University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

2001

A Case Study of Shared Governance at Imperial Valley College

Gregorio A. Ponce EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>

Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Ponce, Gregorio A. EdD, "A Case Study of Shared Governance at Imperial Valley College" (2001).
Dissertations. 683.
<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/683>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

A CASE STUDY OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AT IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE

by

Gregorio A. Ponce

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

2001

Dissertation Committee

Edward DeRoche, Ph.D., Director
Kathleen Collins, Ph.D.
William Piland, Ed.D.

© Copyright by
Gregorio A. Ponce
2001

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. Consequently, this investigation sought to establish (a) who was directly involved with the governance process, (b) how the process was operationalized, and (c) the benefits, drawbacks, and unresolved issues for implementing the governance process. The design of this investigation was a qualitative case study.

Noting that the use of multiple sources of data collection adds to the reliability and validity of a study, interviews, observations, documents, and the professional literature on governance were used to both gather and triangulate the data. Once all of the data were accumulated, Guba & Lincoln's constant comparative method and Spradley's domain analysis worksheet were applied to discern the emergent categories and themes of the study. Finally, the findings were presented via a virtual roundtable discussion to provide readers with a better sense of what was important to the stakeholders.

An overall recommendation of this study was the need to evaluate the governance processes at the state, and local levels, on an annual and biannual basis. The six major themes of responsibilities, structures, processes, opportunities, participation, and communication, emerged from the analysis of the data and brought forth the following recommendations: Key governance players need to (a) disclose, discern and inform governance stakeholders about their roles and responsibilities defined in statute, regulation, and policy, (b) sort out the inconsistencies created from the merging of pre and post AB1725 governance structures, (c) generate clear, or revise vague, governance processes and insure their implementation too, (d) build upon the opportunities created by AB1725 to better guide its development and practice, (e) identify and attend to existing barriers and issues that shape the participation of stakeholders, and (f) endorse, espouse, and ensure the use of communication as means to enhance the flow of information, understanding of issues, and making of decisions.

Dedicado a Dios y a mi familia.

Dedicated to God and to my family.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I vividly remember seven years ago walking into the office of Dr. Joseph Rost to discuss my application for USD's Educational Leadership program. "Why leadership?" he asked. "Because I can wing it only so long," I answered. What a journey!

Prior to this meeting, many individuals encouraged me to begin the doctorate program—Dr. DePaoli, Dr. Walker, Dr. Macci, Carolyn Grant, Olga Artech, and Dean Leptich, to name a few. Six years later, many other people have been making sure that I complete the project—Nona Hughes, Victor Jaime, Beth Smith, Eric Jacobson, Michael Jerge, Rosie Lopez, David Zielinski, Ruben Lopez, Claudine Duff, Raul Aragon, Mel and Mary Wendrick, Norma Nava, Janeen Kalin, Frank Rapp, Rosa Chavez, Jose Lopez, Dan and Tina Cerda, James Patterson, Cesar Guzman, Alicia Ortega, Josefina Wendell, Linda McMullin, Nannette Kelly, Marylynn Carlson, Craig Luoma, Ralph Marquez, Carol Lee, Maria Castro, Linda Giurbino, Raquel Garcia, Frances Lionheart, Patti Biley, Valerie and Gary Rodgers, Esther Granados, Rafael Santos, and many more. I am also grateful for the support given to me by the members of my division, especially these past two years.

I also want to recognize the participants of this investigation—administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students—who not only allowed me to interview and observe them, but who also shared with me in a very candid manner their experiences, concerns, ideas, and insights about shared governance. Moreover, this study would not have been possible without the support of Dr. Gilbert Dominguez and the IVC Board of Trustees. Dr. Dominguez and his executive secretary, Shirley Hofer-Bell, opened their doors and gave me full access to any and all information that I needed to complete this study.

The development of this dissertation came about with the guidance and support of my dissertation committee members. I am honored for the opportunity I had of benefiting from their expertise to strengthen this dissertation. I am particularly appreciative of my director, Edward DeRoche, who was an anchor through the storms, a beacon in the haze, and a guide through the maze that is typical of writing a dissertation.

From the start of the program, I had the privilege of working for and learning from Joseph Rost. From our conversations, I soon learned that the essence of leadership does not lie in the leader but rather in the relationship that develops between leaders and collaborators. Joe's insights into leadership have influenced me far beyond the classroom. Leadership—influence relationship, mutual purposes, leaders and collaborators, intended real changes—what a framework to do leadership in this Twenty-First Century!

Sandra and Hector Lopez have both taken the time to make sure that I continue my educational career, and that I not give up when all seemed impossible. Their way of life is to give guidance, and I was lucky, very lucky indeed, that guidance was but one of many gifts that I received from both of them. I cherished, and plan to continue cherishing, their advice, encouragement, insights, and, most of all, their friendship.

Family is by far the most important relationship for me, and yet it was family who paid the biggest price as I worked to complete this endeavor. I begin with my parents, Margarita and Gregorio, for it is their hard-working ethic, coupled with the importance they gave to education as *the way* to help family come out ahead, which has been and continues to be a driving force in my life. I continue with my sister, Sara, whose smile and cheerful nature I always welcomed and looked forward to, especially on days when I felt there was little to smile about. In addition, there were the Sanchez, Curlango, Lopez, Cordova, Soto and Ruiz's families, whose encouraging words never failed, in spite of the many get-togethers that I missed. I am appreciative of my children, Gabriela, Gregorio Alejandro, and Karina, who so kindly gave up many hours of our time together so that I may complete this dissertation. I conclude by recognizing the extraordinary patience, endurance, sacrifice, encouragement and understanding of my loving wife, Laura. From day one, Laura unselfishly provided our children and me the much needed stability and strength needed to follow through and complete the doctoral program. Gracias mi amor!

To all whom I have mentioned, and to all whom I have carelessly neglected to mention, please accept my sincerest, most appreciative and heartfelt THANK YOU!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY.....	1
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE	2
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	3
DEFINITION OF TERMS	4
BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY	5
<i>ABI 725: The Mandate for Shared Governance.....</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Imperial Valley College: 1988 to 1992.....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Imperial Valley College: 1992 to 1995.....</i>	<i>7</i>
<i>Imperial Valley College: 1995 to 1999.....</i>	<i>11</i>
RESEARCH QUESTIONS	12
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	14
INTRODUCTION	14
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	15
STAKEHOLDERS: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	19
<i>Board of Trustees.....</i>	<i>20</i>
<i>Administration</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>Faculty.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>Staff.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Students.....</i>	<i>35</i>
GOVERNANCE.....	39
<i>Structure and Process.....</i>	<i>39</i>
<i>Implementation Issues.....</i>	<i>43</i>
<i>Guidelines and Recommendations.....</i>	<i>46</i>
LEADERSHIP	49
<i>Leadership within a Bureaucratic Framework.....</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>Leadership within a Political Framework</i>	<i>51</i>
<i>Leadership within a Cultural Framework.....</i>	<i>52</i>
<i>Leadership within a Collegial Framework</i>	<i>54</i>
<i>Leadership and Shared Governance.....</i>	<i>55</i>
CONCLUSION	57
CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY.....	60
RESEARCH DESIGN	60
SITE DETERMINATION AND DESCRIPTION.....	62
SAMPLE SELECTION.....	63
DATA COLLECTION	64
<i>Interviews.....</i>	<i>65</i>
<i>Documents</i>	<i>66</i>
<i>Observations</i>	<i>67</i>
<i>Professional Literature.....</i>	<i>69</i>
DATA ANALYSIS.....	69
SUBJECTS' RISK/BENEFITS.....	72
LIMITATIONS	72

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA.....	73
INTRODUCTION	73
THE SHARED GOVERNANCE PLAYERS	75
<i>The Decision Makers</i>	76
<i>The Implementers</i>	77
<i>Missing in Action</i>	81
<i>Summary</i>	82
THE SHARED GOVERNANCE PROCESS	83
<i>Structures for Participation</i>	83
<i>Policies and Procedure</i>	93
<i>Putting it Into Action</i>	97
<i>Summary</i>	99
THE SHARED GOVERNANCE VIEWS	100
<i>On the Plus Side</i>	100
<i>On the Down Side</i>	103
<i>Issues, Issues, Issues</i>	108
<i>Summary</i>	117
CONCLUSION	119
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	120
INTRODUCTION	120
SUMMARY OF STUDY	122
SUMMARY OF EMERGENT THEMES AND FINDINGS	124
<i>Responsibilities</i>	124
<i>Structures</i>	124
<i>Processes</i>	125
<i>Opportunities</i>	125
<i>Participation</i>	125
<i>Communication</i>	126
DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	126
LEADERSHIP IMPLICATIONS	139
CONCLUSION	141
REFERENCES	142
APPENDICES	151

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. APPENDIX A – REQUESTING PERMISSION TO CONDUCT STUDY LETTER.....	152
2. APPENDIX B – APPROVAL TO CONDUCT STUDY LETTER	153
3. APPENDIX C – LETTER OF INTRODUCTION TO CAMPUS COMMITTEES	154
4. APPENDIX D – INFORMED CONSENT FORM.....	156
5. APPENDIX E – INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR STRUCTURED SECTION	157
6. APPENDIX F – INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SEMI-STRUCTURED SECTION	158
7. APPENDIX G – CONCEPT MAP ILLUSTRATION	159
8. APPENDIX H – DOMAIN ANALYSIS WORKSHEET	160
9. APPENDIX I – DOMAIN ANALYSIS ILLUSTRATION.....	161
10. APPENDIX J – EMERGENT CATEGORIES.....	162
11. APPENDIX K – SUMMARY OF CALIFORNIA GOVERNANCE STATUTES AND REGULATIONS	163

CHAPTER ONE: OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

Introduction

The traditions of shared governance received nationwide attention in 1966 when the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the American Council of Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) jointly formulated a *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (AAUP, 1966). At the heart of the statement was the declaration that “the variety and complexity of tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others” and thus necessitated the need for the “full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort” by all these groups (AAUP, 1966). In recent years, though, criticisms of the shared governance process for educational institutions have been growing.

In the 1996 report, *Renewing the Academic Presidency: Stronger Leadership for Tougher Times*, the Commission on the Academic Presidency of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) declared that “at a time when higher education should be alert and nimble, it is slow and cautious instead, hindered by the traditions and mechanisms of governing that don’t allow the responsiveness and decisiveness the times require” (AGB, 1996). The Commission concluded that shared governance “is at the heart of the academy’s governing problems” and recommended that shared governance “be clarified and simplified, so that those with the responsibility to act can exercise the authority to do so” (AGB, 1996).

In a study sponsored by the California Higher Education Policy Center, Trombley (1997) similarly reported that shared governance “has shrouded the decision-making process in confusion and has led to power struggles up and down the state between

faculty organizations and college administrators” (Trombley, 1997). One consequence of shared governance is a consultation process at the state level which “seldom reaches consensus about anything” (Trombley, 1997). Trombley concluded that “there is general agreement among the interested parties that changes are needed, but there is little consensus about what these changes should be” (Trombley, 1997). The current lack of “consensus among policy makers about how to deal with governance issues” (Richardson, 1997), coupled with the importance given by the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (1997) to faculty, staff, and student roles in the governance of an institution, indicate a growing need to restudy the issue of shared governance in educational institutions.

Statement of the Issue

Shared governance advocates (Gerber, 1997; Ramo, 1997; Scott, 1996) are alarmed that most calls for changing the shared governance process in educational institutions depend heavily on minimizing the role of faculty in governance. Proposals that call for minimizing the role of key stakeholders while enhancing the role of one or two key stakeholders in the governance of an institution are perplexing due to the latest developments in leadership and management theories (Wishart, 1998; Trombley, 1997; AGB, 1996; de Russy, 1996). For example, in order to create a lasting and transforming change in individuals and institutions, leadership scholars have been calling for the need to develop more inclusive processes of change (Chrislip and Larson, 1994; Heifetz, 1994; Rost, 1991; Starratt, 1993). Business scholars are also advocating for more participative management processes in the corporate world so that businesses can better respond to customer needs (Block, 1993; O’Toole, 1995; Senge, 1990). Indeed, “at a time when legislators, trustees, and administrators are bemoaning the absence of top-down bureaucratic ‘efficiency’ in colleges and universities, enlightened management experts are advocating a less top-down, more ‘professional’ model for corporations” (Ramo, 1997, p. 41).

Broad-scaled studies (Darnell 1994; Flanigan, 1996; Giese, 1995; Harpster, 1995; Piland and Bubnitz, 1998; Wheeler, 1995) on Assembly Bill 1725, the 1988 California shared governance mandate, have indicated that the governance processes of community colleges were highly participative. At the same time, large-scale studies by other researchers (Hanson, 1995; Howell, 1997; Richardson, 1997) documented a need to improve the shared governance process throughout California's colleges. A result of researchers studying the California Community College System as a statewide system has been a macro level understanding of the shared governance process.

Other researchers (Segesvary, 1997; Shihadi, 1996; Cota, 1993; Duncan-Hall, 1993; Burleigh, 1990) studied specific aspects of the shared governance mandates at the campus level. For instance, Burleigh (1990) researched the faculty peer review aspect of the shared governance mandate. In 1993, Cota investigated how the members of two multicollge districts understood and planned to implement shared governance. In the same year, Duncan-Hall (1993) explored the extent of faculty participation in the process of institutional planning. Finally, Segesvary (1997) focused on the budget process of one community college. While these investigations were helpful to develop an understanding of specific aspects of the shared governance mandate, there is a need to carry out an extensive study of the implications of shared governance at the campus level.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study, then, is to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. The intent of this study is to fill a void in the understanding of shared governance at community colleges because there has been no comprehensive study of the implementation of AB1725 at the campus level. In particular, there is a need to explore the full implications of the shared governance process from the perspective of the individuals who implement the shared governance process on a day-to-day basis. This study should provide new insights about issues emerging from the

complex process of shared governance to help practitioners and policy-makers improve the shared governance processes at their respective institutions.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this dissertation the following terms were used throughout this investigation:

Shared Governance: Procedures to ensure faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards (California Education Code, Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988, Section 70902(b)(7)).

Academic Senate: An organization whose primary function is, as the representative of the faculty, to make recommendations to the administration of a college and to the governing board of a district with respect to academic and professional matters (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 53200).

Academic and Professional Matters: Policy development and implementation matters pertaining to; (a) curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines, (b) degree and certificate requirements, (c) grading policies, (d) educational and program development, (e) standards or policies regarding student preparation and success, (f) district and college governance structures, as related to faculty roles, (g) faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self study and annual reports, (h) policies for professional development activities, (i) processes for program review, (j) processes for institutional planning and budget development, and (k) other academic and professional matters as mutually agreed upon between the governing board and the academic senate (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 53200).

Consult Collegially: the process in which the district governing board shall develop policies on academic and professional matters using either or both of the following methods; (a) relying primarily on the advice and judgment of the academic senate, or (b) the district governing board, or designee, shall have the obligation to reach mutual agreement by written resolution, regulation, or policy of the governing board effectuating such recommendations (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 53200).

Background for the Study

AB1725: The Mandate for Shared Governance

In 1988, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1725 (California Education Code, Chapter 973, Statutes of 1988) which “took the landmark step of creating the California Community Colleges as a system of higher education” (Board of Governors, 1990b, p. 1). Assembly Bill 1725 (AB1725) thus required the California Community College system to change its governance structures and processes in such a way that “the new structure should be a postsecondary system with governance shared between the local boards and the Board of Governors” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 55). In addition to “delineating the roles of the Board of Governors and district governing boards” (Board of Governors, 1990a, p. 1), AB1725 also required local governing boards to change their governance structures and processes. After all, “the roles of faculty, students, and others in governance [were] being strengthened at both the State and Local levels” by the AB1725 reforms (Board of Governors, 1990a, p. 2).

AB1725 required local governing boards to recognize “the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards” (California Education Code, 70902(b)(7)). With regards to equivalency, administrative retreat rights, and minimum degree requirements, the local governing boards had to rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate (California Education Code, 87359(b), 87458(a), 87615(b)). In the case

of hiring procedures, they had to be “developed and agreed upon jointly by the representatives of the governing board and the academic senate” (California Education Code, 87360(b)).

In order to facilitate the shared governance process, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges updated sections 53200 to 53205 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations and defined how local governing boards were to consult collegially with academic senates on academic and professional matters. Consequently, each community college in California, through their respective governing boards and academic senates, had to begin the process of changing their governance structures and processes.

AB1725 also required local governing boards to establish procedures so that faculty, staff, and students could have a voice and express their opinions at the campus level regarding any issues that they considered relevant to their interest (California Education Code, 70902(b)(7)). As a result, the Board of Governors updated section 51023 of Title 5 of the California Code of Regulations outlining the minimum standards required not only to establish the shared governance policies for each respective college but also the process by which the college established its policies and procedures. Colleges thus embarked on updating their governance structures and processes, Imperial Valley College included. In order to better understand the current experiences of individuals and groups responsible to carry out the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College, it is crucial to first “examine critically the context, the antecedents and the movement and history of changes” (Wilson, 1992, p. 48).

Imperial Valley College: 1988 to 1992

There are two campus organizations representing the faculty at Imperial Valley College—the academic senate and the collective bargaining agent. The California Teachers Association (CTA) became the exclusive bargaining agent for the faculty at the same time that California voters approved in 1978 Proposition 13, an initiative to lower

property taxes. A direct consequence of Proposition 13 for educational institutions was a dramatic loss of state and local funds to carry out their mission. By facing staff reductions brought about by Proposition 13, union and administrative officials began their relationship in the midst of conflict and chaos. The issues they faced together set the tone for confrontational meetings that created animosity and mistrust between the administrative team and the faculty's bargaining agent.

In 1988, the academic senate began to study AB1725 to determine how to bring Imperial Valley College into compliance with the new law. For the next four years, academic senators worked to develop policies with regards to equivalency, administrator retreat rights, hiring procedures, and tenure evaluation procedures. At the same time, the bargaining agent began to work on policies for evaluation procedures, faculty service areas, and tenure evaluation procedures, some of which were initially developed by the academic senate. Once drafts were developed, each group would then initiate the process to meet with the administrators of the college. Even though the tension and mistrust between the faculty and administrators were high at times, as they met to discuss the respective policies, agreement was reached on setting policy in the areas of equivalency, administrator retreat rights, hiring procedures, faculty service areas, and evaluation of faculty. With respect to tenure evaluation procedures, both the bargaining agent and the administration agreed not to change the process that was in place at the time.

Imperial Valley College: 1992 to 1995

In 1992, members of the academic senate began to consider how to update the college governance processes mandated by AB1725 and Title 5. Specifically, Title 5 dictated how governing boards should consult collegially with academic senates on academic and professional matters. However, compliance with Title 5 was not the only priority for the academic senators. Another priority was to change the typical adversarial relationship that existed between faculty and administrators into a more collaborative relationship. The majority of the academic senators felt that in order for shared

governance to have a long-term beneficial effect at the college, then a crucial step had to be the improvement of relations with the college community, and in particular with the college president and his administrative staff. This task was complicated by a union referendum, also in 1992, which resulted in a vote of no confidence for the college president. The academic senators, nonetheless, continued with their plan to improve relations and bring Imperial Valley College into compliance with Title 5.

In the fall of 1992, the newly elected senate president presided over the first senate meeting of the year and was asked by the student body president to explain the role of the senators and the academic senate. This question was the impetus for the senators to find out in more detail about their role and the role of the academic senate. A plan of action was presented to the faculty on how to enhance its role and effectiveness through the shared governance process mandated by AB1725.

The proposal consisted of a three-phase process. Phase I consisted in defining the role and responsibilities of the academic senate and sharing the information with all of the faculty. Phase II consisted in assessing the actual way in which the academic senate carried out its responsibilities and finding out the extent to which college policies helped or hindered the academic senate in carrying out its responsibilities. Phase III required developing a plan to formally restructure the governance processes at the college.

To better understand the role of the academic senate, the senate president began to attend conferences sponsored by the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. Through these conferences the senate president began to understand AB1725 and its implications for the college. As a result of these experiences, the senate president proposed to change Phase I of the academic senate action plan. The senate president proposed that the first phase include two additional stages; a proposal for the senate president to go to Sacramento and meet with government officials and leaders of state organizations focused on community college issues, and a proposal for the senators to sponsor two workshops led by state-level experts on shared governance. A key aspect of

the senate president's proposal was a recommendation that all shared governance information and workshops be made available not only to faculty, but also to the other members of Imperial Valley College; classified staff, students, administrators, and board members. The invitation of other groups beside faculty to attend workshops demonstrated a collaborative approach by senators as they searched to better understand the role of the academic senate at the college and was well received by classified staff, students, administrators, and board members.

Before 1992, senators routinely conducted closed sessions. The senate president shared with the other senators his view that closed sessions were not in the best interests of the faculty and college. The senate president felt that secrecy was putting individuals on the defensive and fed into the poor communication which existed between the administrators and senators. The response from the senators was mixed. Some senators felt that discussing plans on how to carry out the shared governance plan in open session would put the faculty at a disadvantage with the administration. The other senators felt that the risk was worthwhile if relations were to improve with the college president and his administrative staff. As a result of the discussion on doing business in open sessions, rather than automatically going into closed session, the senators began to discuss the appropriateness of doing so, which resulted in fewer closed sessions.

The ideas of collaboration and openness enabled senators and administrators to work on a new playing field. Even though there were disagreements between both groups, good faith efforts to agree on both sides brought forth new ideas and policies that were ultimately in the best interests of the students. In cases where disagreements were not resolved, issues were presented to the board of trustees for their input and/or decision. In the midst of a vote of no confidence for the college president, a new way of discussing and developing policy emerged.

The new ways of communicating and working with the college president and his administrative team became important factors as senators began to re-write the senate

constitution. The new constitution did not allow senate presidents to serve for more than three years in a row. Not only that, but rather than the senators electing the president, the constitution required that the president be elected by the whole faculty. In addition, the academic senate increased the size of its membership, from 9 to 21 members with the requirement that each division be represented in the senate. Finally, the decision-making process, adapted into a resolution process, required that faculty members receive a copy of any proposed resolution before making a decision and gave the faculty the authority to override any decision made by the senators.

