit the checks from the previous two conference registrations. An effort was made to contact the registrants and ask them to submit new checks. Most of them were cooperative but it was estimated that as much as one-fourth of the revenue from those two conferences was lost.

Both interviewees agreed that the second annual conference was probably the low point of the organization. It attracted only 75 participants compared to the 110 attending some part of the first conference. The campus representation was also more limited, with approximately 85 percent of the participants coming from the Miami campuses, the Cincinnati campuses, and Wright State Lake. Drs. Kich and Aubrecht discussed the reasons for the temporary downturn of AURCO. They felt that those who had become active because of the threats to the regional campus system lost interest after that issue was resolved. They were gradually replaced by a new group of participants represented by Robert Howell and Tracey Hawkins who had different goals for the organization. Losing two years worth of conference revenue did not do much to improve the financial health of the organization either.
Although they felt that AURCO had made great strides and was now a mature organization, both interviewees referred to the recent announcements by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents as cause to once again become concerned about the future of regional campuses in Ohio. They re-iterated the impact of the Managing for the Future Task Force in stimulating the creation of AURCO in 1993. According to Dr. Aubrecht, “There was a lot of conversation about the Managing for the Future Task Force, no doubt about it, and that was an impetus for the formation [of AURCO.] But after the first couple of meetings, we got to talking about how regional campuses could have some sort of impact because we felt powerless. This Managing for the Future thing, that’s really what it came down to, was the feeling of powerlessness. The powers-to-be were going to dictate to us and we had no say in what they were going to do.” He added that “The regional campuses all have a commonality and I believe that AURCO is an example of the recognition, I guess I would say, of such commonality. Anyway, to go beyond that Managing for the Future thing, what happened is we started talking to one another and we thought about what are the ways that we would be able to build this community. To have meetings seemed like a natural thing. Would they succeed? Well, we didn’t really know if the first one--we didn’t know if any of them would succeed. But that was a start and then so we had some meetings--some were successful and others disappointing. We had some meetings, and indeed a sense of community had seemed to be building and has only continued to grow stronger; and part of that growing stronger was the graduation of the AURCO Journal to a refereed publication” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 26, 2007).
Drs. Aubrecht and Kich discussed the role of the *AURCO Journal* as a service to regional campus faculty “because some faculty on regional campuses found it hard to find time to do research and get it published. There was publishable research being done on regional campuses that wasn’t getting published because of lack of time. And some community colleges have huge teaching loads, and some regional campuses have huge teaching loads, and sometimes it’s very much different depending on where you go. Anyway, it was thought, I mean we all thought (I think speaking for all of who were there), of having this outlet and making it sort of a part of the annual meeting. You made a presentation at the annual meeting and you could choose to submit it for peer review and see what happened. But as I say, it’s in looking at the AURCO Journal, some articles (mine especially of course) but some articles are good and some articles aren’t so good. But the thing is that, I think, if you look over the peer reviewed articles that are in that journal there are examples of scholarly activity that we see that have been published that are publishable, and useful. Maybe they’re not going to be in the first rank journals of anybody’s thing but this is a generalist journal and remember that Mendel’s papers were published in a little generalist journal from his part of Austria” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 26, 2007). Dr. Kich asserted that the articles in the AURCO Journal have gotten better as time has gone by. According to him, as the peer review process evolved, the total number of admissions has declined from the conference presentations. “It used to be everybody who did a conference presentation threw some kind of paper together to get it in the journal. Now that the peer review process has gotten a little closer, I think the number of people that turn in the paper have declined somewhat. The
number that’s gotten accepted as a percentage of that has gone up slightly. So that would suggest on both ends that there’s recognition of higher standards and quality” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 26, 2007).

Both saw the opportunity to participate in AURCO as a professional advancement tool particularly useful for faculty at the beginning of their careers. Dr. Aubrecht indicated that “A lot of people that go to regional campuses right after their Ph.D. haven’t gotten acculturated to being part of the world of scholarship” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 26, 2007). Dr. Kich believed that, “We have attracted (because of the venue for publications), a lot of the younger faculty at the regional campuses…But these people have been conditioned in graduate school to have to publish. They come out facing publication pressures. This offers them a venue for getting one or two publications right out of the gate, fairly easy, low pressure, and so they get involved in it and I think it keeps them publishing then.” He noted the personal benefit to involvement in AURCO, “We’re getting something back out of it whether it’s tangible or intangible. That’s what keeps us interested in doing it.” Dr. Kich added, “I am not pretending that everybody that’s involved in AURCO is being completely altruistic. Because I think you’re involved in something because it gives you something personally being involved. You have a sense of accomplishment” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 26, 2007).

The opportunity to interact with colleagues has been important to Dr. Kich and Aubrecht and also, they felt, to others, including their colleague Mr. Molitierno:

Art always used to say that he liked it because he got to see what the hell these other campuses look like and could remember going to the conferences, like
maybe we were going to the furthest regions in the state. And now I just get in the
car and go. You know we’ve been to a lot of the campuses now and you kind of
know where they are. There’s something about familiarity of place that reinforces
collegiality as well. You know like when I’m coming here today [OSU Marion] I
didn’t even think about how I was going here. I’ve been here enough times that
it’s sort of in my head and I think that that’s had a lot to do with it. Because, when
you’re at a regional campus, you feel like you’re out in the boonies anyway, and
so this way it lessens that sense of isolation. You also, on the regional campus,
have the one-person department. And so this gives you a chance to interact with
people in similar disciplines, if not your own discipline, that are teaching at the
same kind of institution that you are. Whereas, if you go to a professional
conference, a lot times most of the people there are at four year institutions and so
the issues, in a lot of ways, aren’t comparable (M. Kich, personal interview,
October 26, 2007).

**Another round of interviews**

As indicated in Chapter Three, a snowballing technique was utilized in the first
round of interviews that led to the suggestion of additional interview subjects. There was
a high degree of uniformity among the initial three interviews about who else was
significant in the early years of the organization. The second interview with Drs. Kich
and Aubrecht was used to confirm the names that had been mentioned. Dr. Aubrecht, Dr.
Kich, and Mr. Molitierno named three other individuals to interview: Dan Evans, Lee
Fox-Cardamone, and Robert Howell. With this information confirmed, interviews were
scheduled with these three people who were regarded as significant in the early years of AURCO, although none of them was at the original organizational meeting in 1993.

**Lee Fox Cardamone**

Dr. Lee Fox Cardamone is a professor of psychology Kent State Stark in North Canton, Ohio. She received her Ph.D. in social psychology in 1990 from Miami University of Ohio. She served as the fourth president of AURCO, and was the program chair of the AURCO conference three times. We met on November 5, 2007 at her office on the campus of Kent State Stark.

Her affiliation with AURCO began shortly after her arrival at Kent State Stark, when the AURCO representative at that campus asked for a volunteer to represent the campus at the AURCO business meeting at Miami University Hamilton. She retold the story of her first exposure to AURCO:

I had been here a month, if that, and there was an email that went out from a guy named Thomas Norton Smith saying “Was anybody interested in going to the business meeting for AURCO?” And it just so happened that it was being held at, I believe, at Miami University Hamilton campus. I didn’t know anybody, and I really didn’t know Thomas, and I sent back sort of an email saying, “Gee I wish I knew more because I would love to go back. That’s a place that I have taught at; I graduated from Miami; and I have roots in that area; and I would make the trip.”

So he was very eager to take that responsibility and pass it on. So that’s how I ended up going to my very first meeting ever, knowing virtually nothing about the organization (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).
Dr. Fox-Cardamone enjoyed interacting with her counterparts from other regional campuses and ended up being one of the organization’s leaders. She said it was “the people” that most attracted her to AURCO and caused her to become more active. But she was aware that AURCO had its origin as a more politically oriented organization:

Because I really didn’t know enough about regional campuses to know what the issues were going to be, it probably was the people more than anything [that sparked my involvement.] You know, people like Art, Marty, and a guy named Bob Howell from the University of Cincinnati. I’m sure he’s been mentioned as well, as being there early on. And then there were somebody here named Sandra Cooney who has since retired who has been in, if not in the first year, pretty darn close. And so she basically sat me down and educated me as to why this has come to be and why it was likely to be important. So, that’s really how it started (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007)

She saw AURCO as a necessary organization in light of the previously mentioned plans of the Ohio Board of Regents, but she had no knowledge of AURCO ever being required to act on that role:

I think that was the reason that AURCO was formed. At least as I remember Sandra telling me and Art telling me, that this issue of somehow streamlining the process of consolidating the regional campuses and making them more like community colleges and “blah blah blah.” It comes along, they used to say, every ten years, so a little bit more than ten years now but same sort of issue. If nothing else it’s more like networking. You would not know your colleagues throughout
the state if it wasn’t for an organization like AURCO. While that’s a loose affiliation, they keep mailing lists and they can send things out and they can mobilize support if they need to (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

Dr. Fox-Cardamone’s leadership within AURCO started when she accepted the role of conference chair for the 1997 AURCO Conference at Bowling Green State University Firelands:

They were looking for somebody to…organize [the conference], because you didn’t have to be on the campus at the time to organize the conference. And I don’t know why I thought I would be a good person to do this, since I really didn’t know anything. But I said I would do it. And that’s sort of how it started. And from there, you know, it’s like lots of organizations--there are, they would say 20 percent of the people do 80 percent of the work. I would say probably in organizations like this five or ten percent of the people do almost everything. So when they had elections, the first thing I remember doing is being vice-president. Maybe the guys remember me before that; but I don’t know that I ever did secretary, treasurer or any of those kinds of things, because I think I was vice-president and then I moved up (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

Some of Dr. Fox’s comments emphasized the limited opportunity for regional campus faculty to interact, even within their own system. In fact, in referring to AURCO’s current president, Brad Shepherd, also of Kent State Stark, she indicated that
she hardly ever saw him now that he had moved his office to the other building on campus.

