One of the rationales for White Paper 2 seems to be to position WSU for future growth. The White Paper states that the current leadership structure "does not provide the flexibility for substantial growth outside of the Pullman campus" and that it seeks to "build a foundation for future growth." I wondered whether the structure proposed in White Paper 2 really is necessary for growth.

In his report on the multicampus system, Craig Parks identifies three administrative structures that are commonly used by multicampus universities: 1) Regional campuses led by a CEO-CAO tandem reporting to system CEO; 2) regional campuses led by local CEO reporting to either system CEO or CAO; 3) regional campuses led by director level (eg dean, vice provost) who reports to the system CAO. I did a quick and dirty look (please forgive any errors!) at the mean total system enrollment, mean number of campuses, and mean campus enrollment for each type of system (see table below). What is most immediately obvious is that WSU has nowhere near the enrollment of universities that have the administrative structure proposed in the White Paper (which I take to be version 1a in the table below). Those systems have an overall enrollment of 144,343 with a mean campus enrollment of 21,119. For comparison, WSU has a system enrollment of 31,607 and a mean campus enrollment of 5267. Our entire system is smaller than some campuses in those other systems. Indeed, WSU is substantially smaller than even the systems with the simplest administrative structure (section 3 in the table below). Those campuses have a mean system enrollment of 67,800 and a mean campus enrollment of 14,262. From these numbers it appears that WSU would have substantial room for growth with the simplest administrative structure that involves director-level administrators reporting to a CAO. It is unclear to me why we would need the proposed administrative structure in order to grow. Has the administration considered shifting to a less administration heavy model?

	1a) Local CEO/CAO model; main campus also has local CEO/CAO			Note: This is the model proposed in White Paper 2
University	Total enrollment	# campuses	Mean enrollment per campus	Source
WSU	31,607	6	5267	https://wsu.edu/about/facts/
University of North Carolina	242,464	7	34,637	https://www.northcarolina.edu/news/unc- system-announces-third-straight-year-of- record-enrollment/
University of Wisconsin	164,494	13	12,653	https://www.wisconsin.edu/news/archive/ uw-system-enrollment-drops-overall- increases-for-underrepresented-students/
University of Illinois	90,000	3	30,000	https://news.uillinois.edu/view/7815/6884 80835
University of Texas	240,000	14	17,142	https://www.utsystem.edu/about
Rutgers University	77,800	4	19,450	https://www.rutgers.edu/about/by-the- numbers
University of Tennessee	51,330	4	12,832	https://tennessee.edu/

Mean	144,343	7.5	21,119	
1b) Local CEO/CAO model				
University of California	285,862	10	28,586	https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/inf ocenter/fall-enrollment-glance
University of Michigan	44,042	3	14,680	https://umich.edu/facts-figures/
Mean	164,952	6.5	21,633	
2) Local CEO model				
U of WA	60,418	3	20,139	https://www.washington.edu/news/2020/ 10/27/enrollment-strong-for-the- university-of-washingtons-fall-2020- entering-class/
U of Pitts.	dk	5	dk	https://www.upb.pitt.edu/
Purdue U	70,000	6	11,666	https://www.britannica.com/topic/Purdue- University
Indiana U	110,000	9	12,222	Wikipedia
U of Oklahom	31,702	3	10,567	Wikipedia
U of Minn	66,880	4	16,720	Wikipedia
Mean	67,800	4.75 (excluding Pitt)	14,262	