As senators began to understand the role of the senate, it became clear that such responsibilities required a change in the teaching load of future senate presidents. In 1993, after sharing information with board members and administrators about the role of the academic senate, the senators felt that justification for released time was more than sufficient. Citing fiscal reasons, the college president denied the first and second requests for released time. The senators then decided to present their case directly to the board of trustees. The board of trustees, upon the suggestion of the college president, invited the senate president to give a presentation on shared governance at an upcoming board retreat. The presentation included not only a plan of action to restructure the governance processes for the college, but also a proposal for released time. Consequently, two resolutions were placed on the board agenda for its next regular meeting. One resolution was to approve the college's shared governance policy as it related to the academic senate and the other resolution was to approve released time for the senate president.

On the night of the board meeting in July 1994, the union representative formally protested to the board members that the released time resolution was a negotiable item and that any board action on that resolution would leave the bargaining agent with no choice but to file a formal letter of protest. The board members took no action on the resolution. At the next senate meeting, the senators discussed their options to get the released time resolution back on the agenda. On one side, union officials indicated to the

senators that the proper course of action was to let them negotiate the item. On the other side, though, administrators made it clear to the senators that released time was not a negotiable item. The lines were drawn and the senators were caught in the middle. Eventually, both sides signed a memo of understanding stating that granting released time to the senate president would not forego any of the union's future rights to negotiate the issue. Eight months later the board of trustees approved the request for released time for future senate presidents.

The protest by union officials in July of 1994 overshadowed the unanimous approval of the shared governance resolution. The change in the college decision-making process, which formalized the role of the academic senate and the faculty, caused other movements toward change. The Associated Student Government for Imperial Valley College began to send student representatives to state conferences to find out more about their possible roles in the shared governance process. In addition, the classified staff and their bargaining agent began to sponsor workshops to discuss the implications of shared governance as applied to their role. However, as the academic senate began to work towards implementing the shared governance process, the unexpected death of the college president brought forth a period of uncertainty and change for the college.

Imperial Valley College: 1995 to 1999

In the spring of 1996, the new college president identified as one of his priorities the desire to create a college council. While the college was in compliance with the shared governance process as it related to the academic senate, a consultation process giving students, staff, and faculty the opportunity to voice their views and opinions on campus level issues was still not in place. Thus, in the fall of 1996, after consultation with his cabinet and the academic senate, the college president created an ad-hoc college council to develop a proposed policy for the formation of a college council as a standing committee. The ad-hoc committee consisted of three administrators, three classified staff members, three faculty members, and three students; all with the same voting rights.

At the first meeting of the ad-hoc college council, the group determined that the chair of the committee would be a faculty member. In addition, the group received a copy of a proposal, prepared by the administrative team, outlining its recommendation on the function, composition, and procedures of the future college council. The ad-hoc group decided to study the proposal for its next meeting.

Prior to the second meeting, the college council chair prepared another proposal for the consideration by the group. The proposal was distributed prior to the second meeting to give the members of the ad-hoc college council time to study and compare the two proposals. At the second meeting, the members noted that the second proposal had separated the general policy from the operating procedures of the college council and, after a long discussion, merged some of the ideas of the first proposal into the second proposal. The ad-hoc college council reached agreement on the final document and directed the chair of the college council to forward the document to the college president and academic senate president.

In December 1996, the Board of Trustees updated its shared governance policy (Imperial Valley College, 1998) to form the college council as a standing committee of Imperial Valley College. The college council consisted of three representatives from the following groups; administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students. The policy defined the primary function of the college council to be a forum for all college groups to share their views and opinions with respect to the development of new policies and the change of current policies. Thus, before any major policy proposal would go to the Board of Trustees, campus policy-making groups should solicit comments from the college council and respond to any of their suggestions. Subsequently, the proposed policy would be sent to the Board of Trustees.

Research Questions

With this background information about Imperial Valley College and this study's purpose to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of the individuals and

groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College, the investigation addressed the following research questions:

1. Who are the individuals and groups directly involved with the shared governance process?
 - Who are the individuals and groups responsible for maintaining and updating the shared governance process?
 - Who are the individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance policy?
 - Who are the individuals and groups missing from the shared governance process?
2. How has the shared governance process been operationalized?
 - What is the shared governance committee structure?
 - What is the shared governance process to develop or change policy?
 - How do individuals and groups maintain, update, and implement the shared governance policy?
3. How do the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance view the shared governance process?
 - What are the benefits from implementing the shared governance policy?
 - What are the drawbacks from implementing the shared governance policy?
 - What are the unresolved issues from implementing the shared governance policy?
4. What generalizations can be made to other community colleges concerning the implementation of shared governance?
5. What are the leadership implications for community colleges that operate under a shared governance process?

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

In order to better understand the impact of shared governance in community colleges, I organized this review of the literature into four sections; (a) historical background, (b) stakeholders, (c) governance, and (d) leadership. The first section outlines the history behind community colleges and the events that led to Assembly Bill 1725. Community colleges initially grew out of the K-12 educational system with high school districts meeting the college educational needs of their communities. It was not until the 1960s when community colleges began their transition into the higher education system of California. However, the governance structures and processes of colleges continued to be similar to the K-12 system until the passage of Assembly Bill 1725. Historically and currently, the California Legislature has had much authority and influence on the day-to-day operations of California's community colleges.

The second section identifies the stakeholder groups that arise out of the community college system and examines the roles of governing boards, administrators, faculty, staff, and students. A key aspect of this section, and a consequence of the prescriptive laws enacted by the California Legislature, is the inclusion of the mandates on the roles of these stakeholders. The key sources for this section of the literature review are the California Education Code, Title 5 California Code of Regulations, and the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges.

The third section elaborates on the governance of community colleges. The section begins by providing a background on the structures and processes of governance, which involve the stakeholder groups identified in the previous section. The focus here is on the implementation issues that have arisen out of using the shared governance

structures and processes in the community college system. I examine guidelines and recommendations that either identify effective shared governance processes and structures, or are aimed at improving the implementation of shared governance.

The final section reviews the literature on leadership as it relates to the governance of educational organizations. Most of the literature on leadership places much emphasis on the effect that leaders have on their organizations. How leaders lead is due in part to their views on the meaning of an organization and how the organization should function. I thus elaborate on how the bureaucratic, political, cultural, and collegial models for educational institutions relate to the process of leaders leading their organizations.

Historical Background

“California’s community colleges originated as extensions of public secondary schools, and for most of their history were governed in much the same fashion” (Howell, 1997). “The first statutory authorization for what has evolved to become community college education was enacted in 1907 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1907), when the legislature authorized high schools to offer” courses equivalent to the first two years of an university (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 3). Then, “in 1917, the Legislature enacted the ‘Junior College Act’ (Chapter 304, Statutes of 1907), which provided financial support for junior colleges courses offered by high school districts” (p. 3). Even though, “the Legislature authorized the creation of separate junior college districts in 1921, most junior colleges were operated by high schools and unified districts throughout their first half-century” (Richardson, 1997). Hence, “while community colleges now are recognized as partners in a state’s higher education enterprise, they grew out of a public school tradition that separated the overseers (administrators) from the hired hands (teachers)” (Piland, 1994, p. 97).

In 1959, “the education code was recodified . . . [and] filled 927 pages, providing evidence of the growth in education-related matters being decided by the Legislature” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 3). In that same year, the California Legislature solicited

from the State Board of Education and the University of California Regents “a study of the system of higher education in the State and to prepare a master plan for higher education” (p. 8). “On the basis of the Master Plan’s recommendation, there was enacted into law at the 1960 First Extraordinary Session, . . . the ‘Donahue Higher Education Act,’ named after the late Assemblywoman Dorothy M. Donahue” (p. 12). While the law applied to all of the segments of higher education, state colleges, junior colleges, and the University of California system, Trombley (1997) noted that:

The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education included community colleges (there were then 63) as part of public higher education, assigning them the task of providing quality lower-division (freshman and sophomore) instruction for students who want to transfer to four-year institutions, as well as offering a wide range of vocational and technical programs (Trombley, 1997).

Even though the 1960 Master Plan “included the junior colleges as part of higher education, neither the plan itself, nor the Donahoe Higher Education Act contained any realistic attempt to change the [*sic*] governance structure for the delivery of junior college education” (Board of Governors, 1986, p.15). Clearly, the colleges’ “early relationship with K-12 [continued] to blur their status as a part of higher education” (Richardson, 1997).

“By the mid-1960’s, there was a growing dissatisfaction with state-level governance and leadership of junior colleges by the Department of Education” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 15). A committee on education of the State Assembly recommended that the 1967 Legislature “consider a bill to establish a separate Board of Governors for the California Junior Colleges, with such a body to assume the duties and responsibilities of junior college policy setting and administration presently vested in the State Board of Education” (p. 17). As a result of this recommendation, the Legislature created “a state

Board of Governors to guide the development of coherent policy directions for the community colleges” (Rockwell, n.d.).

Rather than “delegating it broad power to oversee the colleges” (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 6) similar to that of the California State University System, the Legislature “vested the new Board with the same prescriptive list of powers and duties that had been held by the State Board of Education” (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 6). “This creation of a state Board of Governors implied a reduction in the authority of the local Board, and it was an acknowledgment of the need for state issues to be served through the community colleges, as well as local ones” (Rockwell, n.d.). However, “by leaving existing statutes intact, the Legislature clouded the Board’s authority to implement the new delineation of functions” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 22) since there remained conflicting lines of authority between local governing boards and the Board of Governors.

The Legislature also retained major authority of the community college system because it “(a) delegated limited authority to the Board of Governors, (b) retained major control of local districts, and (c) dictated how the Board of Governors should carry out its own functions” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 44). Thus, the Legislature “retained authority by choosing not to consolidate it within either the state governing board or the governing boards of local districts” (p. 44). In 1978, this authority over the community college system became even more valuable to the California Legislature because of Proposition 13.

According to Rockwell (n.d.), prior to 1978, local governing boards “had three bases for their authority. First, they had local taxing authority. Second, they made policy decisions which affected only the residents of the district. Finally, they represented the local voice in the general policy climate of the area” (Rockwell, n.d.). “However, the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978 eroded the clout of local governing boards by limiting their taxing authority” (Trombley, 1997) because “the ‘local’ property tax was transformed into a state tax law with the focus of authority in Sacramento, and its local

focus on a two-thirds, super majority required of district voters to pass finance measures” (CCCHE, 1997). Thus,

when California voters passed this initiative in 1978, like other local entities in California, the community colleges lost two-thirds of their property tax revenues and their legal ability to establish, through board action alone, the level of property taxes based on their perceptions of local needs. In effect, local property taxes were consolidated with state revenues and each entity was provided an amount derived, for the most part, from a legislatively determined formula (CCCHE, 1997).

Before Proposition 13 “community colleges received 39.6 percent of their funding from the state and 60.3 percent from local revenue. A year later, the funding mix was 69.2 percent from the state and 28.9 percent from local sources” (Richardson, 1997). Though “Proposition 13 did not technically alter the community college governance structure, its revenue reducing impact and the fact that the state share of community college funding was greatly increased created a strong impetus for increased legislative intervention” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 25).

“During the early 1980’s, critics noted that the Legislature functioned as a super board for colleges, subject to frequent criticism for intrusion in local affairs, for dictating policy by statute, and for lack of understanding of the nature of the colleges” (Rockwell, n.d.). “Evidence of legislative activism is provided by the fact that the Education Code grew from 927 pages in 1959 to over 2,300 pages in 1985” (Board of Governors, 1986, p. 25). In 1984, “a coalition of community college organizations known as, ‘Californians for Community Colleges’ consisted of the major faculty union and organizations, including the statewide academic senate; the chief executive officers association, the

administrator's association, the trustee's association, the classified employee's association, the student association, and the Board of Governors" (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 8). One major goal of the group was to develop recommendations to improve the governance structure for community colleges. In fact,

the Californians themselves operated in a manner which presaged the "shared governance" provisions of AB 1725. One group, one vote, was the order of the day, and consensus drove the agenda. The work was painstaking due to the diversity of interests, but there was a common ground cleared through the recognition of the crises (Rockwell, n.d.).

Consequently, "as a finance and governance reform measure, AB 1725 was backed by virtually all major organizations within the community colleges" (CCCHE, 1997). "Yet, its implementation . . . helped crystallize the differences between these groups along with their long-standing philosophical differences" (CCCHE, 1997).

Stakeholders: Roles and Responsibilities

"The first serious reform of the California Master Plan for Higher Education came about with the passage of Assembly Bill 1725, the community college reform bill" (Piland & Bubnitz, 1998, p. 100). In 1990, the Board of Governors for the California Community College System clarified that "shared governance embraces the basic objective that all key parties of interest should participate in jointly developing recommendations for governing board action. At the district level, key parties include administrators, faculty, staff, and students" (Board of Governors, 1990c, p. 1). According to the AGB though, "the involvement of these diverse internal stakeholders will vary according to subject matter and the culture of the institution, but the board is responsible for establishing the rules by which their voices are considered" (AGB, 1998).

The focus now of this literature review, then, is to better depict the role and authority of each stakeholder group, not only because “the Legislature has already fixed these delegations of authority, thereby reinforcing its intent that certain parties be empowered in certain instances” (Board of Governors, 1990b, p. 2), but also because “an increasingly heated debate has been taking place over the role of presidents, board of trustees, and faculty in the governance of institutions of higher learning” (Gerber, 1997, p. 14).

Board of Trustees

In the California Community College System, “the major responsibilities of governance rest with the seventy-one popularly elected board of trustees within each district” (Laffoon-Villegas, n.d.). The California Education Code delineates the role and function of the board of trustees as follows:

- (a) Every community college district shall be under the control of a board of trustees, which is referred to herein as the "governing board." The governing board of each community college district shall establish, maintain, operate, and govern one or more community colleges in accordance with law. In so doing, the governing board may initiate and carry on any program, activity, or may otherwise act in any manner that is not in conflict with or inconsistent with, or preempted by, any law and that is not in conflict with the purposes for which community college districts are established. The governing board of each community college district shall establish rules and regulations not inconsistent with the regulations of the board of governors and the laws of this state for the government and operation of one or more community colleges in the district.

- (b) In furtherance of the provisions of subdivision (a), the governing board of each community college district shall do all of the following:
- (1) Establish policies for, and approve, current and long-range academic and facilities plans and programs and promote orderly growth and development of the community colleges within the district. In so doing, the governing board shall, as required by law, establish policies for, develop, and approve, comprehensive plans. The governing board shall submit the comprehensive plans to the board of governors for review and approval.
 - (2) Establish policies for and approve courses of instruction and educational programs. The educational programs shall be submitted to the board of governors for approval. Courses of instruction that are not offered in approved educational programs shall be submitted to the board of governors for approval. The governing board shall establish policies for, and approve, individual courses that are offered in approved educational programs without referral to the board of governors.
 - (3) Establish academic standards, probation and dismissal and readmission policies, and graduation requirements not inconsistent with the minimum standards adopted by the board of governors.
 - (4) Employ and assign all personnel not inconsistent with the minimum standards adopted by the board of governors and establish employment

practices, salaries, and benefits for all employees not inconsistent with the laws of this state.

- (5) To the extent authorized by law, determine and control the district's operational and capital outlay budgets. The district governing board shall determine the need for elections for override tax levies and bond measures and request that those elections be called.
- (6) Manage and control district property. The governing board may contract for the procurement of goods and services as authorized by law.
- (7) Establish procedures not inconsistent with minimum standards established by the board of governors to ensure faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.
- (8) Establish rules and regulations governing student conduct.
- (9) Establish student fees as it is required to establish by law, and, in its discretion, fees as it is authorized to establish by law.
- (10) In its discretion, receive and administer gifts, grants, and scholarships.
- (11) Provide auxiliary services as deemed necessary to achieve the purposes of the community college.

- (12) Within the framework provided by law, determine the district's academic calendar, including the holidays it will observe.
- (13) Hold and convey property for the use and benefit of the district. The governing board may acquire by eminent domain any property necessary to carry out the powers or functions of the district.
- (14) Participate in the consultation process established by the board of governors for the development and review of policy proposals.
- (c) In carrying out the powers and duties specified in subdivision (b) or other provisions of statute, the governing board of each community college district shall have full authority to adopt rules and regulations, not inconsistent with the regulations of the board of governors and the laws of this state, that are necessary and proper to executing these prescribed functions.
- (d) Wherever in this section or any other statute a power is vested in the governing board, the governing board of a community college district, by majority vote, may adopt a rule delegating the power to the district's chief executive officer or any other employee or committee as the governing board may designate; provided, however, that the governing board shall not delegate any power that is expressly made nondelegable by statute. Any rule delegating authority shall prescribe the limits of the delegation (California Education Code, Section 70902).

In addition, the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges (1997) includes the following responsibilities for board of trustees:

1. The governing board is an independent policy-making board capable of reflecting the public interest in board activities and decisions. It has a mechanism for providing continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.
2. The governing board ensures that the educational program is of high quality, is responsible for overseeing the financial health and integrity of the institution, and confirms that institutional practices are consistent with the board-approved institutional mission statement and policies.
3. The governing board establishes broad institutional policies and appropriately delegates responsibility to implement these policies. The governing board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.
4. In keeping with its mission, the governing board selects and evaluates the chief executive officer and confirms the appointment of other major academic and administrative officers.
5. The size, duties, responsibilities, ethical conduct requirements, structure and operating procedures, and processes for assessing the performance of the governing board are clearly defined and published in board policies or by-laws. The board acts in a manner consistent with them.
6. The governing board has a program for new member orientation and governing board development.
7. The board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process (ACCJC, 1997).

Finally, since AB1725 “provided authority to the Board of Governors and local boards to delegate authority” (BOG, 1990b, p. 1) to various campus groups and individuals, the Board of Governors indicated “that they approach the task of delegating authority with discipline and care” (p. 2) because “governing boards remain accountable legally” (p. 2).

Consequently, to provide a sense of direction to local governing boards, the Board of Governors (1990c) provided the following five principles to delegate authority:

1. Both the Board of Governors and local boards should proceed in an open, deliberate, and collegial manner as they develop and adopt policies that fix responsibilities and delegate authority.
 2. Ideally, the body that is assigned by statute or regulation with legal responsibility for a particular function should control the nature and extent of any delegation of authority or apportioning of responsibilities regarding that function.
 3. Whenever the Board of Governors or a district governing board assigns a responsibility to a person or a body, that person or body must be provided (or be found to possess) the means to carry out or exercise control over the responsibility. Otherwise, it is not reasonable to hold the person or body fully accountable for performance of the responsibility.
 4. Whenever a governing body divides a particular responsibility among several persons or bodies, each person or body can be held accountable only for that piece of the responsibility over which it has authority and control.
- The governing body that divides the responsibility thereby retains the task of

monitoring the performance of each person or body, as well as the interrelationships of each person or body.

5. The unique governance structure of the California Community Colleges requires the Board of Governors to exercise restraint whenever it assigns responsibilities to districts, or bodies, or persons within districts. Under Section 70901 of the Education Code, the primary role of the Board of Governors is to provide leadership and direction to the colleges, with the work of the Board, at all times, directed to maintaining maximum local authority and control in the administration of the colleges (pp. 2 – 3).

Hence, even though “the community college governing boards retain the final decision by affirming or, in some cases, simply rejecting undesirable recommendations emanating from the shared governance system” (Piland, 1994, p. 97), AB1725 emphasizes the importance of administrative, faculty, staff, and student input towards the development and implementation of institutional policies.

Administration

Traditionally, board of trustees’ appoint a chief executive officer and an administrative team that will provide the leadership and management expertise needed to implement the policies and procedures that it approves. Not only that, but a board of trustees usually delegates “much of their broad decision-making authority” (de Russey, 1996, p. B4) to chief executive officers. Thus, many of the mandates in the California Education Code directed towards local governing boards, as mentioned above, are shared, developed, and carried out by college presidents, when approved and supported by their respective local governing boards.

In addition to the California Education Code, the ACCJC (1997) provided guidelines regarding the expected role of the chief executive officer and administrative team, as it relates to the governance of an institution,

1. The institutional chief executive officer provides effective leadership to define goals, develop plans, and establish priorities for the institution.
2. The institutional chief executive officer efficiently manages resources, implements priorities controlling budget and expenditures, and ensures the implementation of statutes, regulations, and board policies.
3. The institution is administratively organized and staffed to reflect the institution's purposes, size, and complexity. The administration provides effective and efficient leadership and management which makes possible an effective teaching and learning environment.
4. Administrative officers are qualified by training and experience to perform their responsibilities and are evaluated systematically and regularly. The duties and responsibilities of institutional administrators are clearly defined and published.
5. Administration has a substantive and clearly-defined role in institutional governance (ACCJC, 1997).

For the most part, “the president shares responsibility for the definition and attainment of goals, for administrative action, and for operating the communications system which links the components of the academic community” with the board of trustees and the administrative team (AAUP, 1966).

Shared governance attempted to address the fact that “to facilitate an orderly college, instructional administrators must work collegially with the academic senate, the classified staff, students, and the collective bargaining agents in an environment where the stakeholders of the institution clearly understand the scope of responsibility and authority of each of the constituent groups” (Kanter, 1994, p. 230). “The rationalization was that shared governance is a decision-making process that contributes to the best interests of the students and the institution because those affected by the decisions participate in an environment of cooperation and trust” (Cohen and Brawer, 1994, p. 14). AB1725 then, “mandated participation by the faculties of each college through their academic senates in numerous aspects of school management and administration” (Howell, 1997).

Faculty

According to the Board of Governors for the California Community College System, “one of the basic principles of academic governance in higher education is that authority derives not only from the powers vested in governing boards and their staffs by law, but also from the knowledge and experience possessed by the faculty and others” (1990c, p. 3). In 1999, the AAUP stated that shared governance was not intended “to give college and university faculties dominant power, but was meant to establish a balance of power” (Richardson, 1999). In attempting to find a balance, the intent of AB1725 was “to increase the authority and responsibility of the faculty through the actions of the academic senates” (Piland & Bubnitz, 1998, p. 100).