After thirteen years at Kent State Stark, Dr. Fox-Cardamone was aware of regional campus faculty concerns and felt that AURCO filled a need that faculty might have. She referred to regional campus faculty as “second class citizens” because the main campus doesn’t always remember that the regional campuses are out there:

This is my thirteenth year and I think it’s difficult for a home campus to first of all remember there are other campuses out there doing similar things. And I think that in their minds what we do is not as important because of--at least here in the Kent system--our mission is more teaching than research oriented. And while there is a research expectation, I can’t think of any discipline where it’s the same expectations it would be on the Kent campus. Now, I don’t think that’s true everywhere and my understanding of Ohio State is you publish or perish. It doesn’t matter where you are. Like, I remember hearing unhappiness about that; but I think even then the assumption is what we do wouldn’t be the same quality; won’t be the same quantity; and what research is, what researchers think, pays the bills. I don’t think that’s actually how it works but that’s what they think. So anybody can teach. You should know that anybody can teach (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

She also noted differences within the Kent State system, with size being the primary determinant of faculty satisfaction. Kent State Stark is often considered the premiere of Kent’s regional campuses because of its large number of students and location in an
urban area. Her opinion of teaching at Kent State Stark was similar to Dr. Aubrecht’s analogy of the best of both worlds and supported the research findings of Wolfe (1995) at Wright State Lake. “If you like to teach then you would get to teach a lot more. You get to keep your hand active in whatever it is you’re trained to do. So you get to do the research end of it. There’s maybe a little more time for service. If you’re not suffering from a little bit of self-esteem issues, then this is a good gig. But if you trained to be a researcher, you may always wonder if you would’ve made it in a different setting” (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

Dr. Fox-Cardamone saw both the AURCO Conference and the *AURCO Journal* as important tools for professional advancement. According to her, establishing the review process enhanced the *Journal*’s benefit to regional campus faculty. “It was a conference but it wasn’t a refereed or peer reviewed kind of conference, the *Journal* wasn’t at that time. Pretty much you put in for it and most people got included. And one of the things I pushed for was making it at least peer reviewed which worked well for a while… We would follow as close as you could an informal peer review process so that people could count AURCO a little bit differently than they were able to do before at least. It still doesn’t count like the *Psychology Journal* or *Personality* or *Social Psychology* or something. But it counts as a peer reviewed statewide journal, so it carries a seal a little bit. Well it helps round out your record” (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

Dr. Fox-Cardamone last attended an AURCO conference in 2003 and has not kept up on AURCO activities and personalities since then. After serving AURCO as an officer
and a conference program chair, Dr. Fox became more active in organizations such as AAUP, and simply drifted away from participation in AURCO. She did not rule out becoming active again, but said she has extensive duties as the campus president of AAUP. As the interview ended, she pondered the absence of research about regional campuses, and expressed approval that someone was taking the time to document the history of AURCO: “I think getting the history down is probably a good idea for AURCO just because we don’t have that. Even though it has not been around terribly long; that stuff easily gets lost in the midst of time” (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007).

**Dan Evans**

Dr. Dan Evans is Dean of Ohio University Southern and Executive Dean of the Ohio University Regional Campuses. He became Dean of Wright State Lake shortly after the formation of AURCO and had been mentioned by all three of the initial interviewees. Dr. Evans arrived at Wright State Lake on July 1, 1994, about seven months after the AURCO organizational meeting, but still prior to the first AURCO conference. In 2000, he was named Dean of Ohio University Southern where he remains today. Dr. Evans began his undergraduate career at Ohio University Southern earning a B.A. in English and then a Ph.D. in higher education from Ohio University. Prior to his position at Wright State Lake, he was an administrator at Shawnee State University, and an instructor at Ohio University Southern (Dan Evans named Southern campus dean, 2000). In 2006 he was also appointed executive dean for regional campuses for the Office of University Outreach and Regional Campuses (Dan Evans named executive dean, 2006).
Dr. Aubrecht, Dr. Kich, and Mr. Molitierno acknowledged the financial support that Dr. Evans gave to AURCO. He subsidized faculty attendance at AURCO conferences, and funded the publication of the *AURCO Journal* through Wright State Lake. After moving to Ohio University Southern he gave permission for the online version of the *AURCO Journal* to be hosted on the OU Southern web server. On November 26, 2007 I traveled to Ironton, Ohio to interview him. Dr. Evans downplayed his contributions, which he thought were minor. He re-iterated his support for the organization, and praised the service it provides to faculty. Dr. Evans said that he tried “to get out of the way and make sure that I could support our faculty during the early years of AURCO” (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007). He was particularly appreciative that faculty could present at the AURCO Conference and publish in the *AURCO Journal*.

Dr. Evans pointed out some of the basic difficulties for faculty on the regional campuses: being the only faculty member of a department, having tenuous ties to the department on the main campus, and having limited resources for conducting scholarly research. He thought it made sense to support AURCO as a venue to grow professionally, particularly at a campus like Wright State Lake:

You would have thought that a multi-campus institution might have really been the impetus for starting it rather than a single campus institution. But when you think about it, you realize that it’s the single campus institutions that probably have the least amount of opportunity to feel like they’re part of something because they’re so small and the main campus doesn’t really have much of a clue
about what it means to be a faculty at regional campuses. At a multi-campus at least you have some brothers and sisters, you know, from other campuses. And you come together occasionally; you have an opportunity to communicate and to share with each other. So I guess, when you think about why Wright State, as that single, small campus sort of reaching out and trying to understand what it means to be a faculty member on regional campus (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007).

His financial support of the *AURCO Journal* was based primarily on his desire to provide professional advancement opportunities for his own faculty:

I saw the journal not only as being something good for the organization, but it would be something good for our faculty members. At regional campuses, faculty members still have to stand on the three legs of the stool and when we have teaching, scholarship, and service, (and at regional campuses our primary emphasis is on teaching and our secondary emphasis is probably on service) and it becomes difficult sometimes to really engage faculty members in what I’ll refer to as meaningful scholarship. In many cases they’re the only faculty member in the department on your campus. It’s difficult to make the connection back to the department for a main campus that’s many miles away. It’s difficult for them to go to department meetings and sometimes they’re not even welcomed if they do go to the meetings. And they often feel like they’re alone in trying to establish some meaningful scholarship and to continue to do some research work. And so it made a lot of sense to me that if we could establish a journal it would give our
faculty members a chance to grow professionally and to do it in a much safer, more secure environment than going to a national conference and making your first presentation. You would be among friends here; so not only an opportunity to publish in a journal but an opportunity to go to a conference and to make a presentation at the conference. It seemed to me that this was the missing link to getting some of our folks ready, prepared professionally, to go out to a national conference or even a regional conference and make a presentation. And I’ve seen that happen. I mean personally I have encouraged our own, the faculty at every campus that I have ever been, those also at Ohio University. We have five campuses and I think I continued to encourage our faculty members to go there. I’ve encouraged the faculty members at the Southern campus to go there and I used it as a regular means of the evaluation that I had with faculty (D. Evans, personal interview” November 26, 2007).

In response to a question about the lack of research about regional campuses, Dr. Evans suggested that AURCO may want to consider funding someone, possibly a graduate student, to do research about regional campuses:

I think that the reason that we don’t see a lot of research that’s related to regional campuses is because it depends on the faculty members’ interests. Faculty members typically have a discipline and they’re typically interested in the discipline and they’re working on research that has to do with their discipline. I think if-- and there have been discussions about this, probably every year since AURCO has been formed-- about using some of the money that AURCO creates
through dues to buy some research about regional campuses. Find a graduate student somewhere and pay them an amount of stipend and say “we would really like to encourage you to do some research about regional campuses. And if you do, you know there’s going to be a $500 stipend or a $1,000 stipend that’s going to help you with that research.” I know that discussion has occurred several times. I don’t know if we have ever been able to pull that off at least formally, but I would like to see the organization focus in some way in trying to get more information on regional campuses (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007).

Although Dr. Evans was unaware of any faculty organizations similar to AURCO, he was familiar with the two national venues for regional campus administrators: the Regional Branch Campus Administrators Conference (RBCA) and the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators. In fact, he serves on the executive committee of NABCA. Although faculty members are allowed to attend the conferences of these two organizations, few do, and according to him, the focus is clearly on administrative issues rather than faculty concerns.

Interviewing Dr. Evans also gave me an opportunity to ask him about the Ohio Association of Regional Campuses, the group of all of the regional campus deans in Ohio. OARC meets about ten times each year, and the agenda includes an update from each campus and issues that are relevant for branch campus operations. The meetings also serve as a venue for state officials such as the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents to address all regional campus deans at the same time. Dr. Evans has found these
meetings to be useful as an opportunity to interact with colleagues. He told of how, as a
new dean at Wright State Lake interacting with other regional campus deans, he was
relieved to find that the issues he dealt with were common among the regional campuses.
This made it easy for him to understand that faculty could benefit from the same type of
interaction through AURCO. Dr. Evans thought that it was significant that AURCO grew
out of a “grass roots” effort by faculty who felt the need for an affiliation. Had such an
organization been formed by OARC on behalf of the faculty, Dr. Evans felt that it would
not have been as successful.

**Robert Howell**

On December 10, 2007 I met with Dr. Robert Howell at his office at the
University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College, in Blue Ash, a suburb of Cincinnati.
Dr. Howell is a professor of chemistry who received his BS in Mathematics from Penn
State University. After spending four years in the Marine Corps, one of which was spent
in Vietnam, and leaving as a captain, he taught in the Raleigh, North Carolina City
Schools. He entered graduate school after three years of high school teaching, skipped a
master’s degree, and earned a Ph.D. in chemistry from North Carolina State University in
1979. He began teaching at the Raymond Walters College in 1978, while completing his
dissertation. In 1984, Dr. Howell became Assistant Dean of Admissions, and then
returned to a full-time faculty position after seven years. He was elected Department
Chair in 2001, was appointed as Interim Associate Dean for Outreach and Continuing
Education in 2006, and Interim Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in 2007 (R. Howell,
personal communication, December 31, 2007).
Dr. Howell first attended an AURCO meeting in 1996 and became president in 1997. He related the story of being asked to become vice-president, a position which is also considered to be the president-elect. He was hesitant to serve because he was so new to AURCO. He agreed only after being assured that it would be two years before he would move up to president. As it turned out, the recently selected president, Myra West, retired from her position at Kent State Stark and never became AURCO president. Dr. Howell then became president two years ahead of schedule. He later served as program chair for the 2000 AURCO Conference that took place at the University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College. For the past several years his duties on campus have prevented him from maintaining a high level of activity in AURCO.

His involvement in AURCO began when he accepted the position as the AURCO faculty representative for the Raymond Walters College. He explained that at his campus the AURCO representative position is an elected position that is part of the election process of the faculty assembly. He attended his first AURCO Board meeting at University of Miami Hamilton and found it to be “a revelation:”

So I went to the first meeting at Miami Hamilton and found that the organization had been founded in response to what was called Managing for the Future, which was the early ‘90’s equivalent of the Fingerhut initiative now. Everything just keeps coming back. And they wanted to make regional campuses community colleges and I happened to been on a committee at UC that responded to that. So, I was involved at this level but I wasn’t involved in the state level like the AURCO people were. But joining it was sort of a revelation to me, because I had
been here for a number of years (probably fourteen or fifteen years) and I thought we were so special; that our faculty were so good, so dedicated, so student-oriented and we just did everything so well. And what I learned was that everyone on a regional campus is like that; we’re all special, that every campus has a dedication to students and quality faculty (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

According to Dr. Howell, his participation in AURCO gave him “a better feeling for what the regional campus mission was all about” (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

Dr. Howell’s first experience with AURCO was a pleasant one. And, much like Dr. Fox-Cardamone, it was “the people” that was the attraction for participation. In fact, the first meeting he attended was the same one at University of Miami Hamilton that was Dr. Fox-Cardamone’s introduction to AURCO. According to Dr. Howell, “She was the first AURCO person I met. I walked into the meeting room and sat down next to her and started up a conversation.” He went on to add, “And it’s kind of nice that as a result of AURCO, I have friends probably at most regional campuses and some central campuses” (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

Dr. Howell, along with Dr. Fox Cardamone, had served as an associate editor of the AURCO Journal, and he praised the role that Mr. Molitierno had played in “taking it from some pages stapled together to a pretty nice journal. It went from un-refereed to refereed under Art.” He added, “It’s a nice outlet for the kinds of things that interest regional campus faculty and it gives people the opportunity to present and publish in an
established journal and share their work” (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

According to Dr. Howell, AURCO, through its promotion of scholarship, provided professional advancement opportunities for regional campus faculty:

I think that in some disciplines, like sciences, it’s difficult to do the traditional kind of scholarly activities that you would expect of university faculty not on a regional campus. You know you have graduate students, you have research labs, you have research assistants and post docs. But you just don’t have that kind of space and personnel to do that kind of thing. So there’s been a real push on regional campuses and on central campuses for what’s called the scholarship of teaching and learning as publishable material. And I think, at least in the state of Ohio, AURCO has sort of taken a lead in that because that’s what we do here (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

Our conversation included a discussion of the plans for the University System of Ohio by The Ohio Board of Regents. Dr. Howell shared with me his concern that not enough attention was being paid to the plan and its possible implications for Ohio’s regional campuses. He was unable to attend the October 26, 2007 AURCO business meeting, but he did share with me his attempts to have this topic placed on the agenda:

I emailed Brad [AURCO President Brad Shepherd] when I first saw the University System of Ohio and some of the rumors about the Fingerhut plan. I thought that ought to be a topic for AURCO. So I sent that on because he didn’t know anything about it at the time. But I suggested that he might want to get that
out there in advance so that people could come with whatever information they had, whatever concerns that they had. Did that take place? I suspect that it did not (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

I indicated that Dr. Aubrecht had led a discussion at the meeting and shared a transcript of a conversation between AAUP officials and Chancellor Fingerhut. Although he was pleased that the topic was discussed, he was disappointed to learn that no action had been taken. Dr. Howell reiterated, “It seems an important political role for AURCO and it has not happened” (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

I also took advantage of this opportunity to talk with someone from a regional campus so close to its main campus, to see if the dynamics might be different or that there may be less compelling reasons for faculty to affiliate with AURCO. I was surprised to learn that Dr. Howell considered the University of Cincinnati campuses to be on the extreme end of lack of contact with each other. Despite being located within 20 miles of each other, there appears to be little interaction among the faculty of the main campus and the two regional campuses:

Unlike almost all regional campuses we are accredited separately from our central campus. We are funded by the state separately from our central campus. We have a separate state budget. Our promotion and tenure process goes to the provost; but all the guidelines and procedures are here. I am not a member of the chemistry department in the College of Arts and Sciences and the University of Cincinnati. Historically, I’m not sure if you know their history, it grew sort of by engulfing other units. There was a conservatory of music. There were actually two music
schools in the area and all of a sudden they became part of the University of Cincinnati. The College of Applied Science was the Ohio Mechanics Institute, an independent place that became part of the University of Cincinnati. And so, they all had their own independent history and autonomy and for a long time. It has changed considerably. For a long time the colleges acted almost as if they weren’t a part of the university. Students who were in the College of Arts and Sciences on the main campus, who switched to the College of Business in the not too distant past, actually received transfer credits from the College of Arts and Sciences into the College of Business. And they were just walking from building to building--very strange. So I don’t know everybody in the Arts and Science chemistry department. I have relatively little interaction with them. When I was the department chair I had some interaction with them but mostly through the American Chemical Society meetings and not the University of Cincinnati. So, we’re far too independent out here and it sometimes causes problems. The big concern now is that the university will undoubtedly switch to semesters. We have a representative on the central committee and what she is trying to do is make sure that every appropriate department in our college has on their transition team, a representative from one of the two regional campuses to be our point person so that they don’t do things and then we scramble in the following year to catch up. That happens a lot when the baccalaureate programs change and then after the fact they tell us of the change and we have to make those changes. We’ve been, I think, too independent (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007)
The Interviews Prove to be Useful

Seven interviews with six people over the span of nine weeks allowed the discovery of information on the formation of AURCO, its subsequent growth and development, and the role it played and continues to play in the lives of some regional campus faculty. Interviewing three people present at AURCO’s organizational meeting in 1993 minimized the need to rely on one person and the possibility that his account might be biased. The information supplied by the first three interviews allowed a reconstruction of the history of the formation and of AURCO. The second interview of Dr. Kich and Aubrecht together did much to clarify the information, and confirm the themes that emerged during the first three interviews. The interviews with the other three provided an expansion of information and additional insight on the growth of AURCO beyond its formation.
CHAPTER 6: THE THEMES

Themes Emerge From the First Interviews

The first round of three interviews produced valuable information about the formation and growth of AURCO. In addition, the interviewees offered many reflections about their personal relationship with AURCO and the benefits they received as active members. It became apparent that certain concepts were being repeated by all three participants. An analysis of the transcripts of the first three interviews revealed four distinct but overlapping themes about the roles AURCO could play in the lives of regional campus faculty and on behalf of regional campuses: promotion of scholarship, professional advancement, collegiality, and promotion of regional campuses.

The primary purpose of the interview conducted on October 26, 2007 with Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht together was to confirm that the themes detected from the interview transcripts reflected their thoughts about the purpose of AURCO, and to determine if there were any other themes that they felt explained AURCO’s role. As it turned out, these two participants agreed that the themes reflected their perceptions about the roles that AURCO plays among regional campus faculty. During the subsequent interviews, the other participants were asked to share their perceptions of the roles of AURCO, using the themes as guidelines.

Promotion of Scholarship

The interviewees made frequent mention of how the annual conference and the AURCO Journal had caused numerous regional campus faculty to conduct research with a goal of using AURCO to disseminate their information. Most of the presentations at
AURCO conferences and the articles in the *AURCO Journal* are of a pedagogic nature and share best practices in instruction. Dr. Kich claimed that information he had received through years of writing the newsletter suggested that the amount of research by regional campus faculty had increased. Specifically, he noted that the numbers of published articles by regional campus faculty outside of the *AURCO Journal* have also increased. He attributed much of this to the role of the AURCO conferences and the *AURCO Journal*. He used Kent State Stark as an example because he regularly receives a Kent State publication that lists all the faculty publications. According to Kich, in the early days of AURCO, approximately 85 percent of the publications of the Kent State University regional faculty were in the *AURCO Journal*. Now perhaps 85 percent are outside of AURCO. According to Dr. Aubrecht, one article by Myra West in *The Physics Teacher* was the only publication from a Kent State Stark faculty when AURCO began. Now there are fifty reviewed articles, only a few of which are in the *AURCO Journal* (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Mr. Molitierno’s years of experience as journal editor caused him to feel that many of the faculty who submitted articles would not have written them in the first place if not for the existence of the *AURCO Journal*. He saw the conversion of the *AURCO Journal* to a reviewed publication as a huge step forward in the professionalization of regional campus faculty. As an example of this Dr. Kich told how regional campus faculty became more familiar with the presentation method of conference papers. As was indicated previously, he recalled that many of the attendees in the early days complained that the presenters were just reading their papers aloud. He surmised that those attendees
had never been to a professional conference in which papers were read. In the past couple of years, those criticisms have ceased.

Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht agreed that the opportunity to publish was more important to some faculty than others. For regional campus faculty of The Ohio State University, tenure is granted through the home department rather than through the regional campus, so there has always been an emphasis on research for those faculty members. According to Dr. Aubrecht, Ohio State and Miami are the two exceptions in terms of research expectations. Yet even faculty members from those six campuses have contributed to the *AURCO Journal*. In fact, Dr. Aubrecht himself is one of the most prolific contributors in addition to being widely published in national professional associations. He attributed this to his close affiliation to AURCO, as well as the fact that the *AURCO Journal* has a fixed deadline. He commented about numerous articles for physics-related journals that he wants to write but never gets around to. But knowing that the *AURCO Journal* has a deadline has caused him to put aside other work to get articles submitted. Dr. Aubrecht saw AURCO as “providing an avenue for promoting scholarship on the regional campuses where it’s less valued. Asking people to be involved in the research and presenting their research, much of it on pedagogical themes, is important and increases the size of the pool” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

In the estimation of the founders of AURCO, the organization has done much to close the scholarship gap between campuses like those of Ohio State and Miami and the rest of Ohio’s regional campuses. They feel that AURCO has raised the level of scholarship throughout the regional campus system. In fact, Dr. Kich feels that AURCO
has reached beyond the regional campus system to influence the level of scholarship among Ohio’s community and technical colleges. He is one of the few AURCO participants to remain active in OATYC (Ohio Association of Two Year Colleges) after the formation of AURCO. He felt that the continual improvements to the *AURCO Journal* caused the journal published by OATYC to become more professional and certainly larger. Although, at first glance, this may appear to be unlikely, an examination of the OATYC website reveals that three of twelve OATYC board members are from regional campuses, including the current editor of the *OATYC Journal* (OATYC board, 2007). So there would seem to be the opportunity for that influence to occur. In fact, at the 2007 OATYC Annual Conference, 10 out of 30 conference breakout sessions were led by faculty from Ohio’s 23 regional campuses. Represented campuses included Bowling Green Firelands, Kent State University Tuscarawas, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College, The University of Akron Wayne College, Ohio University Chillicothe, and Miami University Middletown (OATYC News, 2007).

Dr. Fox-Cardamone has also published in the *AURCO Journal* and saw it as an avenue to publication that fits the needs of most regional campus faculty. She indicated that the situation varied from system to system and even within campuses of the same system in terms of emphasis on research and access to resources necessary for research. Dr. Howell also pointed out that in some disciplines it is difficult for regional campus faculty to carry out the traditional scholarly activities because of the lack of laboratories and graduate student assistants. He proclaimed AURCO as a “great outlet for scholarly activity” (B. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).
Dr. Evans indicated that one of the biggest reasons he has been supportive of AURCO is its ability to provide opportunities that would probably not otherwise be available to regional campus faculty. Even among faculty with opportunities to submit to publications within their discipline, AURCO often provides an accessible starting point for those who lack experience in research and publication. He offered a very detailed example of his encouragement of a faculty member in art history at Ohio University Southern. Dr. Evans urged him to participate in AURCO. This faculty member had never given a presentation before, but his first presentation at the AURCO Conference led him to give presentations within his discipline and at national conferences. Dr. Evans credits AURCO with providing that needed first step toward an increased emphasis on scholarship.

**Professional Advancement**

The opportunity to present and publish can be a significant component of any faculty member’s accumulation of credentials for professional advancement. In addition, AURCO has provided opportunities to serve in leadership capacities. Several interviewees cited the value that AURCO had provided to them and others in creating professional opportunities that made them more effective and successful as educators. Mr. Molitierno conceded that he didn’t have the statistics to back it up, but thought it would be an interesting topic of study, even for an academic paper, to see how influential publishing in the *AURCO Journal* has been in helping people get tenure or a position on their campus.
As was previously mentioned, the interview participants viewed presenting at an AURCO conference to be a good way of doing a first presentation in a friendly atmosphere. Dr. Aubrecht spoke of the intimidation factor of presenting to a large national conference with perhaps many more participants. He was aware of situations in which people went on to present at the Modern Language Association or other national venues within their discipline after they gave their first presentation at AURCO. Dr. Evans, in his example of the first-time presenter from his campus, portrayed AURCO as a safe, secure environment to get a feel for whether a presentation could be taken to a broader audience.

Dr. Kich referred to faculty evaluations at Wright State Lake as further evidence of both professionalization and professional advancement. The entire sum of faculty publications in the mid 1990’s were his publications, except for one book review by Mr. Molitierno. Although faculty were attending conferences and doing presentations, they were not publishing. That same list today, according to Dr. Kich, shows not only people regularly publishing in the *AURCO Journal*, but also in top peer reviewed journals.