Title 5 elaborates on the authority to enhance the participation of faculty, through their academic senates, as follows;

- (a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt policies for appropriate delegation of authority and responsibility to its college and/or district academic senate. Among other matters, said policies, at a minimum,

shall provide that the governing board or its designees will consult collegially with the academic senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters. This requirement to consult collegially shall not limit other rights and responsibilities of the academic senate which are specifically provided in statute or other Board of Governors regulations.

- (b) In adopting the policies and procedures described in Subsection (a), the governing board or its designees shall consult collegially with representatives of the academic senate.
- (c) While in the process of consulting collegially, the academic senate shall retain the right to meet with or to appear before the governing board with respect to the views, recommendations, or proposals of the senate. In addition, after consultation with the administration of the college and/or district, the academic senate may present its views and recommendations to the governing board.
- (d) The governing board of a district shall adopt procedures for responding to recommendations of the academic senate that incorporate the following:
 - (1) in instances where the governing board elects to rely primarily upon the advice and judgment of the academic senate, the recommendations of the senate will normally be accepted, and only in exceptional circumstances and for compelling reasons will the recommendations not be accepted. If a recommendation is not accepted, the governing

board or its designee, upon request of the academic senate, shall promptly communicate its reasons in writing to the academic senate.

- (2) in instances where the governing board elects to provide for mutual agreement with the academic senate, and agreement has not been reached, existing policy shall remain in effect unless continuing with such policy exposes the district to legal liability or causes substantial fiscal hardship. In cases where there is no existing policy, or in cases where the exposure to legal liability or substantial fiscal hardship requires existing policy to be changed, the governing board may act, after a good faith effort to reach agreement, only for compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons.

- (e) An academic senate may assume such responsibilities and perform such functions as may be delegated to it by the governing board of the district pursuant to Subsection (a).

- (f) The appointment of faculty members to serve on college or district committees, task forces, or other groups dealing with academic and professional matters, shall be made, after consultation with the chief executive officer or his or her designee, by the academic senate.

Notwithstanding this Subsection, the collective bargaining representative may seek to appoint faculty members to committees, task forces, or other groups (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 53203).

In addition to the Education Code and Title 5 Code of Regulations, the ACCJC (1997) listed the following statements to explain standard ten of its accrediting standards on governance and administration;

1. Faculty have a substantive and clearly-defined role in institutional governance, exercise a substantial voice in matters of educational program and faculty personnel, and other institutional policies which relate to their areas of responsibility and expertise.
2. Faculty have established an academic senate or other appropriate organization for providing input regarding institutional governance. In the case of private colleges, the institution has a formal process for providing input regarding institutional governance.
3. The institution has written policy which identifies appropriate institutional support for faculty participation in governance and delineates the participation of faculty on appropriate policy, planning, and special purpose bodies (ACCJC, 1997).

Finally, Flanigan (1996) surveyed all community college presidents and academic senate presidents, with an 86% response rate, and concluded that faculties seem to be involved in governance of their colleges with respect to academic and professional matters. In addition, Flanigan ascertained that despite an increase of faculty participation in the shared governance process, the quality of reports and recommendations to local governing boards have not changed much since implementing AB1725. Nevertheless, according to a study conducted by Miller, Vacik, and Benton (1998), the involvement of faculty in the governance process seems to have developed a better outlook towards the governance of an educational institution. They cautioned, however, “that faculty

involvement may also tend to attract those individuals with a more optimistic or positive perception of shared governance responsibility” (p. 653).

Staff

A role for staff in the governance of a community college is mandated by AB1725. However, unlike the role of faculty and students, Title 5 guidelines are general and basically allow each local governing board to determine the appropriate role of staff in shared governance for their respective district. Specifically,

- (a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt policies and procedures that provide district and college staff the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance. At minimum, these policies and procedures shall include the following:
 - (1) Definitions or categories of positions or groups of positions other than faculty that compose the staff of the district and its college(s) that, for the purposes of this Section, the governing board is required by law to recognize or chooses to recognize pursuant to legal authority. In addition, for the purposes of this Section, management and nonmanagement positions or groups of positions shall be separately defined or categorized.
 - (2) Participation structures and procedures for the staff positions defined or categorized.
 - (3) In performing the requirements of Subsections (a)(1) and (2), the governing board or its designees shall consult with the representatives of existing staff councils, committees, employee organizations, and other such bodies. Where no groups or structures for participation exist

that provide representation for the purposes of this Section for particular groups of staff, the governing board or its designees, shall broadly inform all staff of the policies and procedures being developed, invite the participation of staff, and provide opportunities for staff to express their views.

- (4) Staff shall be provided with opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures, and in those processes for jointly developing recommendations for action by the governing board, that the governing board reasonably determines, in consultation with staff, have or will have a significant effect on staff.
- (5) Except in unforeseeable, emergency situations, the governing board shall not take action on matters significantly affecting staff until it has provided staff an opportunity to participate in the formulation and development of those matters through appropriate structures and procedures as determined by the governing board in accordance with the provisions of this Section.
- (6) The policies and procedures of the governing board shall ensure that the recommendations and opinions of staff are given every reasonable consideration.
- (7) The selection of staff representatives to serve on college and district task forces, committees, or other governance groups shall, when required by law, be made by those councils, committees, employee

organizations, or other staff groups that the governing board has officially recognized in its policies and procedures for staff participation. In all other instances, the selection shall either be made by, or in consultation with, such staff groups. In all cases, representatives shall be selected from the category that they represent.

- (b) In developing and carrying out policies and procedures pursuant to Subsection (a), the district governing board shall ensure that its actions do not dominate or interfere with the formation or administration of any employee organization, or contribute financial or other support to it, or in any way encourage employees to join any organization in preference to another. In addition, in order to comply with Government Code Sections 3540, et seq., such procedures for staff participation shall not intrude on matters within the scope of representation under Section 3543.2 of the Government Code. In addition, governing boards shall not interfere with the exercise of employee rights to form, join, and participate in the activities of employee organizations of their own choosing for the purpose of representation on all matters of employer-employee relations. Nothing in this Section shall be construed to impinge upon or detract from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between exclusive representatives and district governing boards. It is the intent of the Board of Governors to respect lawful agreements between staff and exclusive representatives as to how they will consult, collaborate, share, or delegate among themselves the

responsibilities that are or may be delegated to staff pursuant to these regulations.

- (c) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to impinge upon the policies and procedures governing the participation rights of faculty and students pursuant to Sections 53200-53204, and Section 51023.7, respectively.
- (d) The governing board of a community college district shall comply substantially with the provisions of this Section (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 51023.5).

In a general manner too, the ACCJC assesses whether “the institution clearly states and publicizes the role of staff in institutional governance” (1997). Nonetheless, “the governing board still maintains responsibility to assure effective participation of students, faculty, and staff” (CCLC, 1998, p. 9).

Students

Unlike staff, students have been recognized as part of the shared governance process since 1966 when the AAUP declared that if students “desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, [then] their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university” (AAUP, 1966).

The respect of students for their college or university can be enhanced if they are given at least these opportunities: (1) to be listened to in the classroom without fear of institutional reprisal for the substance of their views, (2) freedom to discuss questions of institutional policy and operation, (3) the right to academic due process when charged with serious violations of institutional regulations, and

(4) the same right to hear speakers of their own choice as is enjoyed by other components of the institution (AAUP, 1966).

A key point, however, is that historically, students have not been a principal participating stakeholder group, as compared to boards, administrators, and faculty, in the governance of educational institutions (AGB, 1998).

While the ACCJC assesses in general terms how an institution “states and publicizes the role of students in institutional governance” (1997), Title 5, California Code of Regulations dictates in more specific terms what role students should play in the shared governance process of a California community college. Specifically,

- (a) The governing board of a community college district shall adopt policies and procedures that provide students the opportunity to participate effectively in district and college governance. Among other matters, said policies and procedures shall include the following:
 - (1) Students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. This right includes the opportunity to participate in processes for jointly developing recommendations to the governing board regarding such policies and procedures.
 - (2) Except in unforeseeable, emergency situations, the governing board shall not take action on a matter having a significant effect on students until it has provided students with an opportunity to participate in the formulation of the policy or procedure or the joint development of recommendations regarding the action.

- (3) Governing board procedures shall ensure that at the district and college levels, recommendations and positions developed by students are given every reasonable consideration.
- (4) For the purpose of this Section, the governing board shall recognize each associated student organization or its equivalent within the district as provided by Education Code Section 76060, as the representative body of the students to offer opinions and to make recommendations to the administration of a college and to the governing board of a district with regard to district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. The selection of student representatives to serve on college or district committees, task forces, or other governance groups shall be made, after consultation with designated parties, by the appropriate officially recognized associated student organization(s) within the district.
- (b) For the purposes of this Section, district and college policies and procedures that have or will have a “significant effect on students” includes the following:
 - (1) grading policies;
 - (2) codes of student conduct;
 - (3) academic disciplinary policies;
 - (4) curriculum development;
 - (5) courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued;
 - (6) processes for institutional planning and budget development;

- (7) standards and policies regarding student preparation and success;
 - (8) student services planning and development;
 - (9) student fees within the authority of the district to adopt; and
 - (10) any other district and college policy, procedure, or related matter that the district governing board determines will have a significant effect on students.
- (c) The governing board shall give reasonable consideration to recommendations and positions developed by students regarding district and college policies and procedures pertaining to the hiring and evaluation of faculty, administration, and staff.
 - (d) Nothing in this Section shall be construed to impinge upon the due process rights of faculty, nor to detract from any negotiations or negotiated agreements between collective bargaining agents and district governing boards. It is the intent of the Board of Governors to respect agreements between academic senates and collective bargaining agents as to how they will consult, collaborate, share or delegate among themselves the responsibilities that are or may be delegated to academic senates pursuant to the regulations on academic senates contained in Sections 53200-53206.
 - (e) The governing board of a community college district shall comply substantially with policies and procedures adopted in accordance with this Section (Title 5, California Code of Regulations, Section 51023.7).

Ideally, then, the mandate for the inclusion of students on the shared governance process should have had some effect on the actual participation of students in the areas of

academic governance. However, Rollin (1997) studied student participation in the shared governance at California's community colleges and documented the following perceptions of students and their advisors: (a) their input is not valued, (b) they do not have enough representation in committees to affect decisions, and (c) they lack the resources to fulfill their shared governance responsibilities.

Governance

Governance, as defined by Fryer and Lovas, "comprises the institution's structures and processes for decision-making and the communication related to those structures and processes" (1990, p. 6). According to Trombley, "consultation lies at the heart of shared governance. The basic idea is that faculty members, classified workers . . . , and students should have a say in how the institution is run" (1997). Consequently, AB1725 placed "a high priority on the contributions of all community college groups" in the decision-making structures and processes of community colleges (CCCHE, 1997).

Structure and Process

At the state level, the California State Legislature has final authority over the community college system because "rather than delegating broad authority to the system itself, the Legislature separately prescribes the functions of both the state and local boards in a highly prescriptive manner" (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 5). Consequently, even though the Board of Governors, a state board, has some authority over community colleges, local college districts can, and do, bypass the Board of Governors to present their needs directly to the Legislature (Trombley, 1997).

At the local level, governing boards maintain legal responsibility for their respective community colleges. However, "traditionally, and for practical reasons, boards delegate some kinds of authority to other stakeholders with the implicit and sometimes explicit condition that the board reserves the right to question, challenge, and occasionally override decisions or proposals" prepared by individuals or groups within the organizational structure of the college (AGB, 1998). "Such structures include faculty

senates, governing commission, and task forces” (Scott, 1996, p. B1), in addition to administrative councils, campus committees, faculty, staff, and student organizations. The success of the shared governance process, however, not only “depends heavily upon establishing effective working relationships among trustees, college administrations, the academic senate, the faculty union, and classified staff” (CCCHE, 1997) but also on the role that students have in the shared governance process of an institution. After all, “the basic idea is that faculty members, classified workers, and students should have a say in how the institution is run” (Trombley, 1997).

A joint task force of trustees, chief executive officers, and state academic representatives identified the following as procedures for an effective shared governance process,

1. In preparing recommendations to the governing board, it is necessary that all parties know in advance their responsibilities for determining recommendations . . . ,
2. The work products of committees pertaining to academic and professional policies and procedures will be referred to as “proposals” . . . ,
3. These proposals are available for review by college groups as part of the process to assure effective participation of those affected by such proposals . . . ,
4. Committees forward these proposals to the academic senate for consideration and refinement . . . [and],
5. After approval by the senate, the “proposal” becomes a “recommendation” of the academic senate (CCLC, 1998, pp. 3 – 7).

In addition to these guidelines, the Community College League of California (CCLC) indicated that “in all procedures, structures, and committees, students and staff should be assured of effective participation in matters which affect them” (1998, p. 7).

In 1998, Nussbaum, Chancellor for the California Community Colleges, stated in the 20th annual Earl V. Pullias Lecture at the University of Southern California that

AB 1725 ushered a new era of shared governance for the community colleges. At both the system and local levels, the various organizations and constituencies now have explicit legal rights not only to participate in policy development, but also to sometimes jointly determine policy (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 9).

In reference to the language of AB1725, however, Wishart (1998) opined:

Faculties interpret this language as meaning their recommendations in academic matters automatically will be adopted. Trustees interpret it to mean that faculty opinions will carry a great deal of weight but may not always determine the outcome. Presidents, chancellors, and other administrators are trying to figure out what is left of their decision-making power as they struggle to fulfill their responsibilities as leaders (Wishart, 1998).

The AGB (1998) also declared that “many governing boards, faculty members, and chief executive officers believe that internal governance arrangements have become so cumbersome that timely decisions are difficult to make, and small factions often are able to impede the decision-making process” (AGB, 1998).

The sources of such increasing tensions in community colleges, according to the California Citizens Commission on Higher Education (1999), originate from

- (a) The fact that the colleges are asked to play a role in *higher* education while having a K-12 organizational framework with district boundaries and elected trustees . . . ,
- (b) Their strongly local orientation on which rests a huge burden of state statutes and regulations . . . ,
- (c) The enormous size of the system and the wide diversity of its 107 colleges . . . ,
- (d) Structural inconsistencies such as revenue control by state government in a system where responsibility for collective bargaining . . . reside exclusively within each of the 71 districts . . . , [and]
- (e) Difficulty moving from the type of decision-making structure found in K-12 to a more collegial one typical of universities (p. 25).

Similarly, Nussbaum (1998) noted the following negative tendencies of the shared governance mechanisms.

1. The structure tends to promote balkanization of the college and district—in that faculty unions, classified unions, academic senates, student organizations, and management groups tend to pursue their own organizational agendas;
2. The structure tends to promote turf wars between these organizations;
3. The structure tends to produce a budget which is cobbled together through a series of bilateral agreements between the district and each of these various groups;
4. The structure tends not to facilitate trust;

5. The structure tends to be unsound in terms of legal accountability—for instance, when a governing board can't act absent a mutual agreement, yet remains wholly accountable for the action or the failure to act; and
6. The structure tends to make the colleges less responsive to change (p.10).

Kanter (1994) observed, however, that “most conversations about shared governance continue to center around whether faculty, staff, and administrators have indeed been empowered in the decision-making process” (p. 229). The answer, as concluded by Harpster (1995) and Howell (1997), depends on who is asked because “in community college governance, the personalities of the key players—trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and in some cases student leaders—interact with the organizational structure and processes in ways that help create an institution’s environment or climate” (Fryer & Lovas, 1990, p. 14).

Implementation Issues

De Russy (1996), Trustee for the State University of New York, opined that “when properly conceived, shared governance can be very advantageous. But when it becomes, in effect, governance by multiple veto by campus groups with vested interests, it can stymie reforms” (p. B4). In fact, according to the California Citizens Commission on Higher Education (1999), “many governance decisions are heavily, if not exclusively, influenced by priorities internal to the institutions and excessively focused on protecting the status quo, especially during times of stress” (p. 44). “Alternatively, in the quest for consensus or efficiency, the governance process sometimes produces a ‘lowest common denominator’ decision, which does not adequately address the underlying issues” (AGB, 1998). Not only that, but Wishart stated that AB1725

has set up political power struggles that take the focus of the faculty away from their students and aim it directly at governance processes. This empowerment of

faculties has dramatically changed the decision-making equation and balance of power on each campus such that the business of education has degenerated to bureaucratic infighting that pits faculty against administrators and places elected board members in the position of refereeing the melee (Wishart, 1998).

Consequently, when "governing board members sometimes cross the line between setting broad policy and interfering in the day-to-day administration of the colleges" (Trombley, 1997), then administrators and faculty "have charged indignantly that activist trustees are 'micromanagers' engaged in 'bald assertions' of legal power, in violation of the tradition of shared governance" (de Russy, 1996, p. B3).

While "some CEOs say the extensive consultation requirements [of AB1725] make it impossible for them to do their jobs" (Trombley, 1997), other CEOs "find it difficult to resist the temptation to make decisions and then pass the word along. After all, it is easier for one person to decide than it is to engage the support of a large number of people" (Cohen and Brawer, 1994, p. 15). According to Wurst (1997), college superintendents have perceived no improvement in the policy-making process and the implementation of such policies since the onset of AB 1725.

Furthermore, in a roundtable discussion of the California community college system shared governance process,

participants - largely comprised of current and past administrative leaders and those outside the community college system-insisted that colleges have been bogged down since the passage of AB 1725 with "trying to satisfy everyone." They claim that campus leaders must obtain "mutual agreement" from all parties or they cannot act. This has meant, these participants argued, that issues of turf and governance have crowded out work on the challenges of incorporating

technological advances into the curriculum, planning welfare-to-work initiatives, organizing to meet projected enrollment increases, and fostering professional change. In response to this rapidly changing external environment, they said decision-making at the campus level needs to be more flexible and responsive, not molasses slow and cementing the status quo (CCCHE, 1997).

“Many administrators, in turn, [have] regarded the new role of faculty as a major intrusion on the administrative role, and some board members saw the new faculty role as intrusive, as well” (Rockwell, n.d.). Interestingly, Harpster (1995) noted that college presidents perceive greater faculty and senate participation in the governance of their respective institutions than academic senate presidents. Nonetheless, “despite gains by academic senates, in no case were they perceived as more dominant than administrations” on academic and professional matters (Howell, 1997).

“For their part, faculty members often believe that administrators are willing to sacrifice deliberation for speed in their concern for the bottom line” (Miller, 1998). According to Gerber (1997), “the whole emphasis on timely decision-making and presidential authority is embedded in an approach that would move colleges and universities away from a model of collegial decision-making and toward a more hierarchical system of organizations” (p. 18). Thus, “what was meant to be, in fact, collegial decision making and the concomitant empowerment of faculty soon became an adversarial battle for power” (Kanter, 1994, p. 229).

Shared governance advocates contend that “the basic problem with the implementation of shared governance is that many campus administrators resent sharing authority or are inept at providing faculty with meaningful information and input into important policy decisions” (CCCHE, 1997). The practice by some boards “of consulting with a faculty body of its choosing, failing to circulate documents in a timely fashion, and setting deadlines for campus input that faculty could not possibly meet” further impairs

the shared governance process at colleges and universities (Scott, 1997). “Faculty members at many institutions feel they have been sidelined lately as others have decided big issues” (Leatherman, 1998, p. A8).

According to Piland & Bublitz (1998), “faculty tended to agree that shared governance means, faculty input into all institutional decisions . . . cooperation between the faculty and administration . . . and final decisions are made by the board with faculty input” (p. 103). However, in a conference sponsored by the AAUP, panelists identified the following issues with the shared governance process from a faculty point of view,

problems working with boards and legislatures; lack of participation in governance; problems in cooperation between faculty senates and school, college, and departmental advisory committees; lack of involvement in central administrative decisions; due process in the grievance process; and difficulties in understanding the budget (Scott, 1997, p. 30).

Duncan-Hall (1993) and Flanigan (1996) also identified the lack of participation of faculty in the shared governance process, in addition to lack of trust and poor communication with administrators. However, Piland & Bublitz (1998) concluded that “by incorporating all faculty in some aspects of governance, and thereby giving them a stake in its success, shared governance can lead to cooperation and institutional improvement” (p. 109). “Administrators, then, looking to increase opportunities for consensus development and the empowerment of faculty, can look to faculty leaders as . . . role models for gaining the involvement of others” (Miller, Vacik, and Benton, 1998, p. 653).

Guidelines and Recommendations

“Community college governance is much more complex and subtle than the treatments we’ve been reading in the newspapers—even more complex and subtle than

the treatments we've been receiving from the think tanks and blue ribbon commissions” (Nussbaum, 1998, p. 2). The following are some features which seem to be common among colleges which have effective processes.

1. One such feature is a clearly defined governance structure. Everyone understands how the process works, and the structure is used consistently
2. Communication is also a hallmark of a good collegial consultation process. Venues are created for key leaders to discuss matters in formal settings
3. A collegial leadership style, both for faculty and administrative leaders, contributes greatly to making participatory governance work. Effective leaders see their role as supporting, communicating, and facilitating rather than authoritative
4. Development of positions on issues should begin in the embryonic stages rather than any group presenting a full-blown policy or process. Collegial consultation is fostered by constituent groups taking initial positions on issues that give direction but allow concepts and procedures to grow and develop
5. Collegial leadership styles go a long way towards creating a climate in which trust can be built
6. Collegial consultation works best in well run districts whose leaders are open, honest, and committed to working together for the benefit of students . . .
7. All participants in the shared governance process should be provided copies of the relevant laws, regulations, and district policies and procedures (CCLC, 1998, pp. 9–14).

The AGB adopted the following standards of good practice regarding the governance of an institution.

1. Governing boards should state explicitly who has the authority for what kinds of decisions—that is, to which persons or bodies it has delegated authority and whether the delegation is subject to board review
2. Boards and chief executives should establish deadlines for the conclusion of various consultative and decision-making processes with the clear understanding that failure to act in accordance with these deadlines will mean that the next highest level in the governance process may choose to act
3. The chief executive is the board's major window on the institution, and the board should expect both candor and sufficient information from the chief executive
4. Governing boards have the sole responsibility to appoint and assess the performance of the chief executive
5. There should be a conscious effort to minimize the ambiguous or overlapping areas in which more than one stakeholder group has authority
6. In institutions with faculty or staff collective bargaining contracts, internal governance arrangements should be separate from the structure and terms of the contract (AGB, 1998).

Piland and Bublitz (1998) concluded that

Shared governance has a definite pattern that should be observed in practice, according to this study. First, it means that faculty should have input into the

decision-making process, both in the day-to-day operations and in long-term planning. Second, there should be a well-established structure for cooperation between faculty and the administration. Third, the faculty recognizes the ultimate final authority of the governing board in the decision-making process. Fourth, faculty and administrators should serve on all institutional committees. Fifth, the faculty should assist the board in interpreting and implementing state board and legislative directives. Sixth, the faculty should not be content with only a narrow role in governance, and they should be concerned only with academic and curricular activities. Seventh, the faculty has only a luke-warm conviction that the prerogatives of shared governance should extend to any other campus groups, such as students and support staff (p. 108).

Finally, Wurst (1997) specified that leadership styles, culture, and communication are key factors for successful shared governance. What's more, stated Fryer and Lovas (1990), "because the structures and processes for decision making and communication help control the institutional climate of a community college, we see governance as a critical vehicle for exercising leadership" (p. 14).

Leadership

When the AAUP declared that "the president, as the chief executive officer of an institution of higher education, is measured largely by his or her capacity for institutional leadership" (AAUP, 1966), they pointed towards the leader as the key agent responsible for bringing about change. Thirty years later, the AGB similarly emphasized the crucial importance of the leaders of an organization when they stated that "the role of the president, under the authority of the board, is to provide strong comprehensive leadership for the institution . . ." (AGB, 1996). Interestingly, while the former group saw shared governance as a process to complement the leadership of the president, the latter group

say shared governance as an impediment to the leadership of the president. In either case, placing such importance on the leader of an organization is representative of much of the literature on leadership and considered key towards gaining a better understanding of the process of leadership and organizational change.

According to Fryer and Lovas (1990), “the function of leadership in governance is to create the conditions within which people want to decide and want to act in ways that maximize the institution’s achievement of its purposes” (p. 33). A key point, then, in trying to understand the leadership issues which surround shared governance, is to realize that the “administrators’ conceptualization of leadership derives from the assumptions they make about the nature of social organizations” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 24). Within an educational setting, the organizational models can be bureaucratic, political, cultural, and collegial (Howell, 1997; Wheeler, 1995; Bensimon, 1994; Birnbaum, 1988; Reyes, 1985). In view of this relationship between leadership and organization, the focus is to understand the leadership implications within each of these organizational frameworks.

Leadership within a Bureaucratic Framework

This type of organizational framework “emphasizes precision, speed, clarity, regularity, reliability, and efficiency achieved through the creation of a fixed division of tasks, hierarchical supervision, and detailed rules and regulations” (Morgan, 1986, p. 24). From this perspective “management is a process of planning, organization, command, coordination, and control” (p. 25). Within an educational setting, Owens (1998) concluded that this approach tends “to emphasize the following five mechanisms in dealing with issues of controlling and coordination the behavior of people” (p. 30):

1. Maintain firm hierarchical control of authority and close supervision of those
in the lower ranks ,
2. Establish and maintain vertical communication ,

3. Develop clear written rules and procedures to set standards and guide actions .
 . . . ,
4. Promulgate clear plans and schedules for participants to follow . . . ,[and]
5. Add supervisory and administrative positions to the hierarchy of the
 organization as necessary to meet problems that arise from changing
 conditions confronted by the organization (pp. 30 – 31).

Bensimon (1994) noted that “administrative leaders who are guided by the bureaucratic frame are likely to emphasize their role in making decisions, getting results, and establishing systems of management” (p. 25). In fact, Birnbaum (1988) declared that the college president, within this framework, is “the ultimate recipient of all information that flows from the bottom of the organization to the top, and the ultimate decision maker and initiator of all directives that flow down from the top” (p. 123). From this viewpoint, then, administrative leaders see leadership as leaders leading and followers following.

Leadership within a Political Framework

“Processes of interaction, in which the power to get one’s way comes neither from norms nor from rules [or regulations] but is negotiated” characterizes an organization as a political entity (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 130). According to Morgan (1986), “organizational politics arise when people think differently and want to act differently. This diversity [in turn,] creates a tension that must be resolved through political means . . . [and] the choice between alternative paths of action usually hinges on the power relations between the actors involved” (p. 148). The following list outlines key aspects of organizations that fall within the political framework, as established by Allison (1971).

1. There are many individuals, with unequal power, which play a part in the
 decision-making process.
2. Positions determine the stance that individuals should take on different issues.

3. Decisions, rushed by deadlines, emerge out of compromises and negotiations.
4. Individuals bargain and form coalitions to get what they want.
5. Competition and conflict are normal interactions among individuals.

One leadership implication from this framework is that the college president takes the role of “mediator or negotiator between power blocs . . . by pulling coalitions together to fight for desired changes” (Baldrige et. al, 1977, p. 22). At the same time, “the effective president helps all parties to understand and appreciate the perspective of others without destroying the confidence of either side” (Vaughan, 1994, p. 66). The college president also “knows that leadership depends in good measure on presence and timing [because] influence is exerted by people who are present when compromises are being effected and coalitions are being negotiated” (Birnbbaum, 1988, p. 146). Finally, “presidents with a political frame are also sensitive to external interest groups and their strong influence over the policy-making process” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 27).

Leadership within a Cultural Framework

“Within this frame, organizations are cultural systems of shared meanings and beliefs in which organizational structures and processes are socially constructed” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 27). Culture, stated Owens (1998) “develops over a period of time and, in the process of developing, acquires significantly deeper meaning” (p. 165). “Such patterns of belief or shared meanings, fragmented or integrated, and supported by various operating norms and rituals, can exert a decisive influence on the overall ability of the organization to deal with the challenges it faces” (Morgan, 1986, p. 121). Seymour (1993) created “a more detailed enumeration of culture” (p. 148) as follows.

1. At the core of an organization’s culture is a set of basic assumptions and beliefs. These assumptions and beliefs are *learned* responses that stem from espoused values ,

2. An organization exists as a system of shared meanings and, through the development of shared meanings, members achieve a sense of commonality of experience that facilitates their coordinated view of what is most important within their organization ,
3. One way in which shared meanings are formed is through people's interpretation of actions. *Symbolic actions* are any act or event that serves as a vehicle for conveying meaning, usually by representing something else ,
4. Another way in which meanings are shared is through *rites and ceremonies* . . . ,
5. If values are the soul of the organizational culture, then heroes personify those values and provide tangible role models for others . . . and,
6. The culture . . . is also embedded in the stories, sagas, and myths that circulate within an organization. Stories are narratives that are based upon true events . . . sagas and myths are historical narratives that describe the accomplishments of a leader in heroic terms or fictional events (pp. 148 – 152).

From this organizational framework, then, “an administrative leader might be seen as one who brings about a sense of organizational purpose and orderliness through interpretation, elaboration, and reinforcement of institutional culture” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 27). Moreover, stated Vaughan (1994), the effective president, “understands and is sensitive to an institution's culture, respecting and preserving the good things of the past but always shaping the present and planning the for the future” (p. 65). After all, “their position of power lends them a special advantage in developing value systems, since they often have the power to reward or punish those who follow or ignore their lead” (Morgan, 1986, p. 126). Finally, educational leaders with this organizational frame in mind, realize

that “in the final analysis, change sticks when it becomes ‘the way we do things around here,’ when it seeps into the bloodstream” of the organization (Kotter, 1995, p. 67).

Leadership within a Collegial Framework

From this perspective, “organizations are viewed as collectives with organizational members as their primary resource . . . [emphasizing] the processes involved in defining priorities, problems, goals, and tasks” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 25-26). This approach, said Baldrige et. al (1977), “argues that academic decision making should not be like the hierarchical process of a bureaucracy. Instead there should be full participation of the academic community” (p. 11). Birnbaum (1988) identified the following characteristics of a collegial institution.

1. An emphasis on consensus, shared power, common commitments, and aspirations, . . .
2. Leadership that emphasizes consultation and collective responsibilities, . . .
3. Status differences are deemphasized and people interact as equals, . . .
4. There is an emphasis on thoroughness and deliberation, . . . and,
5. Everyone must have an opportunity to speak and to consider carefully the views of colleagues (pp. 86-88).

From this organizational viewpoint, then, “the president is seen not as boss but as first among equals” (Fryer and Lovas, 1990, p. 76). Consequently, “the collegial leader needs professional expertise to ensure that he is held in high esteem by his colleagues. Talent in interpersonal dynamics is also needed to achieve consensus in organizational decision making” (Baldrige et. al, 1977, p. 22). The emphasis, declared Bensimon (1994), is on “interpersonal skills, motivating others, and putting the interest of the institution first” (p. 26). Finally, “persons in leadership positions in collegial systems are

expected to influence without coercion, to direct without sanctions, and to control without inducing alienation” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 102). Incorporating this collegial model into the California community college system, together with its leadership implications, was the intent of AB1725, the shared governance mandate.

Leadership and Shared Governance

“Formerly in community colleges, governance happened most often in a top-down, autocratic, and sometimes militaristic style” (Kanter, 1994, p. 228). An intent of AB1725 was “to do away with . . . autocratic fiefdoms and to introduce a more collegial, consultative approach to governance” (Trombley, 1997). After all, stated Gerber (1997), “a college or university is less a hierarchical bureaucracy in which those at the top can claim authority based on superior training and technical expertise to others in the organization than it is a community in which faculty and administrators are in many ways peers who share a common educational background” (p. 18). Eight years later, though, Flanigan (1996) documented that the we/they mentality coupled with personal agendas was impeding the strengthening of the faculty’s role in shared governance.

From the perspective of faculty, “the basic problem with the implementation of shared governance is that many campus administrators resent sharing authority” (CCCHE, 1997). According to the AGB (1996), though, the shared governance process has made the presidency weak, and for that reason, “colleges and universities are neither nimble or as adaptable as times require” (AGB, 1996). The issue, noted Bensimon (1994), is that the educational organizational models, and their respective leadership applications, “promulgate a view of leadership that is individual centered” (p. 33).

As a result of this view on leadership, researchers have discussed the skills and insights needed by leaders to help followers follow their lead. Representative of much of the literature on leadership, Bennis and Nanus (1985) declared that “nothing serves an organization better—especially during times of agonizing doubts and uncertainties—than leadership that knows what it wants, communicates those intentions, positions itself

correctly, and empowers its work force” (p. 86). Ten years later, Tjosvold and Tjosvold (1995) gave a similar message when they stated that “leaders inform and inspire so people are convinced that they can find more productive, enhancing ways to collaborate” (p. 15). In short, much of the literature on leadership, educational or otherwise, has summarized how leaders can effectively and efficiently inform, inspire and direct their followers. After all, stated Fryers and Lovas (1990), educational leadership is “the art of getting others to want to do something that leaders are convinced should be done in service of the institution’s mission” (p. 3).

A perplexing issue is that in spite of so many leadership theories focused on how leaders can better lead their followers with the intent of changing an organization for the better, there has been little fundamental change in organizations (Block, 1993). Not only that, but “such leadership models will become increasingly irrelevant, particularly as campuses are thrown into disequilibrium by new voices in academe” (Bensimon, 1994, p. 33). Consequently, scholars, such as Rost (1991) and Heifetz (1994) point out that in order to better understand the nature of leadership, the focus needs to be placed away from the leader, the framework of authority and power, and focused instead towards understanding the relationship between leaders and followers.

In his book, *Leadership for the Twenty-First Century*, Rost (1991) proclaimed that the essence of leadership lies in the relationship that develops between leaders and followers, not with the leader. Consequently, Rost indicated that in order to better understand the nature of leadership, scholars need to focus their energies on studying “the process whereby leaders and followers relate to one another to achieve a purpose” (p. 4). From this perspective, then, Rost defined leadership as “an influence relationship among leaders and followers who intend real changes that reflect their mutual purposes (p. 102). The uniqueness of his work stems from his insistence that; (a) influence forms the basis of the relationship, not authority, (b) both leaders and followers are doing leadership, not just the leader, and (c) the desired changes are mutual to both leaders and followers, not

just what the leader wants. Essentially, the focus is on how the relationship develops around a common purpose; not on who develops the relationship around the common purpose.

In 1995, Heifetz wrote that as long as individuals continue to “equate leadership with authority” (p. 49), they will continue to “call for someone with answers, decisions, strength, and a map for the future, someone who knows where we ought to be—in short, someone who can make hard problems simple” (p. 2). By focusing on leadership as a relationship, Heifetz saw authority to be, at best, a resource for leaders, rather than the source, to engage with stakeholders to mutually define and search for solutions to the problems that they both face. Heifetz, thus, elaborated on an understanding of leadership as an activity that engages “people to make progress on the adaptive problems they face” (p. 187) by doing adaptive work, and Heifetz wrote, “adaptive work requires change in values, beliefs, or behavior” (p. 22). Heifetz’s research challenged the norm of equating leadership with authority and emphasized that adaptive work requires from both leaders and stakeholders, rather than just the leader, the energy and sense of purpose to mutually search for solutions to complex problems (p. 247).

Such new views of leadership, as proposed by Rost (1991) and Heifetz (1995) are appropriate for shared governance because “it is a complex process of consultation that demands from faculty, administrators, classified staff, and students a respect for divergent opinions, a sense of mutual trust, and a willingness to work together for the good of the instructional enterprise” (Board of Governors, 1997b, p. 1). The need to reconceptualize leadership is real because “our traditional notions of shared governance are . . . beginning to break down because many people are dissatisfied with how this system of shared governance works” (Rost, 1992, p. 8).

Conclusion

California community colleges, which historically followed a governance pattern similar to the K-12 system, are in the midst of determining whether to continue moving

towards the collegial governance system like those of their higher education counterparts; the University of California and the California State University systems. A key aspect of the current movement to implement the shared governance process mandated by AB1725 is the confusion about the role and responsibility of key stakeholder groups. At the state level the groups include the California State Legislature, the Board of Governors, the Chancellor's Office, and the community college districts. At the local level the groups include the administrative team, board of trustees, classified staff, faculty, and students. In either case, state or local, the transition in understanding how roles are changing have also caused turmoil in the simultaneous attempt to update the governance structures and decision-making processes of community colleges.

Developing shared governance structures and processes which address the issues of efficiency and effectiveness, coupled with frustrations of determining who has the authority and responsibility to do what, point to a key source of frustration among both state and local community college stakeholder groups. While some stakeholder groups want to consolidate authority on key groups or individuals, other stakeholder groups point to past abuses of authority as reasons for using models of authority which are broader in scope. Clearly, each perspective points to different types of governance structures, decision-making processes, and leadership models. How key stakeholder groups address these challenges depends on whether they focus on the negatives or positives of the shared governance process (Piland & Bubnitz, 1994).

According to Kanter (1994), "the California experience demonstrates once again that when behavior is legislated, issues become polarized and often much more complicated than they were originally envisioned" (p. 229). Nonetheless, board members, students, "community college staff, faculty, and administrators, at all levels should renew their efforts to solve shared governance problems at their schools, especially those which are to the detriment of the student body" (Howell, 1997). According to Scott (1997), "the process of refocusing attention to governance has to be homegrown by those who are

willing to do the hard work of building relationships of trust and influence across campus” (p. 33).

To address the complex issues of shared governance Miller, Vacik, and Benton (1998) concluded that “the perceptions of faculty relative to participatory governance must be understood in order to create a more effective, efficient, and successful organization” (p. 652). A key aspect of this study, then, is to understand the perceptions of the individuals and groups who implement shared governance on a day-to-day basis which, in addition to faculty, includes; administrators, classified staff, and students. From the analysis of these perceptions and experiences, then, state and local stakeholder groups will have new insights on how to update and improve the shared governance processes in community colleges.

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Research Design

Qualitative methodologies are appropriate for research questions that attempt “to uncover the nature of persons’ experiences with a phenomenon” (Strauss & Corbin, 1990, p. 19). Furthermore, qualitative research “produces findings not arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification” (p. 17). Several types of qualitative methodologies available to researchers include; phenomenology, used to understand the meaning of a persons’ lived experience (Van Manen, 1990); grounded theory, used to develop theory (Strauss & Corbin, 1990); and ethnography, used to describe a culture (Spradley, 1979).

The design for this investigation is a case study because “case studies help us understand processes of events, projects, and programs and to discover context characteristics that will shed light on an issue or object” (Sanders, 1981, p. 44). In a case study, “educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding that in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice” (Merriam, 1988, p. 32). A case study is “a report that delineates the joint (shared, collaborative) construction that has emerged” from the experiences of the participants in the study (Guba & Lincoln, p. 1989, p. 223). A key factor for using a case study is that “the information gleaned from participants is not subject to truth or falsity” (Merriam, 1988, p. 30) but is, rather, obtained to discover a better understanding of the participants’ experience with the phenomenon under study, in this case being the process of shared governance.

In a case study, “the researcher is the *primary instrument* for data collection and analysis” (Merriam, 1988, p. 19) which necessitates that “the biases, values, and

judgment of the researcher be stated explicitly” (Creswell, 1994, p. 147). Hence, I begin by clarifying that I am a faculty member of Imperial Valley College (IVC). I joined the mathematics department of IVC in 1989. In addition, during my tenure as Academic Senate President, from 1992 to 1994, I played an important role in developing the shared governance policy for the academic senate and faculty. Finally, as College Council Chair in 1996, I also worked closely with administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students to develop a shared governance policy to include all of these groups in the governance of IVC. I am thus an advocate of a shared governance process that includes all campus groups in the development of policy because I feel that the different perspectives which each group brings can result in better decisions for Imperial Valley College.

I believe that these above-mentioned experiences will help me as I work towards acquiring a better understanding of the experiences that administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students have had in implementing the shared governance policy at IVC. After all, Strauss & Corbin (1990) declared that professional and personal experiences represent sources of theoretical sensitivity. By theoretical sensitivity, they mean “the attribute of having insight, the ability to give meaning to data, the capacity to understand, and capability to separate the pertinent from that which isn’t” (p. 42).

However, as I worked to develop a deeper understanding of the participants’ experience with the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College, I also needed to simultaneously bracket my assumptions, values, biases, and judgments (Van Manen, 1990). The bracketing was “not in order to forget them . . . but rather to hold them at bay” (p. 47) in order to create a fresh viewpoint with the experience of implementing shared governance. At certain times, I had to use my assumptions, values, biases, and judgments to guide me as I searched to better understand shared governance. At other times, I had to know when to bracket my assumptions, values, biases, and judgments in order to better understand the experience of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College.

Site Determination and Description

The California Community College system consists of 108 community colleges. Since AB1725 mandated that all colleges change their governance processes, the site for this study could be any college within the system that has already implemented a shared governance process. I thus requested permission (Appendix A), and received permission from the President (Appendix B) of Imperial Valley College, to conduct the study.

Imperial County is located in the southeastern part of California. In 1996, approximately 140,485 people lived throughout the county. The two largest cities in the county are El Centro and Calexico. The major industry in the county is agriculture. Over 66% of the population is categorized as Hispanic, with White (Non-Hispanic) and African American composing 29% and 2% of the population respectively. The climate during the summer months is hot and dry with temperatures reaching as high as 120 degrees. With low temperatures averaging 55 degrees, Imperial County is a haven during the winter for visitors from the northern states of the United States. Finally, Imperial County has one of the highest unemployment rates in the State of California. Thus, community members of all ages look toward education as a mean to develop their personal goals and professional careers.

Centrally located in Imperial Valley, the college is only one of two institutions of higher education for local residents. The other institution, an external campus of San Diego State University, offers a limited choice of upper division courses and majors mostly in the areas of business, education, and law enforcement. In fact, 81% of the 190 students who transferred to either the University of California system or the California State University system, went to San Diego State University. In any event, for most local high school graduates aspiring to receive a postsecondary degree, 75% in 1998, Imperial Valley College is their first stop.

In 1997, Imperial Valley College offered over 924 different courses in 65 programs of study ranging from Administration of Justice to Zoology. Data published in

the 1997–1998 fact book by IVC indicates that 10,075 students enrolled at the college in 1997. Of those students, 27% of the students enrolled in courses offered by the English division; the highest percentage for any division. Such a high enrollment was due to the English as a Second Language program which is part of the English division. The next highest enrollment was in the Behavioral Science division with about 18 percent of the enrollment. Enrollment for the next three years is expected to grow to 11,000 students.

There are four categories that described the staff of Imperial Valley College in 1997. The college had 12 administrators; 1 president/superintendent, 3 vice presidents, and 8 deans. There were 129 classified staff employees; 5 supervisors, 8 confidential staff members, and 116 non-supervisory employees. The campus had 96 full-time faculty members; 73 teaching faculty and 23 non-teaching faculty. Finally, the final category of IVC staff was the adjunct faculty which numbered 242 employees; 190 teaching faculty, and 52 non-teaching faculty.

Sample Selection

Once I determined the groups responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing the shared governance process on a day-to-day basis at IVC, these individuals and groups comprised the population for the case study. I identified the following groups to have important roles, on a day-to-day basis, in the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College; (a) the Academic Senate, (b) the Administrative Council, (c) the Associated Student Senate, (d) the College Council, (e) the Curriculum and Instruction committee, and (f) the Planning and Budget committee. I subsequently sent a letter of introduction (Appendix C) to the chair of each committee and requested a list of the current members which composed the respective committee.

At the beginning of the process of selecting individuals for the sample, my goal was to get the broadest range of experiences that participants could share with me. As a result, the sampling strategy that I used was purposive (Merriam, 1988, p. 48), which is a nonprobabilistic technique. This sample selection process implies that who the first

individual was from each group for the initial interview did not matter (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 204). Thus, the first participants that comprised the sample were the chairs of the groups that I identified in the previous paragraph.