In the October 26, 2007 joint interview with Drs. Aubrecht and Kich, both conceded that not everyone’s involvement in AURCO is altruistic. It is expected that faculty will find ways to serve the academic community, and many have found AURCO to be a rewarding way to serve. Both confirmed that they had benefited personally from their involvement in AURCO, even though their own professional advancement was not at the forefront of their reasons for involvement. Both agreed that holding an office in AURCO was typically regarded positively by campus administration and was worth
including in a vita. Dr. Kich shared that in the past few years the process of choosing officers has evolved into more of a selection process rather than an election process, in part to ensure that AURCO would be served by those with a passion for the organization rather than those who were just seeking a position. In the past, a newcomer would occasionally emerge and announce interest in running for an office. According to Dr. Kich, it sometimes appeared that their motivation was to add an elected position to their résumé. In more recent times there has been a more open discussion ahead of time about who might likely serve and steps have been taken to encourage those who are truly committed to AURCO.

Dr. Howell gave the most resounding endorsement of AURCO’s role in promoting professional advancement of regional campus faculty. When asked if he felt that promoting professional advancement was a significant function of AURCO he replied by saying, “Wow! I am a professor of chemistry and I really think it’s because of my involvement in AURCO that I could present credentials that the university would say were appropriate for me to be named a professor. Because I don’t have research facilities, and the truth is, I took this job because I didn’t want to spend my life begging for money by writing grants. I wanted to teach. I wanted to work with people who are in interested in teaching.” He went on to say, “Through AURCO I’ve had some organizational functions, I’ve been a president, I had an opportunity to referee some articles in the AURCO Journal, I was an associate editor of the Journal, I’ve been a conference chair. These are lots of things that are professional and scholarly activities that I wouldn’t have had an opportunity to do if it hadn’t been for AURCO.” He ended his personal
testimonial to AURCO by saying, “I know I might have found another outlet for that energy, but it was my outlet and it served me well professionally. I think it’s done that for a lot of people” (B. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

**Collegiality**

All participants strongly agreed that the opportunity to interact with colleagues from the regional campuses throughout the state has been one of the most pleasant and rewarding aspects of their affiliation with AURCO. It was the main reason Dr. Fox-Cardamone joined AURCO in the first place. It is what Dr. Kich thinks of when he thinks of AURCO. All had fond memories of interacting with colleagues that they may not have known otherwise. Dr. Howell said, “That’s the best part, to understand that everybody has the same sort of goals, is dealing with the same sorts of issues, the same kind of population of students.” He added, “One of my favorite things about being part of this organization is that I have friends all over the state, who might not be in my discipline or regional campus faculty, but we share a lot in common” (B. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht spoke of the important role AURCO played in providing a “cross fertilization for faculty members of the various campuses to be able to talk to one another in ways that they wouldn’t normally be able, to have peers who have similar, not identical, but similar job situations with fairly high teaching loads and some expectations for scholarly activities” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). Mr. Molitierno, in his remarks, also used the term “cross fertilization” in describing how AURCO “represented a real opportunity and people had not had that opportunity before...
There was no venue, there was no means of sharing, nor was there any means of faculty contacting other faculty directly, face to face communication, making presentations, seeing what other scholarship in the realm and other fields have been done. An so from that standpoint AURCO was a major impetus for faculty to meet together and find out who’s who, what’s going on, and how work was proceeding at other campuses. And that allowed a great deal of a kind of cross fertilization of faculty” (A. Molitierno, personal interview, October 22, 2007).

Dr. Evans saw collegiality as an important theme and even more important for the small systems. He felt that regional campus faculty members in systems with only one regional campus were at a particular disadvantage when it came to opportunities to interact with colleagues. Ohio University, with five regional campuses, is unique in the state in that faculty from those five campuses meet once a year at a regional campus conference. This at least gives them the opportunity to meet their counterparts at the other regional campuses. Faculty at Wright State Lake, University of Akron Wayne College, and Bowling Green Firelands do not have this opportunity. Dr. Evans was pleased when AURCO became established enough that a faculty member might refer another faculty member to participate and he envisioned the conversation. “Hey, you need to go check out AURCO. It’s a good place to find out what it’s like to be a faculty member. You might be the only art history professor at Wright State Lake, but if you go to AURCO you may find in the discipline that there are four or five other art history faculty members at other regional campuses, and you’ll have a chance to talk about what they are doing on their campus.” Dr. Evans went on to call AURCO “a really great way for faculty
members to network in a way that simply wasn’t possible in a small system” (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007). Dr. Evans also appreciated the chance to interact with faculty on an informal basis at AURCO meetings. He sometimes got to talk with faculty from his own campus in a way that he was not able to on-campus. By attending the AURCO Conference he has met faculty from all over the state and established relationships with people he would not have met otherwise.

**Promotion of Regional Campuses**

During the first three interviews (with Kich, Aubrecht, and Molitierno) a theme that was mentioned quite often was AURCO’s role in promoting regional campuses. All three of these interviewees pointed out AURCO’s role in promoting regional campus identity, protecting the interests of regional campus faculty, and creating a unified front against attacks on the regional campus system. However, differences of opinion emerged as this theme was discussed with the second round of interviewees, those who had not been involved during the era of the Managing for the Future Task Force. Dr. Fox-Cardamone and Dr. Evans mentioned but did not emphasize AURCO’s role and Dr. Howell took exception with this theme.

Dr. Aubrecht was most vocal about the uniqueness of Ohio’s regional campus system and the need to create a “united front to do something that would protect…a jewel that the state doesn’t necessarily realize that it has” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). According to Dr. Aubrecht, AURCO was needed to provide a foundation for a united response to challenges to the worth of regional campuses. In a reference to the Managing for the Future Task Force, he said one of the
reasons for establishing an annual meeting was to create a venue to “meet about the challenges of the people trying to get rid of the regional campuses way back when” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). He felt it crucial to have an apparatus already in place for those times when regional campus needed to organize as one voice to promote regional campuses. To him, having a united front seemed a much stronger position than having 23 individual campuses trying to sort things out and not cooperating. “We must all hang together or we shall all hang separately,” he said, referring to Benjamin Franklin’s pronouncement (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007). He conceded that AURCO was not a lobbying organization, but yet, “it is an organization representing many faculty and many regional campuses, and that commonality leads to some sort of authority…when we are talking about regional campuses in Ohio, and I hope that gets us listened to in the state halls, whatever they are grinding on, whatever happens in education. I think in the past we have had some impact, so the hope is to continue to have an impact and we will have an impact because we are united” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 9, 2007).

Dr. Aubrecht’s emphasis on this political function is consistent with the view expressed by others that he was “the most politically aware and politically schooled person in the organization” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007). According to Dr. Kich, “There were several instances where issues arose that affected regional campuses where the rest of us would have been oblivious to the importance of the issue. He not only brought our attention to it but…the organization responded with letters and had some input. I’m not exactly sure of what our influence or impact ultimately was, but
we at least expressed our views as an organization, which we wouldn’t have done if it wasn’t for him” (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007).

Mr. Molitierno emphasized the need to promote the work that takes place on regional campuses and the contribution to their communities. One of AURCO’s purposes, according to him was “showing that there is significant work being done [on regional campuses] and we do make an impact on our students’ lives and the community. When you start showing, for example, the involvement of faculty in actual community work which had not been done there before” (Molitierno, October 22, 2007). Mr. Molitierno thought that regional campus faculty members were making contributions that went unacknowledged and that factor was a large part of the impetus for finding an outlet for showing what faculty members were doing through the creation of AURCO. He concedes that there was an element of self preservation to this. He pointed out that the combined students of the 23 regional campuses would make it the second largest university in the state. This is a significant force that the state should pay attention to, and he thought this was one of the driving forces in the formation of AURCO.

But among the second round of interviews, discussion of AURCO as a promoter of regional campuses was much less significant. Dr. Fox spoke of the original political purpose of AURCO as something that she had heard about when she became active in AURCO. She also saw the maintenance of the mailing lists as an important tool so that “they can send things out and mobilize support if they need to” (L. Fox-Cardamone, personal interview, November 5, 2007). But her references to past and future promotional activity did not include any acknowledgement of a present-day role. And although Dr.
Evans agreed that these four themes represented AURCO’s major functions and roles, his examples and references pertained to the other three themes.

Dr. Howell very clearly indicated that promoting Ohio’s regional campuses was not a function that he felt AURCO was currently fulfilling in an adequate manner. According to him, “We don’t do that much.” He went on to say, “I am not sure that AURCO activities go much beyond the regional campuses. I don’t think we do much outside the AURCO framework” (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007). He cited the lack of activity publicizing Ohio’s regional campuses, and assisting in raising their profile to outside stakeholders, particularly potential students. He mentioned that as president he took AURCO’s political and promotional role quite seriously and recalls writing letters representing AURCO’s interests. But according to Dr. Howell, in recent years, AURCO seems to have strayed away from its original purpose of standing as a champion for Ohio’s regional campuses’ interests.

One recent example would seem to bear out Dr. Howell’s assertions. During the interview he referred to the initiative of the Ohio Board of Regents and Chancellor Eric Fingerhut, called the University System of Ohio. According to a website set up for the initiative, the University System of Ohio represents a ten year master plan for higher education in Ohio (Chancellor begins preview of goals, 2007). Both Dr. Kich and Dr. Aubrecht had made reference to this initiative and drew parallels between the concerns for regional campuses with the 1992 release of the report of the Managing for the Future Task Force and the impending release of the recommendations of the University System of Ohio scheduled for March of 2008. As was the case in 1992 and 1993, many rumors
circulated about how Ohio’s regional campuses may or may not fit into the ten year master plan. Prior to the October 26, 2007 AURCO Board Meeting, Dr. Howell had emailed the AURCO president, Brad Shepherd, to suggest a discussion of the rumors specifically and the plan in general. Dr. Howell recommended distributing information in advance so participants would be briefed and in a position to discuss the initiative and AURCO’s response. Dr. Howell was unable to attend that meeting and inquired whether I was present. I informed him that Dr. Aubrecht had shared the transcript of a conference call between Chancellor Fingerhut and members of AAUP (American Association of University Professors), but that no formal action was taken and no follow-up planned. Dr. Howell, although disappointed in the lack of response, attributed it to the lack of familiarity with the initiative and its goals.

Summary

During the course of three interviews with three participants in AURCO’s organizational meeting in 1993, four themes emerged describing how these participants viewed the roles and functions of AURCO: promotion of scholarship, professional advancement, collegiality, and promotion of regional campuses. A follow-up interview with two of these participants together seemed to confirm that these four themes represented AURCO’s activities quite well. However, as the themes were discussed with three interviewees who were not part of the 1993 organizational meeting a difference of perspective emerged. These three participants agreed that AURCO has played a major role in promoting scholarship among regional campus faculty, creating avenues for professional advancement, and providing a venue for faculty interaction and collegiality.
However they either downplayed AURCO’s political role or disagreed that AURCO had been playing a significant role in promoting the interests of regional campuses.
CHAPTER 7: EXAMINING THE RECORD

Analyzing the Themes as Indicators of Effectiveness

During the interviews with six people prominent in AURCO’s history, a number of indicators of AURCO’s success were suggested. Some cited the longevity of the organization, some cited the role of the AURCO Journal, and some pointed to the number of faculty, campuses, and systems that have been involved over the years. All agreed that an organization that has lasted nearly thirteen years must be providing some value to its members.