Before starting each interview, I presented each participant with an informed consent form (Appendix D). I then asked each participant to read the complete form and ask any questions about the form or the case study. If there were any questions I would answer them before obtaining the participant's signature. I then began to interview the participant after obtaining the signed and completed informed consent form from the participant. Finally, none of the persons invited to participate in the case study declined to be interviewed.

At the conclusion of each interview, I presented the participant with a list of members from the participant's governance committee. In line with recommendations by Guba and Lincoln (1989), I then asked the participant to recommend the next interviewee with the requirement that the next person should have a different shared governance experience. I used this selection process throughout the study to get "as many constructions as possible" (Guba and Lincoln, p. 204) so that I would get a broad level of understanding regarding the experiences of implementing the shared governance process. In cases when participants could not identify another individual with different experience from the given list, I would then show the participant the lists from other committees. The participant then chose someone from the new lists and I would proceed with the next interview.

Data Collection

Noting that the use of multiple sources for data collection adds to the reliability and internal validity of a study (Merriam, 1988), I decided to use interviews, documents, observations, and the professional literature as sources of information to gather the data for the study. Using these different sources of data, then, allows the use of triangulation as a technique to validate the emergent themes of the study during intensive data analysis.

Interviews

Merriam stated that “interviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behavior, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them” and “it is also necessary to interview when we are interested in past events that are impossible to replicate” (1988, p. 72). Since the purpose of the study was to describe and understand the experiences of individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance process at IVC, the need for me to conduct interviews became paramount. I interviewed a total of thirty individuals—seven administrators, twelve faculty, five students, and six classified staff members. Finally, all the interviews that I conducted were one-to-one.

I broke the interview process into three phases. In the first phase, the interview process was highly structured at the beginning of the interview. Here my goal was to collect “sociodemographic data from respondents” (Merriam, p. 73). I thus asked participants to answer background and demographic types of questions (Appendix E). I also utilized this part of the interview process to minimize the nervousness of participants, as most were not used to being tape-recorded.

In the second phase of the interview, I used a semi-structured format with the research questions as guides (Appendix F). A goal that I had in this part of the interview process was to use the research questions as I assisted the participants to elaborate on their experiences in implementing the shared governance process. However, I did not determine “the exact wording nor the order of the questions ahead of time” in order to “respond to the situation at hand, to the emerging view of the respondent, and to new ideas on the topic” (p. 74).

In the last phase of the interview, the format was highly unstructured and open-ended. Here, my intent was to give respondents the opportunity to share information that they had not done so already. In addition, I also wanted to give myself the opportunity to explore with the respondents new and different possibilities about shared governance issues. At the conclusion of each interview, I thanked the respondents for the time that

they were willing to share with me and I indicated that I might do a follow-up interview at a later time.

I tape-recorded the interviews, when allowed to do so, because “this practice ensures that everything said is preserved for analysis” (Merriam, p. 81). Immediately after the interview, I transcribed the recordings. Each transcription included a header with the following information; (a) name of participant, (b) committee membership, (c) date, (d) location of interview, (e) time, and (f) identification of appropriate tape with actual recording.

In the cases where participants did not allow for a tape-recorded interview, I took notes using a concept map approach (Marshall & Rossman, 1995). Using this format for taking notes, I began by enclosing the words shared governance with a circle in the middle of the paper. I then expanded branches from this circle with possible shared governance subthemes. I continued in this manner for each subtheme and noted any possible relationships among the subthemes. Finally, throughout the interview I asked for clarification if I had any doubts about my notes.

Documents

Guba & Lincoln (1989) stated that “systematically tapping into documents and records provides a variety of cues for questions that can be asked during an interview” (p. 209). Not only that but issues “that emerge during an interview can be further illuminated by reference to existing documents and records” (p. 209). In addition, “documentary data are particularly good sources for qualitative case study because they can ground an investigation in the context of the problem being investigated” (Merriam, 1988, p. 109).

At the onset of the study, I searched for written materials outlining the shared governance process. I began by studying the appropriate sections on community colleges in the Education Code. I then focused on the Title 5 California Code of Regulations to document procedural implications of AB1725. Afterwards, I searched for governance recommendations in the *Manual on Accreditation Standards* put forth by the Accrediting

Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. Finally, upon reviewing external documentation outlining shared governance requirements and recommendations, I began to search for documentation specific to Imperial Valley College.

With respect to Imperial Valley College documentation, I first focused on the Board Policy Manual. I then accessed the latest accreditation documentation, which was prepared by college personnel in 1995. I also included minutes of the college council, board of trustees, administrative council, cabinet, academic senate, associated student government, and the planning and budget committee. In addition, I also studied any college document referenced by an interviewee of the study. Finally, I searched these sources and other documents to identify the individuals and groups responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing the shared governance process at IVC.

Observations

For qualitative researchers, “observation is a fundamental technique for gathering information” (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 79). On one hand, researchers need to do a lot of observing, “if for no other reason than in the interest of . . . gaining personal experience with the context” because “such observation, while apparently causal, can lead to useful questions” in an interview (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 210). On the other hand, “apparently casual remarks during the course of an interview can lead to productive observation” throughout the course of the study (p. 210). Hence, observations, together with interviews, are useful for both gathering data and for providing direction to the study.

An advantage of observation is that “immersion in the setting allows the researcher to hear, see, and begin to experience reality as the participants do” (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p. 79). Another advantage is that observations are “useful in exploring topics that may be uncomfortable for informants to discuss” (Creswell, 1994, p. 150). Finally, observation, “when combined with interviewing and document analysis,

allows for a holistic interpretation of the phenomenon being investigated” (Merriam, 1988, p. 102).

Initially, I began making observations during meetings of the following groups; (a) Board of Trustees, (b) College Council, (c) Academic Senate, (d) Administrative Council, (e) Associated Students, and (f) Planning and Budget committee. However, as the study transpired, there were times when interviewees recommended that I attend meetings of other committees. In addition, members of other committees invited me to attend some of their meetings. Finally, I identified other committees that I felt could better inform me on the process of implementing shared governance at the college. As a result I also attended meetings of the following committees; (a) President’s Cabinet, (b) Curriculum and Instruction, (c) Institutional Data Committee, (d) Accreditation Steering committee, (e) Disabled Students Program and Services, and (f) an informal group of faculty members meeting together calling themselves the Brown Bag committee.

Since “the process of collecting data through observations can be broken into the three stages of entry, data collection, and exit” (Merriam, 1988, p. 91), I informed the chair of each committee of my intention to collect data by observation and requested permission to do so. My goal was to be an observer as participant (Merriam, 1988) where my role as observer was recognized by the group and my primary function was to observe rather than to participate. At times I was asked questions with regards to issues that the committee was trying to address, and I only answered questions from committee members with information that I had prior to the start of the study.

At the start of an observation, I noted “the time, place, and purpose of the observation” (Merriam, 1988, p. 98). As I began my observations, I first observed as much as possible, with few notes, to “become familiar with the setting” (p. 91). Once I became familiar with the setting, the people, and the process, I began to take notes on issues that informed the research questions of the study. Once I left a setting, I took the time to expand my notes for a fuller description of my observations.

Professional Literature

“In qualitative research the literature should be used in a manner consistent with the methodological assumptions; namely, it should be used inductively so that it does not direct the questions asked by the researcher” (Creswell, 1994, p. 21). Consequently, as themes began to emerge from the study, I searched for past literature that might be useful to better understand the participants’ experiences of implementing the shared governance process. Not only that, but the professional literature provided the basis for developing recommendations regarding the shared governance process. I thus used bibliographies, indexes, and abstracts, both from library and Internet sources that referenced, when appropriate, the emergent themes of the case study.

Data Analysis

“In qualitative analysis several simultaneous activities engage the attention of the researcher” (Creswell, 1994, p. 153). The need for this simultaneous type of analysis arises out of the emergent design of a qualitative study, which is heavily dependent on the information given by the participants. Consequently, “each interview is followed immediately by data analysis . . . to make materials from preceding interviews available for commentary on subsequent ones” (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 206). As a result, “what emerges in the process is a more inclusive construction” of the participants’ experience (p. 210).

Based on the above insights into conducting a qualitative study, I transcribed the interviews as soon as possible, which was usually immediately after the interview and before the start of another interview. By doing this, I was able to get an initial reaction to what was said by the individual who I had interviewed. When appropriate, I asked participants in subsequent interviews to comment on some of the initial thoughts that I had formulated.

“Analytic procedures fall into five modes: organizing data; generating categories, themes, and patterns; testing the emergent hypothesis against the data; searching for

alternative explanations of the data; and writing the report” (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p. 114). As I read and reread the data that I began to collect, I began to organize the data. That is, I edited information, sorted out redundancies, and organized the data chronologically (Merriam, 1988, p. 126). The goal of organizing the data was “to be able to locate specific data during intensive analysis” (p. 126) which began at the end of simultaneous data collection and analysis. I collected data until there was a saturation of categories, which according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), occurs when “continuing data collection produces tiny increments of new information in comparison to the effort expended to get them” (p. 350).

As I simultaneously collected and organized the data, I also analyzed the collected information in search for “central themes, concepts, ideas, values, concerns, and issues” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 151). After I collected the data, I began the intensive analysis of the data following the guidelines in Guba & Lincoln (1989) and carried out the constant comparative method for developing categories. Specifically, I began by studying the data and making notes on the margins with my initial assessment for possible sources of categories “on a ‘feels right’ or ‘looks right’ basis” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 340).

Once I developed this overall, general analysis of the data, I began a more detailed process to search for categories and themes. In particular, I began to identify units of information within the data, that is, “*units* of information that will, sooner or later, serve as the basis for defining categories” (Guba & Lincoln, 1989, p. 344). I was careful to make sure that a unit was interpretable in the absence of any additional information. In addition, I used index cards, coded for later identification, to record the units that I identified throughout this portion of the analysis. The coding schema included the use of different colored index cards for each constituent group and a numbering system that referenced the exact document page and unit of information written in the index card. As I began to create index cards, I continued the process of developing plausible categories for the data. In order to facilitate the formation of plausible

categories, I then developed a concept map of each interview, illustrated in appendix G, in order to create a visual tool aimed at improving my understanding of issues important to each participant. This tool facilitated the search for emergent themes relevant to the study since common issues to many participants became more obvious.

Once I unitized the data, I then began the formal process of developing categories. Following Guba & Lincoln's (1989) recommendation, I first studied the first index card and placed it to one side, representing "the first yet to-be-named category" (p. 347). I then selected the second index card and determined "on tacit or intuitive grounds" (p. 347) whether this card should start a new pile of yet another new category or whether the card should go with the previous pile. I continued with the successive cards until there was an emergence of regularities (p. 350). Throughout this categorizing process, I kept referencing the research questions to insure that the analysis was informing the purpose of the study; namely, to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College.

As the piles of cards began to reach a critical-size, which according Guba and Lincoln (1989) is six to eight cards, I then began to search for category properties. In view that "research is concerned with producing valid and reliable knowledge in an ethical manner" (Merriam, 1988, p. 163), I followed Guba and Lincoln's (1989) advice "to validate each [piece of information] against at least one other source (for example, a second interview) and/or a second method (for example, an observation in addition to an interview)" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 283). When appropriate, I also used Spradley's (1979) process of domain analysis, using his recommended domain analysis worksheet (Appendices H and I), as another technique to validate category properties. I continued in this manner for all piles of index cards reaching critical size until I exhausted the pile of cards (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 348). From these categories, then, I found the

emergent themes that exemplified the experiences of individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College.

Subjects' Risk/Benefits

In order to minimize the risks to the participants of the study, I provided them with the following information, should they have any questions or concerns throughout the length of the study: (a) they were free to withdraw from the study at any point in time, (b) they could call me at any time at my extension should they feel a need to do so, and (c) when asked by the participant, that the data will be destroyed one year after the completion of the case study.

While my intent was to carry out a process that was open, I was also aware that some of the participants would desire to have certain information remain confidential. Thus, when a participant chose to have his/her comments remain confidential, I explained to the participant what I would do to maintain the confidentiality. Specifically, I indicated that I would use generic terms such as administrator, faculty, staff, or student when using a direct quote in the reporting of the data. At times I provided the example that if the senate president requested confidentiality, then I would refer to this participant as a senator, rather than as the senate president.

Limitations

1. The focus on Imperial Valley College produced themes that were unique to the setting and which probably would not apply to other colleges.
2. The data collected were limited to the perceptions and experiences of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYSIS AND PRESENTATION OF THE DATA

Introduction

Even though “there is no standard format for reporting” qualitative data (Merriam, 1998, p. 185), the manner in which one presents the data is crucial to any study because “in the choice of particular words to summarize and reflect the complexity of data, the researcher is engaging in the interpretive act, lending shape and form—meaning—to massive amounts of raw data” (Marshall and Rossman, 1989, p. 119). Furthermore, the report should present “a holistic and lifelike description that is like those that the readers normally encounter in their experiencing of the world, rather than being mere symbolic abstraction of such” (Lincoln and Guba, 1985, p. 359). According to Creswell (1994), the report could include “narrative conventions such as: varying the use of long, short, and text-embedded quotes, scripting conversation, . . . using category names from the informants, . . . using indents to signify informant quotes, using the first person *I* or collective *we* in the narrative form, [and] using metaphors” (p. 160). Interestingly, Eisner noted that “as educational researchers become increasingly interested in the relationship between form of representation and form of understanding, new representational forms [of data] are being used to convey to ‘readers’ what has been learned” (1997, p. 4). It is in this spirit of exploration for “alternative forms of data representation” (p. 5) that I present the following data to the research community.

The following sections of this chapter, then, document in detail the themes emerging from the perceptions and experiences of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. With the view that the case study should provide “a vicarious experience of the situation, allowing the readers to ‘walk in the shoes’ of the local actors” (Guba and Lincoln, 1989, p. 223), I am presenting

the data in the form of a virtual roundtable discussion. The term virtual is appropriate in two respects; (a) five people never really met to discuss shared governance, and (b) the discussion is implicit in the emergent themes arising from the analysis of the data.

A consequence of this format is that the voices presented in the discussions for the respective stakeholder group do not pertain to any particular individual, but are unique in that they represent the collective voice of all the individuals participating in the study. In addition, I also use this format in part because “facts described literally are unlikely to have the power to evoke in the reader what the reader needs to experience to know” and better relate to the issues that are important to the participants of this study (Eisner, 1997, p. 8). In effect, my goal is to present the perceptions and experiences of administrators, faculty, staff, and students, using an inductive approach, which, stated Connelly and Clandinin (1990), allows data to “more clearly tell their own story” (p. 11).

Each section begins with the appropriate research question and introduces pertinent information to the study arising out of the analysis of the data that does not lend itself to the format of a roundtable discussion. It is important to keep in mind, though, that the statements in the virtual roundtable discussion represent a collective voice of the respective stakeholder group, as opposed to that of a specific individual. Not only that, but according to Lincoln and Guba (1985), the “*writing should be informal . . . portray the world of the site in terms of the constructions that respondent use, . . . expressing their constructions in their own natural language*” (p. 365). Consequently, I use direct quotes from participants that not only facilitate the virtual conversation, but also best represent the collective voice of the respective group and/or embody an emerging theme from the analysis of the data. In cases when I could not use a direct quote, then I would develop a statement by combining quotes from the appropriate stakeholder group which best summarized and represented their collective voice.

Phillips (1994), though, concerned “that the acceptance of a narrative can have important consequences” (p. 17), elaborated on the need to use correct information when

developing narratives. In the case of the accuracy of stories presented as scholarly work, Polkinghorne (1995) declared, "it is the researchers' responsibility to assure that the reported events and happenings actually occurred" (p. 20). Acknowledging that these concerns apply to the virtual roundtable discussion presented throughout this chapter, I used experiences shared by various individuals within stakeholder groups, experiences shared by various individuals among different stakeholder groups, observations, and documents to triangulate and validate the statements used throughout the discussion. However, I avoid making specific reference to an individual or individuals in order to protect the confidentiality of the participants. In addition, for the purpose of this virtual roundtable discussion, the terms AB1725 means Assembly Bill 1725, ASG means Associated Student Government, CSEA means California School Employees Association, CTA means California Teachers Association and IVC means Imperial Valley College. I thus begin the presentation of the data, utilizing the research questions and the emergent themes of the study to structure the rest of this chapter and to guide the organization of the data.

The Shared Governance Players

The initial point of analysis, in understanding the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College, is to establish *who* is involved with the shared governance process. The first research question, then, asks to identify the individuals and groups directly involved with the shared governance process. In order to address this question, the identification of such individuals and groups entails establishing who maintains and updates the shared governance policy; ascertaining who implements the shared governance policy; and determining who is missing from the shared governance process. From this vantage point, then, one can establish who (a) makes shared governance policy decisions, (b) carries out said policy, and (c) is absent from the shared governance process. This, in turn, will provide the foundation needed for the second point of analysis, which addresses *how* these individuals and groups carry out the governance process.

The Decision Makers

[*Researcher*]: Let's begin by identifying the groups or individuals responsible for maintaining and updating the shared governance policy of Imperial Valley College. Who would these be?

[*Faculty*]: I think everything feeding into the shared governance process has to stop somewhere, and it really stops with the elected board members.

[*Researcher*]: The Education Code does indicate that the governing board is legally responsible for the policies of the college, which would include both policies in general and the shared governance policy. At this point, we will focus on the shared governance policy and we will discuss later the overall policy-making process. From what you said then, the board is a key group responsible for the shared governance policy.

[*All*]: Right.

[*Researcher*]: Who else makes and updates the shared governance policy?

[*Administrator*]: The academic senate, under their leadership, is what really led the way.

[*Researcher*]: Led what?

[*Administrator*]: In bringing shared governance to IVC.

[*Researcher*]: And in looking over the board policy manual, I've noticed that the academic senate needs to reach mutual agreement with the board of trustees when changes are going to be made to parts of the shared governance policy. So that would make the senate another key group.

[*Faculty*]: I think everyone sees that as the role of the senate.

[*Researcher*]: Sees what role?

[*Faculty*]: That the academic senate, more than everybody else, is the primary group on this campus that is responsible for maintaining and updating the shared governance policy.

[*Administrator*]: I think that the college president, cabinet, administrative council, CSEA, and the Associated Student Government, in addition to the senate, are key groups. Linked to each group are key individuals who are committed to make sure the shared governance becomes a reality.

[*Faculty*]: While the intent is that all groups are responsible for maintaining the policy, I don't see that happening.

[*Administrator*]: Actually, I would say that it would be the faculty, administration, and staff members themselves who are involved in shared governance that are responsible for maintaining and updating the shared governance policy.

[*Researcher*]: In terms of decision makers, however, the board of trustees, with the academic senate and college president, have been updating the shared governance policy and the committee structure of the college, both of which impact shared governance. Take for example, the creation of planning and budget committee and the adaptation of the curriculum and instruction committee both of which came about by mutual agreement of the board of trustees and the academic senate; or the institutional data committee being added to the college's list of standing committees, as recommended by the college president to the board of trustees. The only other group that has updated the shared governance policy, with board approval, was the college council.

[*Researcher*]: The point you brought up though, about who is involved in shared governance, points to our next topic of discussion; identifying who implements the shared governance policy.

The Implementers

[*All*]: The board of trustees is a key group for shared governance.

[*Researcher*]: Key in that the board implements the governance policy by making decisions or acting on recommendations made by others, or key in that the board implements the policy in other ways?

[*All*]: Key in that the board makes decisions.

[*Administrator*]: The board has an interesting role in shared governance because its members are not on campus and they need to rely on what I tell them or others tell them. It's difficult for them to know intimately what goes on.

[*Researcher*]: Which is consistent with the observations I made throughout the study. Although there were times when board members came to the college and met with faculty, staff, and students. Campus orientations, meeting with the college president, having lunch with faculty, and being part of forums with faculty, staff, and students, are some examples that come to mind. But on a more routine basis, who or what groups implement the shared governance process at IVC?

[*Staff*]: After the board, the academic senate is a good vehicle for implementing the shared governance process.

[*Faculty*]: You basically have academic issues that involve faculty, so you have the academic senate, which is probably the strongest advocate of shared governance, involved in shared governance.

[*Administrator*]: Faculty must play a role in shared governance, to be able to develop it. I would say faculty, staff, and administrators jointly serve a key role in implementing shared governance. The other group that should be involved is the students. Students have to play a role as well. So, we have the academic senate, associated students, cabinet, CSEA, and CTA as key groups for implementing shared governance.

[*Staff*]: I think that CSEA plays a very important role because many of the people that serve on the various campus committees are CSEA members.

[*Faculty*]: You also have laws that legislate working conditions, and that involves unions, for us that would be CTA. So, unions are involved in the formalizing process to change policy.

[*Researcher*]: Any other groups?

[*All*]: The administration.

[*Administrator*]: I think cabinet, composed of the president, vice-presidents and the director of human resources, is a key group in the shared governance process. Cabinet is the conduit for most of the input that comes up through the system and where we can secure information, advise, seek input, or to carry out a process that will include others for that decision.

[*Faculty*]: So are the administrative council, the Associated Student Government, and division chairs.

[*Staff*]: The college council too, is another key group.

[*Administrator*]: Or should be a key group.

[*Researcher*]: According to the board policy manual, the college council, composed of administrators, faculty, staff, and students, can propose changes to the shared governance policy by forwarding its suggestions to the college president and the board of trustees. What about individuals? Are there any key individuals to the shared governance process at IVC?

[*All*]: Yes.

[*Researcher*]: Who would they be?

[*Administrator*]: Linked with the Associated Student Government is the student life advisor. Linked with the college president are the cabinet officials. Linked with the CSEA president is a circle of staff, and with the

academic senate president those faculty who have committed to making sure shared governance becomes a reality.

[*All*]: The college president is a key individual, definitely.

[*Faculty*]: The vice-presidents are important too, the chief instructional officer in particular, because he is bringing changes to the campus through the curriculum and instruction committee.

[*Staff*]: And also because the chief instructional officer works in conjunction with the college president to make sure that the shared governance process is working. The chief student services officer is important too.

[*Student*]: I think the members of the administrative team, especially the college president, are key individuals.

[*Administrator*]: The college president and his vice-presidents are probably the most key individuals for the implementation of the shared governance process.

[*Student*]: The Associated Student Government president is also a key person.

[*Administrator*]: With their advisor as a key ingredient to the participation of the associated students.

[*Student*]: Right.

[*Faculty*]: At IVC, the key people would be the vice-presidents, college president, academic senate president, CSEA president, Associated Student Government president.

[*Staff*]: Leadership is a really, really big thing. All aspects of leadership need to be involved. Everybody has to be involved.

[*Faculty*]: Whether or not they are in fact part of the shared governance process is another question. I think that it depends on the issue.

[*Researcher*]: So there might be individuals and groups missing from the shared governance process.

[*Faculty*]: I'm thinking of the process we have in place now; we have CTA, college council, cabinet, administrative council, the Associated Student Government. So when you ask if a group might be missing, in one sense there is none. I mean they are all on paper.

Missing in Action

[*Researcher*]: Who's missing?

[*Faculty*]: Probably the community is missing.

[*Administrator*]: I think most of the committees that we have on campus that are part of shared governance do not include the community, there may be one or two. I'm not too clear, though, whether or not the purpose of shared governance is to include the community.

[*Researcher*]: According to the board policy manual, there are four such committees. Those would be the affirmative action advisory committee, the competitive athletics committee, the financial assistance, placement, and veterans committee, and the disabled students programs and services committee.

[*Staff*]: Besides the community, I also see the classified staff missing from the shared governance process and the adjunct faculty.

[*Faculty*]: I agree. I don't think that the adjunct are being represented either. Certainly the students are missing from some of the committees.

[*Student*]: I would say that students who really don't care about shared governance are missing.

[*Faculty*]: Perhaps the faculty at large is missing too.

[*Administrator*]: I sit on a lot of committees where teaching faculty is absent, and in the vast majority of cases, in areas where they should be there. The division chairs could also be more involved as a body, rather than an individual here and there.

[*Staff*]: Sometimes I think that our board is missing too.

[*Faculty*]: I think that at different times, everybody is missing from the process.

[*Researcher*]: It seems that people at large, that is, outside the key groups and individuals which you all identified earlier, seem to be missing from the shared governance process. Perhaps we now need to begin to focus on how all these governance players go about implementing shared governance and then maybe get some better insights as to who does or does not take part in the process; and why. But first, let's take a break.

Summary

In answering the first research question, the conversations in this section have identified the groups and individuals directly involved with, or missing from, the shared governance process. Specifically, the board of trustees, college president, academic senate, and most recently college council, have all played a role in both maintaining and updating the shared governance policy of Imperial Valley College. In addition to cabinet, administrative council, CSEA, and the Associated Student Government, participants also established that individuals who were actually involved in the shared governance process were responsible for maintaining the shared governance policy.

Furthermore, according to the data presented in this section, classified staff, administration, faculty, students, Associated Student Government, academic senate, cabinet, CSEA, CTA, administrative council, and college council, are groups responsible for implementing the shared governance policy. Not only that, but participants consider the Associated Student Government advisor and president, college president and vice-presidents, academic senate president, and CSEA president, as the individuals responsible for implementing the shared governance policy. However, some participants noted that having the responsibility to implement the governance policy does not necessarily mean that all of these groups and individuals are assuming the responsibility to participate in the shared governance process.

Finally, participants felt the community was missing from the shared governance process and, at the same time, were unclear whether the community was supposed to play a role in shared governance. Considered missing too were adjunct faculty, division chairs as a group, and possibly the board of trustees. Lastly, participants indicated that, in general, classified staff, students, and faculty at large were also absent from the shared governance process.

The Shared Governance Process

The second research question seeks to establish how the shared governance process has been operationalized. Thus, the second point of analysis, in understanding the shared governance process at IVC, is to determine *how* the shared governance players implement, on a daily basis, the process of shared governance. Bringing focus to this question first requires identifying the shared governance structures that allow the governance players, as identified in the previous section, to participate in the governing of the college. Upon describing the governance structure, then the next objective is to identify the procedures to develop or change college policies in general. The final part in addressing this research question is to elaborate on how individuals and groups use these structures and procedures and put into action the shared governance policy at Imperial Valley College. A consequence of clarifying how the governance players implement the shared governance process will be the third point of analysis of this study; the *outcomes* of putting shared governance into practice on a daily basis.

Structures for Participation

The governance of the institution begins with the board of trustees who, per board policy, acts as a committee of the whole on all matters coming before it. There are seven board members representing the Brawley, Calexico, Calipatria, El Centro, Holtville, Imperial, and San Pasqual high school districts of Imperial Valley. Sitting at the table with the board members are the college president with his executive secretary, vice-presidents, and director of human resources. Per board resolution, the academic senate

and Associated Student Government have nonvoting representatives who also sit with the board of trustees and are recognized as full members of the board. In addition, the public can attend board meetings and share their opinions or concerns to the board of trustees. Finally, CTA and CSEA union representatives are also invited to attend board meetings.

After the board, there are four stakeholder groups within the institution, each of which has its own organizations or bodies to discuss campus issues. The administrative stakeholder group has the cabinet and administrative council. Cabinet consists of the college president, who chairs the committee, the vice-presidents, and the director of human resources. This group usually meets every other week and conducts its business behind closed doors. Administrative council meets on a monthly or bi-weekly basis and is also chaired by the college president. Membership includes all the vice-presidents, the director of human resources, the dean of admissions, the dean of learning services, the dean of external campus, the dean of financial aid, the director of nursing, and the director of disabled student program and services. In addition, other individuals may be invited to attend these meetings, such as the foundation director and the public relations officer. It is unclear whether members of the college community can attend as visitors on a regular basis.

The faculty stakeholder group has two organizations—the academic senate and the California Teachers Association, the exclusive bargaining agent for faculty. The academic senate consists of twenty-one members—the senate president elected at large, nine senators elected at large and eleven divisional representatives. In addition, the immediate senate past president, the chief instructional officer, an associated student representative, and an adjunct faculty member representative work with the academic senate in a non-voting capacity. The meetings of the academic senate are open to the public. CTA, the second faculty organization, is made up of those faculty members who join the organization. The officers of the bargaining agent include the president, vice-president, treasurer, recording secretary, and corresponding secretary, all of which are

elected by the membership. Not only that, but the members of CTA also elect a negotiation team consisting of three faculty members. With exception of the closed session portion of their meetings, CTA faculty members and nonmembers can attend the meetings.

The classified staff comprises the third stakeholder group and is represented by the California School Employees Association. Per section 51023.5 of the California Code of Regulations, in the absence of any other staff organization, this representation can also apply to governance issues. Finally, members of the classified staff have studied the concept of introducing a classified senate to Imperial Valley College. However, no decision has been made on this matter.

The final stakeholder group consists of the students of Imperial Valley College. Student participation is organized through the Associated Student Government. The ASG consists of the student president and thirteen assembly members. Sitting with the student assembly is the student life advisor. The organization meets on a weekly basis and the meetings are open to the public.

Besides the board of trustees, cabinet, administrative council, academic senate, CTA, CSEA, and the Associated Student Government, there is also a host of standing committees that are an integral part of the governance structure for Imperial Valley College. Per board policy, almost all of these committees serve as recommending bodies to the college president and existed prior to AB1725. The following is a list of all board approved standing committees with a brief description of their role and membership as described in the board policy manual. Also noted is whether the board created the committee before or after the inception of AB1725, or modified a committee as a result of AB1725.

- **Admissions, Registration, Petitions Committee:** To interpret and administer college policy on first-time admissions; review and evaluate registration procedures; and act upon student petitions. The chair of the committee is the

dean of admissions and student activities. The college president appoints the following members—one student and an indefinite number of faculty and classified staff. [*pre-ABI725*]

- **Affirmative Action Advisory Committee:** To review affirmative action actions, goals, and policies, and to make recommendations to the college administration through the affirmative action officer. The members of the committee include representation from CSEA, CTA, ASG, academic senate, and various community organizations. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Buildings and Grounds Committee:** To study the physical appearance of the campus and to offer suggestions and plans for its beautification. The chair of the committee is the vice-president for business services. The college president appoints the following members—the director of maintenance and operations, one student, one classified staff member, and an indefinite number of faculty members. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **College Center and Food Services Committee:** To evaluate the operation of the college center and food service, and to develop recommendations to assist in operations and service. The chair is the vice president of business services. The president appoints at least three faculty members, three classified staff members, three students, the dean of admissions, and the cafeteria manager. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **College Council:** To convey to the college president the views of the campus community and to make recommendations on proposed college policies to the college president or other policy making college committees. The committee members elect the chair of the committee from its membership. The members of the committee include two faculty members appointed by the academic senate, one faculty member elected at large, three classified staff members elected at large, three students elected at large, one non-instructional and two

instructional administrators. The college president serves in a non-voting capacity. *[as modified after AB1725]*

- **Competitive Athletics Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning the various athletic programs, and to formulate policy regarding athletic events. The chair of the committee is the director of athletics. The college president appoints three head coaches, two students, two community members, and an indefinite number of faculty members. *[pre-AB1725]*
- **Curriculum and Instruction Committee:** To serve in an advisory capacity to the academic senate, and when appropriate the chief executive officer, by developing policy recommendations and procedures on academic and professional matters. The chief instructional officer and an academic senate representative co-chair the committee. Voting members of the committee include the chief executive officer, academic senate representative, division chairpersons, dean of vocational education, dean of learning services, director of disabled students programs and services, director of nursing education and health technologies, vice president of student services, and the associated student government representative. Consulting members of the committee are the dean of admissions, matriculation coordinator, dean of external campus, and the transfer center director. *[as modified after AB1725]*
- **Disabled Students Programs and Services:** To explore and develop methods to improve education services for disabled students. The chair is the director of disabled students programs and services. The college president appoints an indefinite number of faculty, three classified staff members, three students, three community members, and the vice president for counseling and student services. *[pre-AB1725]*
- **Financial Assistance, Placement, and Veterans Committee:** To improve and implement methods to maintain general areas of veteran's affairs,

placement and financial assistance. The chair is the director of financial assistance and placement services. The following members are appointed by the college president: three community members, an indefinite number of faculty, and the vice president for counseling and student services. [*pre-ABI725*]

- **Institutional Research Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning the various aspects of institutional research. The chair of the committee is the instructional specialist for institutional research. In addition to faculty members, one student and the dean of admissions and student activities are appointed to the committee by the college president. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Language Lab Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning the operation of the language lab. The committee is composed of an indefinite number of faculty members. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Learning Supportive Services and Library/Media Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning the various aspects and programs of the current library and learning support services. The chair of the committee is the dean of learning services. The college president appoints one student, and an indefinite number of faculty to the committee. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Matriculation Committee:** To develop policies necessary to implement the matriculation process. The chair of the committee is the vice president of counseling and student services. The college president appoints the following members—representatives from the English and math divisions, persons from admissions, counseling, data processing, equal opportunity program and services, disable student program and services, transfer center, financial aid, external campus, and an indefinite amount of faculty. [*pre-ABI725*]

- **Planning and Budget Committee:** To coordinate and integrate college plans, and to establish budget priorities consistent with the college's vision, with specific recommendations for the college president. Committee membership includes the vice president of business services, academic senate president, college council chairperson, director of fiscal services, one administrative representative appointed by the college president, two faculty representatives appointed by the academic senate, two classified representatives elected at large, and one student representative appointed by the Associated Student Government. [*post-ABI725*]
- **Reading and Writing Placement Committee:** To make preparations and arrangements for the appropriate placement of students in the English composition and reading course sequence. The chair of the committee is either the reading center facilitator or the writing center facilitator. The members of the committee include the English division instructors, and other interested faculty. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Special Services Advisory Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning applicants to the program, and to make recommendations concerning the activities and services of the program. The chair of the committee is the project director of special services. The college president appoints one student, two community members, and an indefinite number of faculty members to the committee. [*pre-ABI725*]
- **Staff Development/Flex Committee:** To make all decisions regarding committee organization, allocation of funds, approval of workshop proposals, and coordination of the ten flex days. Committee membership includes an indefinite number of faculty and classified staff members. [*post-ABI725*]
- **Student Life and Community Service Committee:** To evaluate and make recommendations concerning the various areas of student life. The chair is the

student life advisor. The college president appoints at least four students, at least four faculty members, and four classified staff members. [*pre-ABI725*]

- **Telecommunications, Information Technology, Internet Committee:** To develop policies and implement procedures related to computer technology and its educational uses. The membership of the committee includes a data processing technician, and an indefinite amount of faculty, classified staff, and administrators. [*post-ABI725*]
- **Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Committee:** To implement, maintain, and support the Title III cross-curricular writing/reading program. [*pre-ABI725*]

In conjunction with the above-mentioned bodies, organizations, and standing committees, I identified numerous subcommittees, ad-hoc committees, and task forces throughout the length of this study. These included, but not limited to, the distance education subcommittee, measure R committee, accreditation steering committee, insurance committee, marketing committee, hiring committees, equivalency committee, sabbatical leave committee, blue ribbon committee, safety committee, rules committee, finance committee, and reclassification committee. Finally, a group of faculty members developed an informal group, called the brown bag committee, to discuss issues relevant to instruction, which according to the membership, were not being addressed elsewhere.

To summarize, then, the shared governance structure of Imperial Valley College includes the board of trustees, associations and campus bodies for each of the four key stakeholder groups, standing committees, and ad-hoc task forces or committees. Of importance, now, is to impart the thoughts held by administrators, classified staff, faculty, and students about the committee structure.

[*Researcher*]: Any thoughts about the shared governance committee structure?

[*Faculty*]: My impression right now, of all the committees we have, is that we have more committees now than we ever had.

[*Researcher*]: But in terms of standing committees, there are only three new ones, and two other ones that were revised after AB1725.

[*Faculty*]: It seems that everything is ad-hoc or the subcommittee of the committee.

[*Researcher*]: From what I could gather, the Associated Student Government had seven standing commissions and committees, and the academic senate had five standing committees. I also identified the creation of at least ten subcommittees from these two groups and other campus organizations and committees. I suspect, though, that I probably missed some too.

[*Administrator*]: I think we've done pretty good in terms of the committee make-up and trying to make sure that all constituents are represented on the committees.

[*Faculty*]: Certainly in terms of the committees we've developed to implement shared governance like college council and planning and budget. They have all of the factions in them.

[*Researcher*]: The accreditation standard subcommittees, too.

[*Faculty*]: In terms of a committee that is actually carrying out the process of shared governance, planning and budget is one that I see where we are making headway.

[*Staff*]: Work needs to be done and it's getting done in planning and budget.

[*Administrator*]: And that's shared governance. People, like the members of planning and budget, getting involved and running the college.

[*Researcher*]: What about college council?

[*Administrator*]: College council is supposed to be the shared governance committee on campus. It's supposed to be a reviewing authority for changes in policy before it goes to the board.

[*Researcher*]: Supposed to be?

[*Administrator*]: It was supposed to be the group where all four clusters were being represented and things were supposed to be put on the table for further review.

[*Researcher*]: According to the 1997 midterm report by the Accrediting Commission, the college council was working reasonably well. What happened?

[*Faculty*]: I think that college council has become a figurehead committee. I don't think they discuss anything that's been of great importance that's going to make a major change on campus. I'm not sure that information is even run through college council, like it was intended, when it was first set up.

[*Staff*]: Lately, I haven't seen any information coming out from that group either.

[*Faculty*]: It's a shame that college council is not what it used to be because even though they were not a policy making body, they were certainly a logical place for information to flow in and out of. We've lost another place for additional discussion to take place.

[*Administrator*]: This could be happening because leadership at the beginning did not allow college council to develop full credibility, or maybe because policies are not being changed.

[*Faculty*]: Or perhaps because it has dealt with issues not related to shared governance.

[*Student*]: But you know, I feel that college council serves a very big, big part of shared governance.

[*Researcher*]: Why?

[*Student*]: Because it is very well balanced. It gives equal amounts of representation to every group on campus—administration, faculty, staff, and students.

[*Administrator*]: That's the beauty of college council—balanced membership.

[*Researcher*]: And I couldn't find any other campus committee that had such a balance in membership. Any other thoughts before we begin discussing the process to develop or change policies?

[*Administrator*]: The committees are what make shared governance because all those committees are going to make decisions that are going to affect the future of this college and our students.

[*Faculty*]: I've always thought, though, that certain committees are more important than others.

[*Researcher*]: On that note, let's begin to focus on the policy-making process.

Policies and Procedure

[*Researcher*]: What would be steps, or processes, to develop a new policy or to revise a current policy at IVC?

[*Administrator*]: You have different groups involved with the different aspects of developing policy input to the administration. A recommendation to change a policy goes through whatever procedure or process we have set up.

[*Researcher*]: And how would that process work?

[*Administrator*]: It would begin with an individual who suggests a change.

[*Researcher*]: Like the faculty member who went to the senate requesting that the sabbatical leave policy be reviewed.

[*Staff*]: Or it could be someone in a committee.

[*Researcher*]: Like the proposal in college council to develop a policy on the use of alcohol for nonprofit organization functions.

[*Faculty*]: It can start in someone's division meeting, the faculty lounge, or the classified lounge. It starts wherever people get together to talk.

[*Researcher*]: Sometimes a review of policy could be mandated too, like the policy on hiring faculty members. Or a new policy could arise because there is no policy, like the policy to hire evening administrators.

[*Faculty*]: Ultimately, though, there has to be some place along the line where the policy development becomes formalized.

[*Administrator*]: Which means that the individual or group brings it to the attention of an administrator, division chair, or some committee.

[*Researcher*]: An example that comes to mind is when CTA asked the academic senate to develop a mentoring policy. Ok, so a policy begins with an individual or group who then takes it to some other group, like curriculum and instruction. Then what happens?

[*Staff*]: The committee members discuss the proposal and then they decide on what the changes should be.

[*Administrator*]: In the discussion they get views and ideas on how to implement the changes and hopefully find solutions to improve a process.

[*Staff*]: Sometimes committees make a trial change to see what happens before making a decision on what to do.

[*All*]: And then the recommendation goes to the next level.

[*Researcher*]: Which would be?

[*Staff*]: A vice president.

[*Administrator*]: Cabinet or administrative council.

[*Faculty*]: Academic senate.

[*Student*]: The college president.

[*Researcher*]: Ok . . . and after that?

[*Staff*]: The president and then the board.

[*Administrator*]: Board of trustees.

[*Faculty*]: Cabinet or board of trustees.

[*Student*]: The board.

[*Researcher*]: Everyone agrees that the last step is the board?

[*All*]: Yes.

[*Faculty*]: Clearly, there are several ways in which a policy can get to the board.

[*Researcher*]: Based on the paper trail of some policies, I would agree. I'll try to summarize the development of some policies. The alcohol policy, considered by college council, did not go beyond that committee. Another example is when administrative and senate representatives reviewed the faculty hiring policies. The administrative representatives updated cabinet, and senate representatives presented the revisions to the senate. The academic senate distributed the document to all faculty prior to voting on it. Upon approval by the senate and agreement with the administration, the revised policy was presented to the board for their approval. An example of the quick revision of a policy is the campus facility use policy. Here the vice president for business services told cabinet members of the need to update the policy. Cabinet members supported the idea and the vice president presented a proposed policy at a subsequent meeting of cabinet. Soon after that, the policy is presented to the board of trustees, and is approved.

[*Researcher*]: The process to form or revise other policies was more involved, though. For instance, the technology committee began to look into developing an internet policy, which would cover e-mail issues. Apparently there was some concern by faculty about privacy issues. The senate president then talked with the vice president for business services, who in turn, talked with cabinet members. From there the vice president for academic services agreed to work on the document with the committee. After that, administrative council discussed the development of the policy and stated that once the committee completed its work, that the policy should go to the vice-president of academic services, administrative council, academic senate, college council, and the board. After the administrative council meeting, the next mentioning of this document occurs at a

meeting of the academic senate. Here, academic senate minutes note the need to review the proposed policy, and that the CTA president will send the document to legal counsel for review. Thereafter, the policy is on the board's agenda for action. However, at the night of the board meeting, the vice president for academic services, informs the board that the technology committee developed a policy for computer use, and that it would be ready for the next board meeting. Afterwards, there is no more mention of said policy.

[*Researcher*]: The final example concerns the revision of the flex/staff development policy. At a meeting of the flex/staff development committee, the co-chair proposed two revisions to the policy. The committee approved both proposals and forwarded them to the academic senate. At a later meeting of the academic senate, the senate supported the first proposal. The second proposal was not approved and the senators decided to create a subcommittee, in addition to getting input from the director of human resources and the vice president for academic services. The senate then prepares a resolution to formalize the approval of the first proposal of the flex/staff development committee. After the first reading, the senate sends a copy of the resolution to all faculty members. On the second reading of the resolution, the senate approves the resolution and forwards the document to the college president. All along, a senate subcommittee, in conjunction with the senate president, is working on the second proposal developed by the flex/staff development committee. Eventually the subcommittee makes a recommendation to the senate and a resolution is created and approved. At a subsequent board meeting, the vice president for academic services informs the board that the proposed changes to the flex/staff development committee is being reviewed and

will be presented for board approval at a later time. The board of trustees approves the proposal thereafter.

[*Researcher*]: These examples, I believe illustrate the different ways in which the college develops policies. I could not find a policy which outlines the process in a step-by-step manner.

[*Administrator*]: Currently there is no definite policy for developing policies.

[*Researcher*]: But I did find one source that came close to outlining a process for developing policies. The source is a document created by the college council explicating its role in the policy making process. The document showed the flow from standing committees and campus associations to the president and the academic senate, to the board of trustees, with the college council playing an advisory role throughout the development of a policy. Clearly, the process is not standard procedure. Nonetheless, policies are being created and the campus community is implementing the shared governance policy.