The themes that emerged during the first round of interviews provide one basis by which to measure the organization’s success. To review, the first three participants felt that AURCO had provided a valuable and measurable service by encouraging scholarship among regional campus faculty, enabling participating faculty to find avenues for professional advancement, creating a venue for collegiality, and promoting regional campuses. All six participants in the interviews agreed that the first three themes represented the value that AURCO provided. However there was some disagreement on whether AURCO was living up to its role in promoting regional campuses. To further the understanding of the purposes and effectiveness of AURCO, I examined the publications and records of the organization to see if they affirmed, expanded, or contradicted the statements of the interviewees. The information from these artifacts provided additional information about the history of AURCO through the participants in its activities.
Promotion of Scholarship

Since its inception in 1996 as a newsletter that reprinted presentations from the AURCO conferences through its current status as a reviewed journal, 217 regional campus faculty, staff, and administrators have had a work published in the *AURCO Journal*. This includes not only the reviewed articles appearing since 1999 but also the presentations reprinted from 1995 through 1998, as well as plenary presentations and panel presentations. Table 2 indicates the campus affiliation of those 217 individuals.

Table 2

*Institutional Affiliation of Faculty Published in the AURCO Journal 1995-2007*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Number of Published Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Ashtabula</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University East Liverpool</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Geauga</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Salem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Stark</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Trumbull</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State University Tuscarawas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Hamilton</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Middletown</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Lima</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Mansfield</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Presenters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Marion</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Newark</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Eastern</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Lancaster</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Zanesville</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron Wayne</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati Clermont College</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati University College</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State University Lake</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of published presenters</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Table 2 includes reviewed articles, non-reviewed articles, panel presentations, and plenary addresses if they were published in the following year’s *AURCO Journal*.

**Scholarship of Faculty at Specific Campuses**

Certainly AURCO has provided an opportunity for a number of individuals to present and possibly be published. But how much has this affected the atmosphere of scholarship on their home campuses? It is unlikely that a campus such as a Kent State Salem has been much impacted by one faculty member serving as a co-presenter in 1995 and having this re-printed in 1996 (Villela, 1996). The Salem campus has 43 fulltime faculty members and only one has had his work published in the AURCO Journal. But that one person, Dr. Ed Villela, is still on faculty (Full-time faculty, 2007). But perhaps
on other campuses, with more AURCO participants, there is more of a possibility of influence.

Scholarship at universities with single regional campuses

At Wright State Lake, thirteen faculty members have presented at the AURCO Conference and subsequently had something published in the AURCO Journal the following year. Five of those are still employed at the Wright State Lake, a campus with a total of 23 full-time faculty according to this year’s web-based directory (Lake campus directory, 2007). Certainly these five of 23 faculty are in more of a position to influence the climate of faculty scholarship on their campus than a campus with little or no participation, such as Kent State Salem. Wright State Lake is one of the smaller regional campuses in Ohio with 883 students (Ohio Board of Regents, Student count, 2006). That campus was home to the editor of the AURCO Journal for its first twelve years, and many of Wright State Lake’s participants have been multiple presenters. In fact, there has only been one year (2002) in which someone from Wright State Lake did not have a presentation published in the following year’s AURCO Journal. Akron University Wayne College presents a similar situation in which four out of this year’s 27 full-time faculty members have presented at AURCO and subsequently had something published (Faculty, adjuncts, contract professionals, and staff, 2007). Another example is Bowling Green Firelands where eleven members of the faculty have been published in the AURCO Journal. That campus has 56 listings for full-time faculty in three academic departments of Humanities, Applied Sciences, and Natural and Social Sciences (BGSU Firelands
Academics, 2007). Thus almost 20 percent of the Bowling Green Firelands faculty members have published in the *AURCO Journal*.

The percentage of AURCO involvement at Wright State Lake, University of Akron Wayne College, and Bowling Green Firelands is consistent with Dr. Dan Evans’ observation that the smaller campuses, and the ones that are the only regional campus of their home campus, are most in need of the scholarly stimulation that comes from interaction with other regional campus faculty through AURCO. The percentage of AURCO participants at these three campuses supports the contention made by all of the interviewees that AURCO could and has impacted the level of scholarship of at least some regional campuses.

**Scholarship of faculty at one campus in a multi-campus system**

In the interview for this research, Dr. Kich frequently used Kent State Stark as an example of a campus where he believed the level of scholarship had been affected by AURCO. (M. Kich, personal interview, October 5, 2007). Clearly Kent State Stark is not a small campus. In fact, with 3,743 students in Autumn of 2006, it was the second largest regional campus in Ohio after the University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College’s 5,149 students (Ohio Board of Regents, 2006). And far from being the only regional campus in its system, it is part of the largest regional campus system in the state with seven campuses. It also has a faculty count of 94 full-time faculty members (About Kent State Stark, 2008), more than three times that of Wright State Lake or the University of Akron Wayne College. But an examination of the *AURCO Journal* indicates that the Kent State Stark faculty have been the most prolific AURCO scholars with 36 individuals
submitting published articles to the *AURCO Journal*. Cross checking with the current Kent State Stark faculty listing shows that 24 of 94 faculty members have a track record of AURCO publication (Online phone directory, 2008). This includes one person who published with AURCO before joining Kent State Stark. This percentage of AURCO participation (26 percent) is comparable to the “single campus” regional campuses. It is actually higher than that of Wright State Lake (22 percent), Bowling Green Firelands (20 percent) and University of Akron Wayne College (15 percent).

It appears that AURCO has reached a level of penetration on some campuses that supports the claims of its supporters that it has been in a position in which it may have contributed to the overall increase of scholarly presentations and publications. Further research would be required to determine the link between AURCO participation and increased scholarly activity, but AURCO has served a notable percentage of the faculty of small campuses such as Wright State Lake (883 students), medium size campuses such as Bowling Green Firelands (2,164 students), and large campuses such as Kent State Stark (3,743 students). It has appeared to serve campuses that are the only regional campus in their system, as well as campuses that are part of the largest system. However, as indicated in Table 4, AURCO’s penetration has been uneven among Ohio’s regional campuses.

**Professional Advancement**

Another of the themes agreed upon by all the interview participants was AURCO’s role in promoting professional advancement of regional campus faculty by creating opportunities not only for presentations and publications, but also leadership and
service. Although more difficult to tally, there are numerous regional campus faculty that have served as officers, conference program chairs, journal article reviewers, campus representatives, and in other positions.

It has already been shown that 20 percent of the current faculty members at Bowling Green State University have had a work published in the *AURCO Journal*. Using the 2006 AURCO Conference at BGSU Firelands as an example, it becomes clear that there were other leadership and service positions. More than just those eleven faculty took advantage of opportunities to play a role in the conference. Fourteen BGSU Firelands faculty served as panelists at the conference. Thirteen served on the planning committee or other committees. Altogether 17 of the 56 full-time faculty members currently at Bowling Green Firelands have had some degree of opportunity from AURCO to serve or disseminate research. Adding these service roles increases the percentage of penetration to 30 percent.

**AURCO as an Early Career Opportunity**

Both Dr. Aubrecht and Dr. Evans cited the role they saw AURCO serving by providing an opportunity for a first presentation. Dr. Aubrecht discussed the comfort factor of presenting at a smaller regional conference such as AURCO where he thought presenters would perceive the audience as less intimidating than at a large national conference. According to him, it was less likely that the presenters would worry about the audience tearing them “limb from limb” (G. Aubrecht, personal interview, October 26, 2007). Then they could decide whether to submit their articles for peer review for the following year’s *AURCO Journal*. Or they could decide to apply for presentations or
publications in other organizations in their disciplines. Dr. Evans also spoke extensively of the scenarios in which young faculty members would tackle that first presentation at an AURCO conference and then go on to present at their other professional associations. He felt that just watching other presentations that primarily deal with pedagogy were beneficial to the faculty members (D. Evans, personal interview, November 26, 2007).

If this model of utilizing AURCO as a means of professional advancement were a common scenario, it would mean that those presenting at AURCO and submitting articles for peer review should be near the beginning of their faculty career. Three forms of evidence seem to bear this out: the overall tendency to publish only one or two articles in the AURCO Journal, the large number of faculty members who have published in the AURCO Journal and are still active in their careers seven to ten years later, and individual cases where the faculty members followed this pattern.

Although there have been prolific AURCO presenters, most faculty have had less than two articles published in the AURCO Journal. As Table 3 indicates, over 90 percent of those who have published in the AURCO Journal have done so only once or twice.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of publications</th>
<th>Number of faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One publication</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two publications</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three publications</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more publications</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A substantial number of people who had articles accepted by the *AURCO Journal* in the 1990’s are still active but have not utilized AURCO since that time. For example, in 1995, five faculty from Kent State East Liverpool gave presentations at the AURCO Conference and were subsequently published in the *AURCO Journal* in 1996. No one from that campus has had anything published since then. All five of those faculty were active over a decade later: three at Kent State East Liverpool, and two at other institutions. As already mentioned 24 out of 36 Kent State Stark faculty who have contributed to the *AURCO Journal* are still active on their campus. Although just two campuses, they conform to the model of early career activity with AURCO.

Two examples help illustrate the tendency for AURCO participation to be an early career activity. Dr. A. Bathi Kasturiarachi is an associate professor of mathematics at Kent State Stark. He has posted his resume on line and it indicates that he received his Ph.D. from the University of North Carolina in 1993. His list of presentations and publications begins with a co-presentation as part of the proceedings of the Delta 1999 Symposium on Undergraduate Mathematics, and a 1999 presentation and then reviewed publication in the 2000 *AURCO Journal* (Kasturiarachi, 2000, 2007). He has not had anything published with AURCO since then and has gone on to publish two other articles and be a part of four other proceedings (Kasturiarachi, 2007).

Mr. Gary Lape, an instructor of economics at Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia, has posted his resume on that university’s website. It lists only two publications: an article published in the AURCO Journal in 2001 based on his 2000 presentation when he was on the faculty of University of Cincinnati Clermont College;
and his 2004 contribution to an online taxation advice column called “Ask Tax Mama” (Lape, 2008). The AURCO Journal has provided him his only opportunity to publish in a reviewed publication.

**Collegiality**

All interview participants agreed that the opportunity to interact with colleagues from other campuses has been a positive aspect of their affiliation with AURCO. Some mentioned it as one of the primary benefits of attending AURCO conferences and other meetings. One example of this came from Dr. Joseph Cavanaugh of Wright State Lake. Dr. Cavanaugh’s name was mentioned by several of the interview participants. He has served as secretary of AURCO since 2006. An examination of AURCO records revealed that he was a presenter at the first AURCO conference in 1995. An email inquiry confirmed that he is the only person who has attended every AURCO conference. I asked him about the factors that caused him to join and remain active in AURCO. Although he mentioned scholarship opportunities and professional advancement, it is collegiality that he has found most rewarding:

I have been involved in AURCO attending and presenting at every conference since my arrival at the Lake Campus in 1994. Wow - about 14 years! I was encouraged by the [Wright State] Lake faculty and my dean to become active and have enjoyed the opportunity to meet and learn from the faculty from the other branch campuses. We all face similar issues and AURCO allows us to commiserate and deal with many of these problems and share successes. The people I have met through AURCO make it an enjoyable organization to belong
to and keeps me coming back each year, although the fact that participation in
AURCO (both as a participant and as a board member) was and is viewed as
favorable for P&T was also a significant reason for my becoming active. As a full
professor now, this is no longer the reason I participate (J. Cavanaugh, personal
correspondence, January 4, 2008).

Dr. Cavanaugh added, “I see AURCO as an organization that allows the faculty of Ohio
branch campuses to regularly communicate with each other face to face, and it provides a
meaningful way to further our professional development (J. Cavanaugh, personal
correspondence, January 4, 2008).

To measure AURCO’s success in providing a venue for interaction and
networking among regional campus faculty, it is necessary to gauge the number of
faculty taking advantage of this opportunity. As of November 1, 2006, the Ohio Board of
Regents reported 1,288 full-time faculty at regional campuses. This includes 57 faculty at
The Ohio State University Agricultural Technical Institute and Agricultural Research and
Development Center in Wooster (Ohio Board of Regents, 2006). But AURCO does not
consider the Agricultural Technical Institute to be one of its member campuses, so the 23
campus total would be 1,231. At the AURCO conference that took place during April of
2007, there were 105 faculty member attendees out of 175 participants. This represents
an attendance rate of nine percent of all faculty at Ohio’s 23 regional campuses.

This seems to support the claims that AURCO provides an important venue for
regional campus interaction. But because the conference is not attended by the same set
of individuals year after year, it is reasonable to assume that some faculty attend only
when the conference is at a site near their campus, and that some faculty have attended only when they have presented, which may have been earlier in their career. This means that the total percentage of regional campus faculty members who have ever taken the opportunity to attend an AURCO conference is probably higher than nine percent.

**Promotion of Regional Campuses**

Chapter Six indicated that discussion of AURCO’s role in promoting Ohio’s regional campuses had revealed a difference between the founding members of AURCO and those who became familiar with AURCO at a later date. The founding members viewed AURCO as a champion for Ohio’s regional campus system. The three more recent members interviewed either did not emphasize this aspect of AURCO’s role or, in the case of Dr. Robert Howell, disagreed that AURCO was adequately serving in that capacity. AURCO’s lack of response to the 2007-2008 initiative by the Chancellor of the Ohio Board of Regents supports Dr. Howell’s concerns.

In 2007, Eric Fingerhut, the Chancellor, announced a plan to revamp higher education in Ohio (Chancellor begins preview of goals, 2007). Throughout 2007 and into 2008, portions of the plan were released to the public via a special website with the goal of presenting a plan to the governor in March of 2008. As of the end of 2007, it was still unclear what changes to the regional campus structure, if any might be proposed. However, just as with the Managing for the Future Task Force in 1992, concerns began circulating among faculty that the regional campuses were once again threatened.

As noted in Chapter Six, Dr. Howell was sufficiently concerned about the threat to regional campuses posed by the University System of Ohio initiative that he emailed
AURCO President Brad Shepherd and asked that information be sent ahead of time so that this issue could be dealt with at the meeting. This researcher, as a participant-observer, had the opportunity to attend the AURCO business meeting which took place October 26, 2007. At that meeting, Dr. Aubrecht shared the contents of a conference call that took place October 16, 2007 between the chancellor and members of the AAUP Government Relations Committee. After a brief discussion, the board moved on to other items. The failure to create a mechanism to monitor the situation or a committee to actively plan for a possible response was inconsistent with AURCO’s stated mission of pursuing a pro-active educational and political direction (Membership approves bylaws, 1994).

An examination of the records and publications of AURCO shows that AURCO has lived up to some of its members’ expectations of being a champion of the regional campuses. Although the first conference was scheduled to include a discussion of the Managing for the Future Task Force, by the time it was held in 1995, it was clear that the task force’s recommendation would not be implement, and this did not emerge as a topic of discussion. An examination of the AURCO Journal reveals that political activism and promotion of regional campuses are not issues that have emerged as ongoing subjects of study or activity.

A Disparity of Campus Participation

Assessing AURCO’s effectiveness as an organization, using the four themes that emerged during the interview process, resulted in a generally favorable evaluation. Evidence exists that AURCO may have had an impact on the scholarship taking place on
some of Ohio’s regional campuses. There is evidence that AURCO activities have assisted in the promotion and advancement of many individuals. There is also evidence that sufficient numbers of faculty have participated in AURCO activities for it to have had the potential to create a sense of collegiality among regional campus faculty. Little evidence exists that AURCO has continued to play a major role in promoting Ohio’s regional campuses.

However, AURCO participation has been intense on some campuses, spotty at others, and non-existent at the rest. Table 4 shows the number of faculty at each campus that have published in the AURCO Journal in each year since its transformation to a reviewed journal in 2000.

Table 4

Institutional Affiliation of Authors of AURCO Journal Reviewed Articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BGSU Firelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Ashtabula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU East Liverpool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Geauga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Salem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Stark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Trumbull</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSU Tuscarawas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami Middletown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Lima</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Mansfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Marion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSU Newark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Chillicothe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Eastern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Southern</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OU Zanesville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA Wayne</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Clermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Raymond Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Individuals may be included more than once due to multiple reviewed articles in the *AURCO Journal*.

Six of the campuses have never had a faculty member publish a reviewed article in the *AURCO Journal*, and one other campus had had only one author. Adjusting for the fact that some campuses were represented by authors who also represented the campus in other years, the disparity among campuses becomes even more noticeable. Table 5 indicates the number of individuals from each of Ohio’s 23 regional campuses who have published in the *AURCO Journal* from its transition to a reviewed publication in 2000 through 2007.
Table 5

*Number of Faculty Published in the AURCO Journal 2000-2007 Per Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Campus(es)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Ohio University Zanesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Kent State Geauga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Cincinnati Clermont College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Miami Middletown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The Ohio State University Marion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ohio University Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Kent State Trumbull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>University of Akron Wayne College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Ohio State University Lima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Ohio State University Newark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Miami University Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ohio University Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Kent State Ashtabula</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Out of the 99 faculty members who have had reviewed articles published in the AURCO Journal between 2000 and 2007, well over half have come from just six of the 23 campuses. Participation in AURCO opportunities has been shown to be of significant benefit to many individuals and several of Ohio’s regional campuses. But if the opportunity to submit articles to a reviewed publication is used as the most visible indicator of AURCO’s impact on Ohio’s regional campuses, AURCO has not reached a level of penetration sufficient to claim an impact on Ohio’s entire regional campus system.

Although the opportunity to publish in the *AURCO Journal*, or even to present at an AURCO conference is a good measure of faculty benefit, simply attending an AURCO Conference can be viewed as beneficial. In order to examine the most recent figures available I asked the conference chair, Rachelle Hippler, for a copy of the attendee list for the 2007 AURCO Conference at Bowling Green Firelands. Out of 175 attendees, only 105 were faculty at one of Ohio’s regional campuses. The rest were students, conference volunteers, or outside presenters. Thirty seven of the 105 were from Bowling Green State University Firelands, the host institution. The remaining faculty came from fifteen campuses, with four campuses (Kent State Trumbull, OU Lancaster,
OSU Lima, and OSU Mansfield) having only one representative. In fact, four campuses accounted for 70 percent of the attendees: BGSU Firelands with 37, University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College with 15, Wright State Lake with 11, and Miami Middletown with 10. Although this is better participation than some of the earlier conferences that drew attendees from only nine campuses, over one-third of Ohio’s regional campuses were uninvolved in a conference viewed by AURCO supporters as the largest and most successful conference in AURCO’s history.
CHAPTER 8: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The intent of this study was to develop a historical analysis of AURCO. The study provided a description of the historical circumstances that led to AURCO’s creation; a historical account of its organizational meeting in 1993; and a description of the chronology of events from its founding to the present. Data was collected by examination of the historical records of AURCO including all issues of the *AURCO Journal*, annual conference programs, newsletters, and meeting minutes. Much of the information about AURCO’s history and the role the organization has come to play among regional campus faculty was obtained through interviews and correspondence with founding members and other selected persons on Ohio’s regional campuses. Interviews were video-recorded to form historical records that were transcribed and analyzed for themes. Additional information was obtained from the researcher’s role as participant-observer, attending two AURCO annual conferences and two AURCO business meetings.

During the course of three interviews with faculty present at AURCO’s organizational meeting in 1993, four themes emerged describing how these participants viewed the roles and functions of AURCO: promotion of scholarship, professional advancement, collegiality, and promotion of regional campuses. A second interview with the two active founders confirmed these themes and, through a snowballing technique, identified other interview participants. Three additional interview participants agreed that AURCO had played a major role in promoting scholarship among regional campus faculty, creating avenues for professional advancement, and providing a venue for faculty
interaction and collegiality. However, they either downplayed or disagreed that AURCO had been playing a major role in promoting the interests of regional campuses.

The records of AURCO, most notably the *AURCO Journal* and the official programs of AURCO conferences, were examined for evidence that AURCO was fulfilling its goals as perceived by the founders, using the themes as a guideline. Information was revealed that supported instances of AURCO promoting scholarship, providing opportunities for professional advancement, and creating venues for collegial interaction. Little or no recorded evidence existed that AURCO was currently achieving its political goals of promoting regional campuses as expressed in its organizational meeting discussions and bylaws. An analysis of institutional affiliation of participants in AURCO conferences and authors of journal articles revealed that AURCO’s penetration among Ohio’s 23 regional campuses was uneven.

**Conclusions**

An analysis of AURCO’s role in promoting scholarship revealed that at some campuses a sizeable number of faculty members had participated in an AURCO conference or published in the *AURCO Journal*. An analysis of AURCO’s role in promoting professional advancement revealed that many individual faculty members appeared to take advantage of leadership, presentational, and publication opportunities within AURCO. An analysis of AURCO’s role in promoting collegiality indicated that sufficient evidence exists that a substantial number of individual faculty members have enjoyed the opportunity to interact with their colleagues from other campuses. An analysis of AURCO’s role in promoting regional campuses revealed that AURCO has not
seized recent opportunities to further the cause of Ohio’s regional campuses. And despite its origin as a politically motivated organization, its publications and activities have not generally reflected this.

Despite AURCO’s success in achieving three out of its four roles as interpreted by its members, its penetration is uneven among Ohio’s regional campuses. On at least four campuses, AURCO appears to have involved large enough percentages of the faculty to support claims of its supporters to have influenced the faculty culture. These campuses include Kent State Stark, Bowling Green Firelands, University of Akron Wayne College, and Wright State Lake. However this must be weighed against the nine campuses at which AURCO has had little or no penetration. In the eight years that the AURCO Journal has been a reviewed publication there has not been one article from faculty at Kent State Ashtabula, Kent State East Liverpool, Kent State Salem, Kent State Tuscarawas, nor The Ohio State University Mansfield. Only one faculty member has represented Miami University Hamilton and Ohio University Eastern, and there have been only two faculty publishing from The Ohio State University Lima and The Ohio State University Newark.