[*Faculty*]: We may not have a consistent policy making process due to the turnover in staff, particularly with the administration. Maybe an orientation session on how shared governance works, or should work, might help.

[*Administrator*]: Particularly if they have never worked in the California community college system.

[*Researcher*]: The next topic, then, is to determine the different ways in which groups and individuals have put into practice the shared governance policy.

Putting it Into Action

This section aims to finish answering the second research question by elaborating on the manner in which individuals and groups use the college's structures and policy procedures to implement the shared governance policy at Imperial Valley College.

Campus groups and individuals have different avenues to participate in the shared governance process. Usually, campus personnel who have an interest in an issue that a committee is going to address volunteer to serve by submitting their name to the chair of the committee. In cases when no initial volunteers step forward, committee chairs, organizational presidents, and campus administrators ask for volunteers or appoint individuals, upon their acceptance, to serve on various campus committees. In addition, there are faculty, staff, and students elected as representatives of their respective groups who work in many of the campus committees. To maximize the voice of the stakeholder representatives, individuals can designate alternates to attend on their behalf. However, when stakeholder groups are not included in the discussion of particular issues, then they request representation to participate, usually by speaking or corresponding with the president of the college.

Communication takes many forms at Imperial Valley College. In written form, agendas, minutes, reports, letters, handouts, memos, memorandums of understanding, handbooks, newsletters, policy manuals, constitutions, bylaws, and resolutions are all used to inform the campus community of what is happening at the college. On a more personal basis, campus personnel have formal and informal meetings, give presentations, impart reports, share concerns, develop ideas, share information, and provide updates on what is happening at IVC. Technology also plays a factor with web pages, web agendas, e-mails, faxes, and voice-mails providing more avenues to the sharing and availability of information. Individuals can also share ideas or concerns through suggestion boxes placed throughout the college campus by various committees and stakeholder groups. Committees and stakeholder organizations, then, play an important role in the day-to-day implementation of the shared governance policy.

The work of stakeholder bodies, committees and subcommittees entails studying and addressing campus issues, developing policy proposals and recommendations, assessing their respective function and role, and working out the implementation details

of specific projects or policies. Voting, consensus building, roll call votes, and resolutions are the various ways in which the aforementioned groups make decisions. Finally, policy-making bodies need to work with administrative representatives before placing an item on the board agenda.

Summary

This section addressed the second research question of this study by determining how the members of Imperial Valley College operationalized the shared governance policy. The topics of structures, policy-making processes, and means for implementation helped bring focus to answering this research question.

The governance structure of the college begins with the local governing board. Thereafter, a host of campus and employee organizations, standing committees, ad-hoc committees, subcommittees, and task forces, provide campus personnel with the needed structures to implement the shared governance process. Most of the standing committees existed before AB1725, with the exception of three new ones and two that were revised after AB1725. Committee make-up, in particular representative membership, was important to the participants. Participants identified planning and budget as a new standing committee particularly effective in getting the job done. College council, however, received poor reviews, as stakeholder groups grappled to determine what went wrong with this standing committee.

The policy-making process can have its beginning, on an informal basis, with any individual. However, in order to formalize the process, the person has to present the ideas to an administrator, division chair, stakeholder organization, or campus committee. At this level, discussion ensues and if the idea develops into a recommendation, then the proposal goes to the next level. The next level, according to the participants, is not clear. To some participants the next level would be an individual such as the college president or vice-president. To other participants the next level would be a committee like cabinet, administrative council, or academic senate. All participants are clear, though, that the last

step in the making of a policy is the board of trustees. Even though a formal process to make policy does not exist, college committees are creating policies.

There are various ways in which the employees of Imperial Valley College go about participating and implementing the shared governance process. In addition to the committee participation required of some employees, volunteering to be in committees is a major way in which campus personnel participate in the governance process. When the membership of campus organizations elect respective representatives, then these individuals also participate in the governing of the campus. At times, individuals or groups need to request representation when excluded, intentionally or not, from current issues or discussions. Campus personnel and groups communicate by means of documents, meetings, and technology. Finally, as campus committees and organizations carry out their responsibilities, consensus building and various forms of voting mechanisms aid in the making of recommendations.

The Shared Governance Views

The final point of analysis, in understanding the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College, is to ascertain the *outcomes* of implementing the shared governance policy. The focus of the third research question, then, is to find out how the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance view the process of shared governance. As a consequence, this research question requires determining from participants the benefits, drawbacks, and unresolved issues arising from their working within a shared governance framework on a daily basis.

On the Plus Side

[*Researcher*]: Have there been any benefits to having a shared governance process?

[*All*]: Yes.

[*Researcher*]: What are they?

[*All*]: Opportunities.

[*Researcher*]: Opportunities for what?

[*Staff*]: I think everybody is getting an equal opportunity to participate.

[*Researcher*]: How so?

[*Administrator*]: At the beginning of every year we are given the opportunity to participate when we get a list of committees and we are asked which ones we want to participate in, and we put our names down. So in terms of access, availability, and who is invited to the table, I don't think anyone is missing from the shared governance process because each segment has the opportunity for representation.

[*Researcher*]: And people usually get the committee they asked for.

[*Faculty*]: Shared governance is letting folks participate and is giving every group a chance to voice their opinion. We have the right to give input and we have the right to participate in decisions.

[*Student*]: Shared governance also gives more opportunities to different people to voice their opinions and have a better government in the school. By being in all those committees, I'm at least given that chance, or opportunity, to voice my opinion and that is the very basis of shared governance.

[*All*]: So there is a process in place where more ideas are being shared by individuals who are part of the shared governance process.

[*Faculty*]: And when you need to include everyone's ideas it takes a lot of time and you have to be willing to invest the time because in the end you have a product that a greater segment of the campus buys into.

[*Administrator*]: Not only that but, people feel empowered and it shows at some meetings. They feel empowered to share their thoughts about how the school should run.

[*Student*]: That is why students have a big part in shared governance. Because we have the right to say what we feel and tell the committees our concerns regarding

the school or what we think should change or what must be improved.

That's our role.

[*Administrator*]: So an important benefit is that when you get somebody in the shared governance committees, you get a person involved from the get go. It's easier to implement change because you have more acceptance and minimal problems. Issues seem to be less heated, less explosive.

[*Faculty*]: Basically there's already buy-in from the people in the committee which is making or changing a policy and generally are able to carry it through with very little friction.

[*Administrator*]: And the more people you get involved in the decision making the more they feel important. So shared governance improves morale because people were brought in at an early stage of the decision making process.

[*Researcher*]: What other benefits have you all experienced as a result of shared governance?

[*Administrator*]: More participation from students. I think shared governance has brought them to the surface.

[*Faculty*]: I agree that we've gotten more involvement from the students.

[*Staff*]: Yes. I too have noticed that students are more involved now than they were in the past. Staff is also involved in shared governance more so than in the past.

[*Student*]: Another benefit is that by working in committees, they get to know me and I get to know the faculty, staff, and administrators. Actually, everybody gets to know one another.

[*Researcher*]: And this is an advantage?

[*All*]: Yes.

[*Researcher*]: Why?

[*Faculty*]: Because you see people's personalities when you start talking in committees, you see a different side of the committee members. You hear their opinions and you realize you didn't know that's how they felt about something.

[*Student*]: So if two people can have totally different ideas and a way to listen to each other and try to understand and possibly learn from each other, then an issue will work out better than it possibly would have otherwise.

[*Faculty*]: Sometimes having different groups together on the same issue might be a little confrontational in the beginning, but it also creates a place to sort of get that out in the open and resolve it. I've seen a lot of arguing but then I've also seen a growing understanding of the other side along with it.

[*Administrator*]: I think what happens is that people get acquainted with other people and other classifications and they get to see another point of view or background. I basically see a broadening of everyone's horizon when shared governance works.

[*Faculty*]: I think having different segments on a committee is good because those individuals will bring their perspectives and hopefully you will have a more global perspective. I think over time there will come a point in which people feel a bit more comfortable with the expertise of other groups.

[*Student*]: I also think that being on committees has given people the impression that students can be articulate and that they can voice their concerns. That they can be mature and responsible, and that they can have a say and direct the course of things at this school.

[*Researcher*]: Ok. Let's focus now on the drawbacks of shared governance.

On the Down Side

[*Researcher*]: Earlier you all mentioned that having the opportunity to participate is an advantage. Do people take the opportunity?

[*Faculty*]: I think that people choosing to participate is one of the real problems we have right now, there has to be a real effort to include people.

[*Staff*]: I'm not sure why others are not as active as they could be. I know that by not being involved, people are not able to understand what is happening and why.

[*Student*]: Look at our student meetings, nobody comes to the meetings, nobody from the public.

[*Administrator*]: I suppose we can say that we want people involved, but unless they take advantage of it, we can't mandate it. If there are individuals or groups who don't want to participate, that is their prerogative.

[*Faculty*]: So you find the same people doing the majority of the tasks over and over again because not enough people seem to be interested in the shared governance process.

[*Staff*]: At times you don't even have all of the people in a committee contributing toward the work that has to be done.

[*Administrator*]: We basically have a certain group of people, even within each constituent group, which do most of the work and so they tend to end up on the shared governance committees.

[*Faculty*]: It just seems that fewer and fewer people are doing more and more of the work and the danger is that you burn people out and then they go away for four or five years and we then lose part of that collective consciousness. Not only that, but there is a re-educating of people all the time as to what the process should be and how information should flow and decision making should happen.

[*Administrator*]: I think you end up with committees being formed around the people with the availability and the willingness to participate. So you end up with a lot of decisions being made by few people.

[Student]: I think that might be part of the problem with why there's a lack of trying; everyone assumes that others are going to take care of it.

[Researcher]: What else could affect the lack of participation in the shared governance process?

[Staff]: We're not given the time to attend the meetings.

[Student]: Some committees hardly ever meet, people are just not interested or show up only when they really have a concern, students have other jobs, family, decisions are made and then we beat them to death when discussing them, and students are not always taken seriously.

[Faculty]: We hear the same thing again and again, people are overworked, weak ideas get a lot of attention, people feel they are not being listened to, they get tired and so they don't bother.

[Administrator]: Lack of time, schedules, not enough people, groups not getting the word out to their constituents, illness, leaves, no communication, or being in class.

[Researcher]: Are there any other drawbacks to shared governance?

[All]: Time!

[Researcher]: Time? What do you mean?

[Faculty]: I see that with shared governance it's more and more time that is required of the faculty. It takes so much time to do all those things that we want to do to be able to give our input. It's one more thing to squeeze in.

[Researcher]: What do you mean?

[Faculty]: Well, I have to take time away from preparing for class, grading papers, be available to students . . . I mean, I spend many afternoons in committees, squeezing a meeting when I can, instead of preparing for my classes, and that contributes to burn out. I just don't think we've figured out very well how to give people the time to think or act on certain things.

[*Administrator*]: Another point is that it takes longer to get things done because you have to work around people's schedules to set up meetings, and the more people you get involved the harder it is to get people together, and of course that delays the process.

[*Researcher*]: What process?

[*Administrator*]: For the most part, major decisions are never made on this campus without touching base with a whole host of people. That's the way decision making is done here. So the implementation of a decision and even modification of those decisions, will be placed on hold or sent back, and the question is always who do we need to let know about this. It takes forever to get something approved and decisions are not always made in a timely manner.

[*Faculty*]: The process is cumbersome because anytime you have to make a decision it involves that many people. You can't bring something up for discussion and arrive at a decision in one day. But the end product is important too.

[*Student*]: Anytime you want to have that balance of authority, you have everybody thinking that they are equal and along with that comes the delays and frustrations because you're trying to get all the opinions of everybody on campus. It is justifiable; it just takes so long to pass one policy.

[*Faculty*]: I would add, though, that sometimes, people that don't really need to be involved in a certain decision are brought into the process whether or not they really have any relationship to the issue or expertise on the issue.

[*Staff*]: But in order for everything to be equitable here at this campus, I think that all voices need to be heard. Each voice has its strength.

[*Administrator*]: There are times when one may not want representation in some issues, but there is always the concern that the decision won't be accepted or understood unless everyone is brought to the table.

Another issue is that people that are part of the process suddenly misinterpret what we started with and then think they should be more involved than they were given the opportunity for.

[*Staff*]: Interpretation is a big drawback because when something has occurred, by the time it gets down the ladder, or vice-versa, the story has changed and people don't know what is going on.

[*Faculty*]: I agree.

[*Student*]: Sometimes I think that shared governance varies on whether or not you like a person.

[*Researcher*]: What do you mean?

[*Student*]: We identify with people and that's sort of how we get stuff done. It's by interacting with one another. So shared governance can be bad if someone does not get along with another person because the resentment that they have for each other could affect everybody else.

[*Administrator*]: I would add that a lot of the representation that groups get depends on the officers that are elected by their respective groups.

[*Faculty*]: Shared governance depends on who is in charge. The whole dynamics of committees can change with who is on the committee and who is in charge.

[*Staff*]: If someone is an active aggressor, then there really isn't a lot of room in the shared governance process for that kind of person.

[*Researcher*]: Other thoughts?

[*Faculty*]: The amount of time that is spent in committees to give input is sometimes not worth the results that we get. If shared governance worked, we would each understand what a good job is.

[*Staff*]: Committee participation is not looked for and when our classified voice gets real strong, people get real negative about it.

[*Student*]: I think that we talk a lot about shared governance, and I know we try really hard, because I'm in many committees, but there's got to be a reason for being in those committees, other than being the token student. Sometimes people are glad to see us, sometimes people just think it's an inconvenience and that it's a hindrance.

[*Administrator*]: Communication is key. To do an effective job of communicating the information so it is not misinterpreted or slanted is difficult to do at times. Sometimes we send information or communicate with a group, but the group doesn't communicate with everyone in their organization, and then the complaint is that we didn't communicate, when we had communicated.

Issues, Issues, Issues

[*Researcher*]: Let's begin, then, with the issue of communication. Who wants to start?

[*Staff*]: You cannot have shared governance if you don't communicate what's going on at your campus to everyone.

[*Student*]: That's right. Students need to know what is going on at the college, so people need to go out and tell the students what they are thinking. Communication is important. That's how the associated students get by.

[*Faculty*]: A very big part of shared governance is communication. If you don't have that basic element, then it breeds suspicion, misinformation, and rumors, which can make, or makes, matters worse.

[*Researcher*]: What do you mean?

[*Faculty*]: When decisions aren't always clear, a lot of time is spent reacting to perceived instances where shared governance has not been realized, and this leads to distrust, and distrust leads to conflict.

[*Staff*]: Secrecy, in other words, does not work well with shared governance.

[*Faculty*]: The more communication in the development of policy, the less reaction, confusion, and conflict when you implement the policy.

[*Administrator*]: It's important to keep people informed, or at least provide information that shows progress in the development of a policy because the flow of information affects shared governance.

[*Faculty*]: I see, however, real problems with the administration not being communicative. So for instance, sometimes they will present policies for information only, which means that they've already decided what the policy should be. Communication is one thing that we really don't do very well here.

[*Student*]: I do think that the administration needs to let us know a bit more of what is going on behind the curtain. Take for example the master plan goals that we chose together, I haven't seen them start anything, or if they have, they don't let the students know.

[*Staff*]: The lack of communication has caused animosity between groups on campus because people don't know what happened or really don't know what is going on. What I mean is that more often than not somebody will mention something and they'll go, I didn't hear that, or the campus says, we didn't hear about that. Our campus has a wide communication span and we need to bridge that.

[*Student*]: Sometimes you're like, well who said that? Who made that decision? Or under whose direction are you working in?

[*Staff*]: Other times things are decided in committees but people don't know about it.

[*Faculty*]: There really isn't a good communication process laid out for campus staff to follow when a decision has been made.

[*Administrator*]: Getting the word out, communicating information is a lot more difficult than what one would think. I just don't think it's possible for everybody to know everything and the complete background

behind every decision. So sometimes there is the confusion that certain groups or individuals or parties were left out intentionally or sometimes it's miscommunication and misunderstanding of what the original issue was or is.

[*Student*]: Maybe we get lost in the paperwork.

[*Staff*]: Or maybe people just kind of fly off the handle on what they hear and then they never go to the source and ask.

[*Administrator*]: Maybe it's because it's not clear what and whom to communicate with, or how. I do think, though, that the flow of information from the top down has improved and there are efforts to continue improving it. Even so, when we think we've covered all the bases, we then find out that we are still missing people out there.

[*Faculty*]: The issue is that decisions are made and we're asked at the very, very last minute for input, before we really have time to think about it. Or input and comments are requested after the fact, rather than having all parties participate in the formation of the policy. So the question becomes, why are we in the shared governance process if, when it comes down to decisions, we aren't extended a courtesy to even hear about it, until after it's over?

[*Staff*]: Because in reality, cabinet decides what they want, and then it goes to a committee to do the details. But the decisions are first made in cabinet.

[*Faculty*]: That's right.

[*Student*]: I do think that sometimes decisions are made first, and then shared governance is considered later. So then I wonder, who asked us? When was the decision made? Well thanks for letting us know.

[*Faculty*]: Or we'll hear about things that are really not important, but we don't hear about the things that seem to be important. Other times the only way we

hear about a decision is if somebody reads the minutes of a particular meeting.

[*Administrator*]: A decision is not made in a vacuum. It's made by getting approval of committees such as curriculum and instruction, academic senate, college council, and the board of trustees. So what happens is that a solution to a problem is implemented because cabinet got feedback from all the different constituencies on campus. Everybody had the opportunity to share opinions, their agreements or disagreements, and then come up with a final product.

[*Researcher*]: Is there a relationship between shared governance and decision making here at IVC?

[*Administrator*]: Decision-making is a product of shared governance. It isn't always, but it can be.

[*Faculty*]: It depends on which decision we're talking about. Many decisions are made on this campus without any sharing at all.

[*Student*]: Basically, there are certain decisions that one cannot change, and I think that there are certain ones that you can. Shared governance can be having input into something that is very minute, or something rather big.

[*Faculty*]: There is a lot of decision making on a minor scale.

[*Student*]: Even though every decision that is made affects the students, when it comes down to the real decisions, I just don't think that there is much shared governance.

[*Faculty*]: But I do think that shared governance is part of decision-making because shared governance is getting input from all the different areas and listening to the input, and putting value to that input before the decision is made. So having the academic senate reach mutual agreement on some issues has been a great benefit to faculty because the decision has the backing of the

academic area. But I just think that even though many shared governance bodies exist, they're not all included in the process of making decisions.

[*Staff*]: I do feel that decisions are made elsewhere, outside the shared governance process.

[*Researcher*]: What role do the campus committees play with regards to shared governance?

[*Faculty*]: There is a feeling in many people's mind that you do not really have a decision making role, that you are advisory and that it doesn't mean much.

[*Student*]: There are times when we let committees know what should be changed and sometimes they don't listen to us. But for the most part, I feel we are being heard.

[*Staff*]: All the committees do is make recommendations, like planning and budget who recommends to the president and then to the board of trustees.

[*Faculty*]: Committees usually think they are making policies, but seldom does it come out of a committee that it doesn't have to go to other levels. The other levels may accept it, change it, or deny it.

[*Researcher*]: According to the accreditation report prepared by the college in 1995, recommendations made by the committees are generally the ones that are presented to the board of trustees.

[*Administrator*]: You only need to sit around and watch the dynamics of a committee to see who is making the decisions, who is not. A decision is made by not one or two people, but by the entire college through the representation that sits on the various governance committees.

[*Student*]: Usually the faculty and staff are voicing their opinions and we should voice our opinions more often. Although sometimes, when I walk in, I have this feeling that my voice is not as equal as the other voices.

[*Faculty*]: I think we do a lot of discussing, but the governance sooner or later boils down, if you cut out all the rest of it, to the president, his cabinet, and the board of trustees.

[*Student*]: Decisions are made by people who expedite the resolution of a problem, and the president and the board have the power to say yes or no. So, most likely we've been sharing information in committees.

[*Staff*]: I see shared governance primarily as a vehicle for communication.

[*Faculty*]: You basically have input from all the different areas through the shared governance committees, so it is just more of a sharing of information rather than a sharing of power and governing. I just think that there has to be a point in time where all this sharing of information will amount to more than just one more meeting where we share more information.

[*Administrator*]: Sometimes there are decisions that are made by the administration, that are reserved for us to do our job. And even though the decision making process at IVC is basically centered on the administration, the president's cabinet in particular, we receive input from many areas like, curriculum and instruction, administrative council, or planning and budget. When the board meets, they receive input from the student and senate representatives.

[*Faculty*]: While the recommendations made by planning and budget have been accepted by the president and the board of trustees, more times than not, the board will follow the recommendations of cabinet and the president. I don't think we have come to full awareness that everybody can have a good answer for something. I still feel that the board usually believes that the administration has the better answer.

[*Administrator*]: You know, there is very little that the administration is capable of doing without the consideration of the academic senate, curriculum

and instruction, college council, and of course the board. And yet faculty groups want to make sure that they participate in shared governance, but they're not as responsible to have others participate, like the students or the classified staff.

[*Staff*]: Basically, there is no concept of teamwork and yet, shared governance is supposed to do this. We all need to work more collegially. We're all peers.

[*Student*]: Except that after working together, everyone loses interest, and everyone goes back to their own little world. Everyone has a position, everyone wants something, and then they leave the students out.

[*Faculty*]: All of us have to be responsible and all of us have to try to make shared governance work. Each committee has a responsibility to develop the area that they are responsible for. Everyone likes to feel that they are part of how policy is made on their campus.

[*Administrator*]: However, unlike an administrator, you never hear anything about the committees that were making decisions about their area being slammed for their poor performance.

[*Staff*]: Everybody should be in the decision making process. That doesn't mean everybody should have the final say, but everybody at least should be able to communicate towards the decision making process.

[*Administrator*]: There is a reciprocal responsibility from the people involved to take advantage of the access and information that is out there, and there needs to be a dynamic with all groups that, hey, communication is a two-way street, even within each group. And, by the way, we are in the same boat as other groups, in that we need to be communicated with as a constituent group too.