This unevenness in participation arose as an issue as far back as 1999 and was one of the agenda items that Dr. Howell targeted during his term as president (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007). As indicated by Table 4, there was a disparity over time as well. Some campuses were better represented in the 1990’s than they are now. Others have only recently become active.
AURCO has been beneficial to many of Ohio’s regional campus faculty members and may have had an impact on some regional campuses and their climate in general. But the unevenness of the participation level among campuses and the lack of resources to reach out to inactive campuses have resulted in AURCO not being able to serve as the powerful statewide organization envisioned by its founders.

**Recommendations for Practice**

If AURCO is to achieve a true statewide penetration, it must do more to extend opportunities to faculty on all 23 of Ohio’s regional campuses. One way to accomplish this is through an enhanced effort to recruit campus representatives at all of the campuses. It is difficult to expect faculty to take advantage of an organization that lacks a presence on their campus. Dr. Howell made reference to his efforts during his term as AURCO president:

One of the things I tried to do and never succeeded and I don’t think they succeeded to this day was to get some sort of organization in place on each of the regional campuses whereby AURCO representatives would be selected and become a part of the structure, the government structure. It is here [at University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College.] We have two representatives and each spring as part of our spring elections we elect a new person to a two-year term. But there are many regional campuses where we might know the name of somebody, or somebody has come to a meeting, but we’re still, I think, not very well organized (R. Howell, personal interview, December 10, 2007).
The method of electing an AURCO representative at University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College appears to be one that could serve as a model for all campuses.

Throughout the interviews, much mention was made of a few people doing the bulk of the work. Although not unique to AURCO, this can be problematic to any organization. In fact, as Dr. Fox-Cardamone indicated, AURCO seems to have replaced the 80/20 rule with the 95/5 rule indicating that most of the work is carried out by five percent of the membership. Ideally, AURCO’s efforts to recruit campus representatives should result in attracting additional committee chairs and other active participants.

Many organizations that hope to have a significant impact on a statewide basis are able to do so through the use of a paid staff person. AURCO currently charges no membership dues of the individual faculty participant. Perhaps the leadership could explore instituting a membership fee that could be used to hire a professional dedicated to the promotion of AURCO.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

The purpose of a case study is to generate hypotheses rather than test them (Yin, 2003). This historical case study has generated ideas about the four purposes of AURCO that could be used in a survey of participants. The results of this study are based primarily on the observations of six people. It would be useful to conduct a follow-up study that would solicit the views of a larger number of AURCO participants. In fact the number of participants is small enough that it is possible to contact a majority of them. A survey instrument could be used to determine their views of the functions and roles of AURCO. For example, 99 regional campus faculty members were identified as having published an
article in the *AURCO Journal* during the time in was a reviewed publication from 2000 to 2007. Many of these people are still active on their campuses and could be contacted through various means in order to ask them about their perceptions of the value of participation in AURCO.

Although the research indicates that AURCO has been an important organization in the professional lives of many of Ohio’s regional campus faculty, it has not been able to achieve its full potential as an organization because of the unevenness of its penetration among the 23 regional campuses in Ohio. Contacting faculty members and administrators of the non-participating campuses might yield information that would be of interest to researchers and valuable to the AURCO leadership.

This research has uncovered much information about the organizational dynamics of AURCO. Researchers in the field of organizational communication could utilize this information to further study AURCO from an organizational theory perspective. And as a faculty organization, it could be compared to other faculty-oriented organizations to learn how AURCO differs from geographically limited or discipline-specific faculty organizations.

As part of the interview, Mr. Molitierno suggested the possibility of documenting the relationship between AURCO participation and promotion and tenure decisions. With only 99 authors of reviewed publications it may be possible to contact them to learn more about their careers since their AURCO involvement. This would allow researchers to learn more about the effectiveness of AURCO in professional advancement of those who chose to take advantage of the opportunities.
This study has contributed to the literature about regional campuses. It has touched upon many topics that, although interesting and important, were not within the focus of this work. Further research can be done on the interesting dynamics of regional campus interaction with main campuses, and regional campus faculty perceptions. Dr. Aubrechts pointed out distinctions, as he saw them, between regional campuses and community colleges, and between regional campuses and small liberal arts colleges. Both of these areas would be important subjects for further research and would help scholars better understand that aspect of higher education in the United States.

The website of the National Association of Branch Campus Administrators contains a forum for regional campus discussion in which Dr. Charles Bird of Ohio University proposed a research agenda that would create a typology of regional campuses. This typology would form a much needed base for further research about regional campus issues:

I would construct a survey to obtain descriptive information about how these campuses operate. What types of programs are provided? What is the relationship of branch campus faculty to main campus departments? Where are decisions made about hiring and/or tenuring faculty? What is the title and authority of the branch campus's chief administrator? To whom does that administrator report? What services are provided? How is the budget obtained, and what is managed locally vs. at the main campus? All of these items could be teased out to create checklists or the like. The point is to expand the description of the idealized
branch, including typical variations within the model (Bird, on line posting, July 16, 2007).

Bird added, “I would probably try to do some more qualitative study on these campuses, seeking information about faculty and administrative perceptions toward the main campus, toward the formal mission, and toward work life and career development issues” Bird, online posting, July 16, 2007). Because previous studies about the types of regional campuses are several decades old, Bird’s proposed research would be a likely precursor to more specific studies of regional campuses issues.

**Reflexive Statement: I am AURCO**

Participant-observers have the potential to change the environment they study and to be changed by it. In this case, both have occurred. As a faculty at one of Ohio’s 23 regional campuses I may now benefit from some of the same opportunities that have been discussed in this work. I have plans to submit a portion of this dissertation as both a presentation at the 2008 AURCO Annual Conference and for review and possible inclusion in the 2009 *AURCO Journal*. As a previously unpublished scholar, AURCO has the potential to provide me with that venue for a first presentation in a friendly, secure atmosphere, and a chance to be published in a reviewed journal. I have also had the opportunity to visit five regional campuses as part of the interview process. Although I have had many experiences with The Ohio State University Marion, and had once attended a meeting at Kent State Stark, my visit to Wright State Lake, Ohio University Southern, and University of Cincinnati Raymond Walters College represented my first contact with those campuses.
As a faculty member at The Ohio State University Mansfield, I am aware that my home campus is one of the least active in AURCO. No one from OSU Mansfield has published in the AURCO Journal since its transition to a reviewed journal in 2000. My participation in the 2007 AURCO Conference at Bowling Green State University Firelands has altered attendance statistics used in the analysis of AURCO’s penetration of Ohio’s regional campuses as based on attendance at that conference. As a result of attending the AURCO business meetings of 2006 and 2007, I am now considered the campus representative for OSU Mansfield. And two of the interview participants cited my interaction with them as an example of the collegiality they have found in AURCO.

Mr. Molitierno, in a follow-up email thanked me for meeting with him and added another comment to the information he provided in the interview, “Until we formed AURCO, we never really knew what fine and exceptional teachers were contributing throughout the entire branch and regional campus system of Ohio. You can include yourself in that illustrious list of people committed to the college and community. I'm going to try to make it to the next AURCO Conference and hope to see you there” (A. Molitierno, personal communication, October 22, 2007). Dr. Howell, during the interview, said “It’s nice to have colleagues like you who will drop me an email and say ‘I want to come and talk to you’” (R. Howell personal interview, December 10, 2007). So, even as a researcher, I was able to experience the collegiality that is prevalent among those to whom AURCO has been an important part of their lives. I am honored to be regarded as their colleague. My research about AURCO has also left me with a renewed sense of
political responsibility to monitor higher education policy as it affects the future of Ohio’s regional campus system.

As AURCO approaches its fifteenth anniversary in 2008, it remains to be seen whether it will reach its full potential, but the record shows that it has had an effect on some regional campus faculty in Ohio. In the words of Arthur Molitierno (2007):

People do make a difference, ideas count, and people with a central idea can make a real impact and make a real difference on an entire community. Sustaining that idea, of course, takes a great deal of work. And people who are willing to do that make a great deal of impact. And the combined efforts of all those people gives you something in the end, which I think everyone can safely say that we enjoyed it, it’s made an impact, and we think it’s of value.”
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APPENDIX A: AURCO BYLAWS 1995

AURCO BYLAWS-AMENDED AND APPROVED 22 APRIL 1995

Article I. Name

The name of the organization shall be the "Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio," AURCO.

Article II. Membership

Membership shall be open to all faculty members who are devoting full-time service to a university regional campus of Ohio.

Article III. Institution Representative

Each regional campus shall be entitled to have two voting members at the official meetings of AURCO. These official representatives shall be chosen by the individual campus faculty in the general and ordinary way by which the particular campus faculty chooses persons to act in a representative capacity.

Article IV. Purpose

The Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio shall have the following purposes:

A. To pursue a pro-active educational and political direction stressing the relevant independent educational vision and purpose of regional campuses while at the same time stressing the vital importance of remaining an integral part of their universities.
A. To encourage communication through varied channels among regional campus faculty.

B. To take note of, study, and provide guidance in meeting the special needs of students attending regional campuses.

C. To deepen the commitment of faculty to the educational and cultural well-being of their respective regional campus communities and to make the communities aware of the rich resources provided by Ohio's regional campuses.

**Article V. Officers and Leadership**

A. Officers - Each officer shall be elected from a different regional campus for a term of two years, with the term of office beginning on 1 May.

B. President - The president shall succeed to the office from the vice-presidency. Should the office of the vice-president be vacant at the time of election, the president shall be elected in the manner of the vice-president. It shall be the role of the president to chair the executive committee and the AURCO meetings. The president shall serve as the primary spokesperson to express the position and policies of AURCO.

C. Vice-President - The vice-president shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the role of the Vice-president to chair the executive committee and the AURCO meetings in the absence of the president. The
vice-president shall be the parliamentarian for all meetings. The vice-president shall complete the term of the president should the president be unable to serve. The vice-president shall become president when the term of the president expires.

D. Secretary -

The secretary shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the role of the secretary to keep and distribute minutes of each executive and AURCO meeting; to keep correspondence, documents, and books for the archives of AURCO; to be responsible for the establishment and oversight of a newsletter or other forms of communication with the general membership.

E. Treasurer -

The treasurer shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to collect, maintain, and distribute all the funds of AURCO; to keep records and file any legal documents necessary.

Article VI. Committees

A. Executive Committee -

The executive committee shall be comprised of the president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. It shall be the role of the executive
committee to:

1. Plan the agendas which shall be mailed to the campus representatives at least 10 days prior to meetings.

2. Assign and oversee the development of position statements on matters affecting member campuses/colleges for discussion and possible adoption by AURCO.

B. Other Committees - To provide for flexibility in meeting current needs, other committees may be established either as standing or ad hoc committees.

1. The purpose and composition of standing committees will be established by the representatives at the meeting at which the committee is initially formed. The term of service will be for 2 years.

2. The term of service for ad hoc committees will last until they are dissolved. The appointment to an ad hoc committee will be made by the president with the advice of the executive committee.

**Article VII. Meetings**

A. Annual Meetings -

There will be an annual business meeting at a date decided by the executive committee. At this meeting the general business of AURCO may be transacted, including the election of officers, as indicated in Article V.
B. Special Meetings

A special meeting of AURCO may be called at the discretion of the executive committee. At such a meeting the only official business to be transacted will be that for which notice has been given.

C. Executive Committee Meetings

The executive committee shall meet at the discretion of the president.

D. Quorum

A quorum at the annual business meeting or at a specially called business meeting will require at least twelve voting members.

E. Parliamentary Procedure

All business will be conducted decently and in order. Should questions of parliamentary procedure arise, Roberts Rules of Order will be the basis for resolving any questions.

Article VIII. Amending Bylaws

These bylaws may be amended at any regular or special business meeting by an affirmative vote of two thirds of the voting members present, provided that written notice of the amendment has been sent to each member at least 10 days prior to the meeting.
APPENDIX B: AURCO BYLAWS 2000

AURCO Bylaws Amended and Approved 08 April 2000

Prepared by Arthur A. Molitierno, AURCO Secretary

18 April 2000

Article I. Name

The name of the organization shall be the “Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio,” AURCO.

Article II. Membership

Membership shall be open to all faculty members who are devoting full-time service to a university regional campus of Ohio.

Article III. Institution Representative

Each regional campus shall be entitled to have two voting members at the official meetings of AURCO. These official representatives shall be chosen by the individual campus faculty in the general and ordinary way by which the particular campus faculty chooses persons to act in a representative capacity. The campus representative should report his or her selection or election to the AURCO secretary, indicating the length of the term of service.

Article IV. Purpose

The Association for University Regional Campuses of Ohio shall have the following purposes:
A. To pursue a proactive educational and political direction, stressing the relevant independent educational vision and purpose of regional campuses while at the same time stressing the vital importance of remaining an integral part of their universities.

B. To encourage communication through varied channels among regional campus faculty.

C. To take note of, study, and provide guidance in meeting the special needs of students attending regional campuses.

D. To deepen the commitment of faculty to the educational and cultural well-being of their respective regional campus communities and to make the communities aware of the rich resources provided by Ohio’s regional campuses.

**Article V. Officers and Leadership**

A. Officers

Each officer shall be elected from a different regional campus for a term of two years, with the term of office beginning on 1 May.

B. President

The president shall succeed to the office from the vice-presidency. Should the office of the vice-president be vacant at the time of election, the president shall be elected in the manner of the vice-president. It shall be the role of the president to chair the executive committee and the AURCO meetings. The president shall serve as the primary spokesperson to express the position and policies of AURCO.

C. Vice-President
The vice-president shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the role of the vice-president to chair the executive committee and the AURCO meetings in the absence of the president. The vice-president shall be the parliamentarian for all meetings. The vice-president shall complete the term of the president should the president be unable to serve. The vice-president shall become president when the term of the president expires.

D. Secretary

The secretary shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the role of the secretary to keep and distribute minutes of each executive and AURCO meeting; to keep correspondence, documents, and books for the archives of AURCO; to be responsible for the establishment and oversight of a newsletter or other forms of communication with the general membership.

E. Treasurer

The treasurer shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the duty of the treasurer to collect, maintain, and distribute all the funds of AURCO; to keep records and file any legal documents necessary.

F. Editor

The editor shall be elected at large for a term of two years by the AURCO representatives at alternate annual business meetings. It shall be the role of the editor to oversee all functions of the annual AURCO Journal.
Article VI. Committees

A. Executive Committee

The executive committee shall be comprised of the president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer. It shall be the role of the executive committee to:

1. Plan the agendas which shall be mailed to the campus representatives at least 10 days prior to meetings.

2. Assign and oversee the development of position statements on matters affecting member campuses/colleges for discussion and possible adoption by AURCO.

B. Other Committees

To provide for flexibility in meeting current needs, other committees may be established either as standing or ad hoc committees.

1. The purpose and composition of standing committees will be established by the representatives at the meeting at which the committee is initially formed. The term of service will be for 2 years.

2. The term of service for ad hoc committees will last until they are dissolved. The appointment to an ad hoc committee will be made by the president with the advice of the executive committee.

Article VII. Meetings

A. Annual Meetings

Business meetings will be held in the Fall and Spring on dates to be decided by the executive committee. At these meetings the general business of AURCO may be transacted, including the election of officers, as indicated in Article V.
B. Special Meetings

A special meeting of AURCO may be called at the discretion of the executive committee. At such a meeting the only official business to be transacted will be that for which notice has been given.

C. Executive Committee Meetings

The executive committee shall meet at the discretion of the president.

D. Quorum

A quorum at the business meetings or at a specially called business meeting will require at least twelve voting members.

E. Parliamentary Procedure

All business will be conducted decently and in order. Should questions of parliamentary procedure arise; Roberts Rules of Order will be the basis for resolving any questions.

Article VIII. Amending Bylaws

These bylaws may be amended at any regular or special business meeting by an affirmative vote of two thirds of the voting members present, provided that written notice of the amendment has been sent to each member at least 10 days prior to the meeting.
APPENDIX C: AURCO CONFERENCES

**AURCO Conferences 1995-2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Program Chair</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
<td>Martin Kich</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Miami Middletown</td>
<td>Sondra Clooney</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
<td>Lee Fox-Cardamone</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kent State Trumbull</td>
<td>Lee Fox-Cardamone</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>Martin Kich</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Cincinnati Raymond Walters</td>
<td>Robert Howell</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
<td>Lee Fox-Cardamone</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Ohio State Lima</td>
<td>Mohammed Yousef</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Cincinnati Clermont</td>
<td>Tracey Hawkins</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Miki Crawford</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Ohio University Zanesville</td>
<td>Sheida Shirvani</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>University of Akron Wayne</td>
<td>Gary Bays</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
<td>Rachelle Hippler</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Cincinnati Raymond Walters</td>
<td>Ruth Benander</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX D: AURCO PRESIDENTS

AURCO Presidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Term of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marty Stevens</td>
<td>Miami Middletown</td>
<td>November 1993 – April 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karin Billions</td>
<td>Akron Wayne College</td>
<td>April 1995 – April 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Howell</td>
<td>Cincinnati Raymond Walters</td>
<td>April 1997 – April 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee Fox-Cardamone</td>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
<td>April 1999 – April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon Aubrecht</td>
<td>Ohio State Marion</td>
<td>April 2001 – April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kich</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>April 2003 – April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terry Quinn</td>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>April 2005 – January 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Shepherd</td>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
<td>January 2006 – April 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX E: AURCO TREASURERS AND SECRETARIES

### AURCO Treasurers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Term of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Molitierno</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>November 1993 – April 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Burton</td>
<td>Miami Middletown</td>
<td>April 1995 – April 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Hawkins</td>
<td>Cincinnati Clermont</td>
<td>October 1998 – April 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### AURCO Secretaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Term of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Molitierno</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>November 1993 – April 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Kich</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>April 1999 – April 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Bode</td>
<td>Ohio State Lima</td>
<td>April 2001 – April 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miki Crawford</td>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>April 2003 – April 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Cavanaugh</td>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>April 2005 – April 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: OVERVIEW OF OHIO'S 23 REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Ohio’s Regional Campuses as of Autumn 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total students</th>
<th>Full-time Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Green Firelands</td>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>2,164</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Ashtabula</td>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>1,536</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State East Liverpool</td>
<td>East Liverpool</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Geauga</td>
<td>Burton</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Salem</td>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>1,274</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Stark</td>
<td>North Canton</td>
<td>3,743</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Trumbull</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent State Tuscarawas</td>
<td>New Philadelphia</td>
<td>2,019</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Hamilton</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>3,297</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami University Middletown</td>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Lima</td>
<td>Lima</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Mansfield</td>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>1,577</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Marion</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ohio State University Newark</td>
<td>Newark</td>
<td>2,414</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Chillicothe</td>
<td>Chillicothe</td>
<td>1,850</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Eastern</td>
<td>St. Clairsville</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Lancaster</td>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>1,727</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Southern</td>
<td>Ironton</td>
<td>1,824</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio University Zanesville</td>
<td>Zanesville</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron Wayne College</td>
<td>Orville</td>
<td>1,742</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of C. Clermont College</td>
<td>Batavia</td>
<td>3,368</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. of C. Raymond Walters</td>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>5,149</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright State Lake</td>
<td>Celina</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46,232</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,231</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX G: OHIO UNIVERSITY CONSENT FORM

Title of Research: A Historical Analysis of the Association of Regional Campuses of Ohio (AURCO)
Principal Investigator: Robert Cohen
Co-Investigator: none
Department: Higher Education

Federal and university regulations require signed consent for participation in research involving human subjects. After reading the statements below, please indicate your consent by signing this form.

Explanation of Study
The purpose of the research is to provide a historical record of AURCO’s founding and development by: a) describing the historical circumstances that led to the creation of the Association of University Regional Campuses of Ohio, b) providing a history of AURCO from its inception in 1993 to present, and c) documenting the role that AURCO has come to play among regional campus faculty.
This will be done through a qualitative study using interviews and correspondence with founding members, administrators, and other selected persons such as you who are familiar with the founding of AURCO.
It is anticipated that no single participant interview will last any longer than 90 minutes. Follow-up may take the form of additional interviewing or telephone or electronic correspondence. Interviews are being recorded through audio and/or video means and may be used in presentations at the 2008 AURCO conference. Written transcripts will be developed for each interview.

Risks and Discomforts
There are no anticipated risks to you for participating in this research.

Benefits
Although there are no anticipated direct benefits for interview participants, Ohio’s academic community will benefit by the availability of a written history of a unique organization. By providing information about a statewide organization created for faculty of regional campuses, this study will contribute to the literature and make it possible for those at regional campuses to better understand how AURCO became the organization that it is today. This study will shed light on the concerns and interests of Ohio regional campus faculty and how they have used AURCO to communicate those concerns and interests. This study will also advance the general knowledge about regional campus faculty concerns and can be useful to people in other states that have regional campuses.

Confidentiality and Records
It is anticipated that interview participants will be identified by name in the dissertation that will result from this research. It is further anticipated that audio or video recordings of the interviews may be used in presentations at or subsequent to the 15th anniversary of the AURCO Conference to take place in 2008. However, your identity will be used only with your permission. You have the option of requesting that your identity be withheld.
and that recordings of your interview not be replayed. If requested, confidentiality will be provided in all aspects of this research and its publication. Please check the appropriate line below and also remember to sign and print your name at the end of this consent form.

____ Yes I give permission to be identified by name in publications associated with this research
____ No, I wish to not be identified.
____ Yes, I give permission for video or audio recordings of this interview to be replayed.
____ No, I specify that audio or video recordings of this interview be destroyed after the research and its publication are completed

**Compensation**

none

**Contact Information**

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Bob Cohen at rcohen@excite.com, (419 610-5924) or the advisor for this research Dr. Robert Young at youngb@ohio.edu (740-593-0847).

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Jo Ellen Sherow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664.

I certify that I have read and understand this consent form and agree to participate as a subject in the research described. I agree that known risks to me have been explained to my satisfaction and I understand that no compensation is available from Ohio University and its employees for any injury resulting from my participation in this research. I certify that I am 18 years of age or older. My participation in this research is given voluntarily. I understand that I may discontinue participation at any time without penalty or loss of any benefits to which I may otherwise be entitled. I certify that I have been given a copy of this consent form to take with me.

Signature________________________________________ Date__________

Printed name________________________________________