[*Researcher*]: Any other issues before we conclude?

[*Faculty*]: If shared governance wasn't legislated, I don't think it would ever be practiced. The benefit is that it's given the administration and board a reason to get input from people on this campus.

[*Student*]: The question then becomes, how much are you doing shared governance because it's state mandated, and how much are you doing because you really care.

[*Staff*]: So for instance, I just don't see a classified member sitting with the board any time soon.

[*Faculty*]: Shared governance will never be easy because there is always the tendency for those with power to tell those without power what to do because it's more expedient or because they don't want equality in decision making.

[*Student*]: And I think that we still have that reservation about having students on an equal footing with administrators or others. It's not very normal to think that students have a say on what goes on.

[*Administrator*]: There is a lack of understanding, or at least of not communicating when shared governance may or may not be prudent to decision making. I do think, though, that in most cases we have followed shared governance. But there are times when there are going to be some exceptions.

[*Faculty*]: I think shared governance is used when it's convenient, and timely, and feels good. But when it's a sticky issue, or they want to go a particular way, they will try to say that it is not a shared governance issue.

[*Administrator*]: Shared governance does not mean that every single decision has to be blessed by every group or segment on campus, especially when there is an emergency.

[*Faculty*]: I believe that in many instances, shared governance would be bypassed if it wasn't for the senate's vigilance to make sure that they put themselves into

any issue where they feel shared governance is indicated. We are constantly dealing with process issues and whether process has been applied.

[Student]: All campus groups need to make sure that shared governance is working at Imperial Valley College.

[Researcher]: Any final thoughts about shared governance?

[Administrator]: The shared governance experience is just a beginning experience, and ultimately, its been a good one for Imperial Valley College.

[Faculty]: I think that you're much better off when you had the whole campus participate, or as many as choose to participate in the process, than if you just tell them. The biggest concern that I have is that we need to continue to invite people to come to the table and press the importance of shared governance.

[Administrator]: The inclusion of everyone is important.

[Faculty]: In some cases, shared governance is happening more than it used to. But I don't think that it's happening to a degree that meets its potential; although there is some buy-in from all groups that shared governance is important, that it takes place.

[Student]: Shared governance is a buzz word and I don't think that many people understand exactly how much voice, authority, and opportunity they have because of shared governance. That's probably the sad thing.

[Staff]: IVC has a long way to go towards shared governance.

[Faculty]: Shared governance will never become ingrained or institutionalized as the way to do business if we constantly find ways to get around it. Transition of power is very difficult, whoever you are.

[Administrator]: I believe that shared governance needs to be reviewed so that it can run more smoothly. Everybody is still shuffling, jockeying for voice and position.

[*Student*]: With time, shared governance will work.

[*Researcher*]: Thank you all for the time you shared so generously and for your candid thoughts on the ins and outs of implementing shared governance on a daily basis.

Summary

The objective of the third research question was to determine how individuals and groups view the shared governance process after implementing it on a daily basis. In order to address this question, participants shared their experiences through three lenses. The first lens centered on the positive aspects of shared governance. The second lens provided insights into the adverse aspects of shared governance. The third lens stressed the unresolved issues arising from the implementation of shared governance.

Opportunity is one benefit of shared governance. Having the opportunity to participate, voice opinions, give input, have representation, and be part of the making of decisions are positive aspects of the governance process. Given this opportunity, campus personnel are empowered to share more ideas and, consequently, more readily buy into possible changes throughout the college. Implementation is much easier and there is less conflict. Another benefit is an increase in participation by campus personnel. With this increase in participation, people get to know each other better and are better able to work through issues. Viewpoints expand, and committees use a more global perspective as the members work together in carrying out their responsibilities.

Many campus employees, however, do not take the opportunity to participate, and thus point to the first drawback of a shared governance process. As a result, people do not have a good understanding of the issues at hand. Another drawback is having many of the same people carrying out much of the shared governance process. Possible consequences to having the same people doing much of the work include (a) less people participating, (b) same people making decisions, and (c) assuming that someone else will take care of the shared governance process. In addition, lack of interest, multiple responsibilities, not

being taken seriously, schedules, and poor communication are some of the reasons why there is a lack of participation in the shared governance process. Time is another adverse aspect of shared governance. Campus personnel have difficulty in finding time or being given the time to participate in the governance process. Scheduling meetings takes more time as the number of people who participate increases. Decisions also take longer to make because the consultation process includes many individuals and groups. Not only that, but people interpret, or misinterpret, information differently as communication flows throughout the campus. Finally, how well the shared governance process works depends on who is in the position of authority.

Communication is an unresolved issue at Imperial Valley College. While all four stakeholders concur that communication is important for an effective shared governance process, how and what to communicate points towards disagreements. Unclear decisions, presenting issues for informational purposes only, asking for input at the last minute or after the fact, and lack of communication on issues, contribute towards animosity, suspicion, distrust, and rumors. Yet, attempts to inform everyone about decisions, or unclear expectations about what and whom to communicate with, make communication difficult. Another unresolved issue pertains to the making of decisions. One side believes that decisions are made outside the shared governance process, with cabinet as one group that makes many of the important decisions for Imperial Valley College. The other side, though, declares that decisions come about only after extensive consultation with all of the campus constituents. Committee members feel that much of what they do is a sharing of information and work in an advisory, rather than a decision-making, capacity. At the same time, some committee members sense that their voice in the discussions is not equal to those of other members and are thus not able to influence the outcomes as well as they would like to do so. Ambiguity over who is responsible for committee decisions point to another unresolved issue. In addition, determining if an issue falls within the umbrella of shared governance, and the making of any decisions related to that issue, is another area

of contention. Finally, while some consider exceptions to applying shared governance as reasonable, especially in emergencies, others contend that the exceptions to the shared governance are far too common.

Conclusion

The information in this chapter, via the format of a virtual roundtable discussion, documented the experiences and perceptions of the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. Specifically, the first three research questions brought focus to (a) identifying who was involved in the shared governance process, (b) outlining how the governance process was operationalized, and (c) determining what the outcomes were from implementing shared governance. In the following chapter, I will elaborate both on the generalizations that may apply to the implementation of shared governance and on the leadership implications of shared governance to community colleges.

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

For over ten years now, stakeholders throughout the California Community College System have been implementing the mandates of Assembly Bill 1725 (AB1725). Ranging from governing board role clarification, to the financing mechanism of the community college system, to the governance structures and processes of colleges, AB1725 sought to bring forth reforms to almost every operating facet of community college districts. A logical consequence for such extensive and far-reaching restructuring of the community college system, then, would be a review of AB1725's effect at the state and local levels. Of particular focus for this case study was the shared governance aspect of AB1725.

As early as 1990, researchers have studied the effects of shared governance in community college districts throughout California. Investigations have varied from the micro level, where scholars such as Cota (1993) studied specific governance aspects of AB1725 in two community colleges, to the macro level, where scholars such as Howell (1997) assessed the implementation of shared governance of colleges throughout the state of California. In addition to individual researchers, commissions for the State Legislature have also been examining California's community colleges.

In 1996, the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) began to study the college system, focusing in particular on its governance structure. Overall, the Commission (CPEC, 1998) recommended strengthening the role and authority of the Board of Governors, Chancellor, and local governing boards. Concerning governance at the state level, the Commission recommended that shared governance, where "the responsibility for governance is distributed among the designated stakeholders" (p. 38) be

replaced by cooperative governance, where “the responsibility for governance is retained by the Board of Governors . . .” (p. 38). Also studying the California Community Colleges, the Little Hoover Commission (LHC) concluded that the Board of Governors and local governing boards were inadequately meeting state and local needs (LHC, 2000, p. 69). The Commission recommended then, to change the governance structure of the community college system by strengthening the role of the Board of Governors, restructuring the Office of the Chancellor, and requiring local governing boards to communicate their goals and outcomes to the public. Interestingly, both commissions conducted their studies, in part, because of perceived problems within the governance processes of the California Community College System.

In 1998, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, and State Chancellor, created a task force to examine the shared governance mandates of AB1725. “The work was not conceptualized as a ‘response to any identified or assumed problems;’ rather the work was undertaken ‘to reflect good principles of planning and evaluation’” (BOG, 1999, p. 2). The task force, among its many conclusions and recommendations, noted that problems of implementation, rather than problems with laws and regulations, were the sources for many of the issues surrounding shared governance. As a result, the task force did not recommend any changes to the statutes or regulations related to the governance of community colleges. However, the task force clarified the need to address the issues of implementation surrounding shared governance. Finally, the task force discouraged the use of the term shared governance, and recommended instead, the use of terms such as participatory governance, collegial consultation, and delegated authority. The task force clarified that those three terms more accurately describe the intent and roles of different stakeholders as outlined by AB1725.

The current analyses of the governance structures and processes, at both the state and local levels, are bringing forth many recommendations to either improve the implementation of existing statutes or to modify and/or repeal current statutes. As local

and state policymakers begin to approach various crossroads concerning their respective governance structures and processes, the availability of research to better inform their decisions becomes paramount. By focusing on the day-to-day experiences of groups and individuals charged with implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College, this investigation aims at putting forth unique insights and recommendations to complement the current literature on the governance of two-year community colleges.

Summary of Study

In 1994, the Imperial Valley College board of trustees adopted a shared governance policy with respect to the role of the academic senate on academic and professional matters. As required by Title 5, the policy detailed the academic and professional areas in which the board of trustees would rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the academic senate and the areas in which the board of trustees would seek mutual agreement with the academic senate. Assembly Bill 1725 also required local governing boards to establish procedures so that faculty, staff, and students could have a voice and express their opinions at the campus level. Consequently, in 1996 the board of trustees updated its shared governance policy to form a college council consisting of faculty, staff, students, and administrators. The policy defined the primary function of the college council to be a forum for all college groups to contribute towards the development of college policies and to articulate their opinions on campus issues.

On November 1998, the college superintendent/president approved the request to conduct this study of shared governance at Imperial Valley College. The purpose of the study was to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. To this end, the investigation sought to establish, (a) who was responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing the shared governance policy, and who was missing from the process, (b) the structures, policy-making processes, and procedures for operationalizing the shared governance process, and (c) the benefits, drawbacks, and unresolved issues for

implementing the shared governance policy. Since one goal of the study was to find ways to improve the practice of shared governance, of particular interest were the perspectives of those individuals who carried out the shared governance process on a daily basis. Given these aims then, coupled with Imperial Valley College being the focal point of the study, the design of the investigation was a case study—a qualitative case study.

Upon determining the population of the study, comprised of those groups and individuals responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing the governance process at IVC, I began to gather data for the case study. I specifically, (a) interviewed seven administrators, five students, six classified staff members, and twelve faculty members, (b) attended and observed meetings of various governance campus committees, (c) collected numerous campus documents, and (d) searched the literature for studies relevant to shared governance.

As I collected data, I began to conduct preliminary analyses of the data to not only guide the search for more data, but also to develop a better understanding of the issues relevant to the participants of the study. Once I accumulated all the data, I applied Guba and Lincoln's (1989) constant comparative method and, when appropriate, Spradley's (1979) domain analysis worksheet, to discern the emergent categories of the data. Since the primary instrument for gathering information was the researcher, I was careful to triangulate the emerging themes and categories of the study by using multiple sources of information and/or methods. Upon completion of the analysis, I presented the findings using a virtual roundtable discussion where the conversations represented the collective voices of each stakeholder group. I used this format to provide readers with a better sense of what was important to the participants of the study.

Important limitations for this study were, (a) the findings emerged from the views and perceptions of individuals who have chosen to participate regularly in the governance process, (b) the views of individuals who have chosen not to participate in the shared governance process were missing, and (c) the sampling design strategy fell short in

selecting a larger sample of classified staff members to get a broader perspective of their views and experiences about shared governance.

Summary of Emergent Themes and Findings

In the following paragraphs, I elaborate in summary fashion, the main themes and findings that emerged from the analysis the data. The perceptions and views of the groups and individuals responsible for implementing shared governance on a daily basis form the foundation upon which the themes emerged.

Responsibilities

The responsibility to maintain and update the shared governance policy is primarily on the board of trustees, college president, academic senate, and the college council, with cabinet, administrative council, CTA, CSEA, and the Associated Student Government playing supportive roles. The responsibility to implement the shared governance process, according to participants, not only falls upon the persons in charge of various campus committees and stakeholder organizations, but also on their respective members. Finally, participants emphasized that these groups and individuals have the important responsibility to communicate their deliberations and actions to the campus community.

Structures

There were twenty standing committees at Imperial Valley College, seventeen of which existed before AB1725. Thereafter, the board of trustees updated its board policy, which resulted in the modification of two committees and the creation of three new committees. Participants considered the planning and budget committee to be working well and the college council to be dysfunctional. In addition to the standing committees, I also identified at least fifteen subcommittees, ad-hoc committees, and task forces. Over and above these aforementioned committees, each stakeholder group had their respective campus bodies and/or organizations, namely, cabinet, administrative council, academic senate, CTA, CSEA, and the Associated Student Government. Finally, participants

indicated that for the most part, campus committees played primarily advisory and informational roles; they saw the board, college president, and cabinet, as the groups and individuals who ultimately made the final decisions.

Processes

All stakeholder groups noted the importance of working within a shared governance framework, but participants disagreed on how well the shared governance process was working at the college. I also documented the making and updating of campus policies, or attempts to do so, even though there was not a formal policy-making process. In addition, participants saw the shared governance process as time-consuming, slow, cumbersome, and its effectiveness dependent on who was in charge at any given point in time. Stakeholders debated as well the possible relationship between shared governance processes and decision-making processes. Finally, some participants noted a resistance to implement, and violations of, agreed upon shared governance procedures.

Opportunities

The governance process has created more opportunities for the voicing of ideas and concerns about the development of policies and procedures. Participants noted that among those individuals who take the opportunity to participate, their understanding of the governance process has improved. Apart from people knowing each other better, the increased opportunities to participate, through representation and committee composition, have also increased mutual understanding of the perspectives held by different groups and individuals. Study participants indicated, however, that even though there has been an increase in participation, many faculty, staff, and students still do not take advantage of the opportunity to participate in the shared governance process.

Participation

Missing in the implementation of shared governance were, in a general sense, faculty, staff, and students at large. Also considered missing were adjunct faculty, community members, and at times, board members. Participants were unsure, though,

what role community members played in the governance process of the college. One consequence of this lack of involvement, participants stated, was that many of the same people doing much of the shared governance work. Scheduling conflicts, lack of time, ignoring input shared in discussions, difficulties in the coordination of meetings, repeated discussions of the same issues, and lack of communication were some reasons why groups and individuals do not participate in the governance process. Finally, stakeholders disagreed whether the deliberation of all governance issues required the representation of every campus group.

Communication

Participants clearly indicated that communication was a major issue at college. Citing poor or lack of communication, especially after the making of decisions with little or no input, participants felt that this was a key source of frustration in the day-to-day implementing of shared governance. Another source of frustration was the recurring misinterpretation or miscommunication of information as it flowed to and from the different levels of the campus community. With an ineffective communication process in place, some stakeholders have had to assume a watchful posture to minimize violations of the shared governance process. Nonetheless, study participants considered an effective communication process essential for creating and developing a successful and meaningful shared governance system.

Discussion and Recommendations

Stake (1994, p. 237) categorizes case studies into three general types—implicit, instrumental, and collective. In the implicit case study, noted Stake, the researcher wants a better understanding of the specific case. In the instrumental case study, the researcher examines the case to better understand a theory. Finally, in the collective case study, researchers focus on many cases to examine and comprehend a general state of affairs. My interest in this case study of shared governance at Imperial Valley College is both instrumental and intrinsic.

Investigating the experiences of people who implement shared governance processes on a daily basis will add to the understanding of the governing of community colleges. As a faculty member of the IVC community, I also want to be able to contribute towards the betterment of the shared governance processes of the college. In either case, the timeliness of this case study is appropriate not only because state agencies are currently reviewing the governance structure and processes of the California Community College System, but also because the members of Imperial Valley College are doing the same to their own governance policies. After all, one goal of this investigation is to give practitioners and policy-makers ideas on how to enhance the implementation of their respective governance processes.

According to Stake (1994), a case researcher needs to “seek both what is common and what is particular about the case” (p. 238) to enhance the meaningfulness of the study to the research community. Finding commonality rests upon the foundation of previous research. Finding particularity rests upon the outcomes of a new investigation. For these reasons, the following discussion and recommendations come from the integration of the study findings with existing knowledge that is presently available in the literature and is relevant to shared governance. The intent is to provide policy-makers and stakeholders with a starting point to further explore ways to address the current governance issues and subsequently improve its practice.

Overall recommendation. Key governance players need to evaluate the governance process at the state, and local levels, on an annual or biannual basis.

The six themes emerging from this study provide the basis for the following recommendations. These six recommendations, in turn, can provide the framework to conduct either a system-wide or a district-wide analysis of the governance of community colleges throughout the state of California. Such an assessment should include feedback, both at the formal and informal levels, from all governance stakeholder groups about every aspect of the governance process. In addition, the input should address determining

the benefits, drawbacks, and issues arising from the implementation of the governance process, and should provide the basis for a concrete plan of action to improve the process. Upon carrying out the plan of action, a written assessment of what has or has not been accomplished should help identify areas of improvement and strengths to further guide the development of the governance process. The following recommendations, then, can assist key governance players at the state, district, and local levels, to begin an in-depth evaluation of their respective governance systems.

Recommendation one: Responsibilities. Key governance players need to disclose, discern, and inform governance stakeholders about their roles and responsibilities defined in statute, regulation, and policy.

An ongoing issue statewide is stakeholders groups and their membership not being familiar with or having different interpretations about their governance roles and responsibilities as defined by statute, regulation, and policy (BOG, 1999). This issue is relevant both to, (a) faculty and academic senates where their roles and responsibilities are well defined and (b) students and classified staff where their roles and responsibilities are less well defined, particularly for classified staff. While having stakeholders groups and their memberships not being familiar with their shared governance roles during the early implementation years of AB1725 makes sense, it does not thirteen years later.

The results of this study point to various possibilities for the pervasiveness of this issue. If the participation in the governance processes of a community college rests upon a small proportion of groups and individuals, then there will be a large number of people who, by their lack of or minimal participation, do not understand or are unfamiliar with their respective governance roles and responsibilities. In addition, as local governing boards employ new individuals to join their campuses, there is a need to give these new members of the college appropriate guidelines and background information about their governance roles and responsibilities, particularly when they are not familiar with the governance mandates of AB1725. Finally, having information available and accessible is

a necessary but insufficient condition for people to inform themselves about their roles and responsibilities in the governance process of their respective community colleges.

At Imperial Valley College, the different administrative and faculty beliefs about their respective roles in governance, together with the classified staff's frustration in getting a more active role in the governance of the college, and the student's incomplete knowledge about their governance role, point towards the need to follow through with the above recommendation. To this end, chapter two provides the statutes and regulations relevant to the governance roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder group. Not only that, but Appendix K summarizes in a convenient table, the same regulations and statutes. In order to improve the implementation of shared governance, stakeholder groups need to disseminate such information and, more importantly, provide *joint* workshops for their discussion, elaboration, and clarification. Not only that, but the roles of stakeholders must be continuously reinforced and consistently applied in the daily implementation of the shared governance process. These suggestions are consistent with previous research findings and recommendations (BOG, 1999; Miller, Vacik, & Benton, 1998; Piland & Bubnitz, 1998; Giese, 1995).

An implication for further study includes the need to research the literature to determine available documentation and/or workshops summarizing and explicating the role and responsibilities of stakeholders in the governance of community colleges. Of particular interest would be to discern similarities and incongruencies between and among information made available by different stakeholder groups and organizations as this would point to a possible source of frustration in the implementation of AB1725.

Recommendation two: Structures. Key governance players need to sort out the inconsistencies created from the merging of pre and post AB1275 governance structures.

Most recently, discussion of community college governance structures centers on the system as a whole (LHC, 2000; CPEC, 1998), in particular with regards to the Board of Governors, Chancellor's Office, and local boards. The California Board of Governors

and CCLC clarified however, that the current structure allows the system to effectively meet the educational needs of the state and local communities (CCLC, 1999). Chancellor Nussbaum (1998), though, in referring to nonconforming statutes which impede state and local boards from properly carrying out their assigned roles and responsibilities, pointed towards a need to review and update the sections of the Education Code relevant to community colleges.

The current governance policies for Imperial Valley College meet the minimum standards set forth by the Board of Governors to insure the participation of faculty, staff, and students, and to delegate authority to the academic senate on academic and professional matters. However, there is clear evidence that IVC stakeholders need to find ways to improve the present structure by conducting a detailed analysis of the college's governance structure. The large number of committees and subcommittees, the sharing of the same information in different committees, and unclear committee roles illustrate, in part, the need to improve the governance structure. To address this issue, then, all stakeholder groups need to (a) review the roles and functions of standing committees that existed before AB1725 to determine their present appropriateness and relevance, (b) remove incompatible or conflicting campus policies or policy directives resulting from the superimposing of new governance structural policies over existing college policies, (c) clarify committee roles and functions to all constituents of IVC, and (d) streamline or reduce the number of campus committees to improve the governance process.

Given that the governance mandates of AB1725 leave to each college district the decision on how to develop their governance structures (BOG, 1999), an implication for further study is to research such varied college governance structures. One goal of such an investigation can be to ascertain, from the perspective of the individuals and groups who implement them on a daily basis, structures that are effective in promoting the participation of campus constituents. Another goal can be to determine which structures are not working and why. A final possible objective is to compare and contrast the

composition of governance committees with their respective responsibilities and functions. This type of information can help researchers better understand potential relationships between participatory structures and decision-making structures. Block (1993) clarified though, that the possibilities for positive outcomes in the restructuring of institutions are marginal when beliefs about governance remain the same.

Recommendation three: Processes. Key governance players need to generate clear, or revise vague, governance processes and insure their implementation too.

For Imperial Valley College, the first order of business needs to be the creation of a formal policy-making process. Campus constituents expend a lot of energy trying to find out where policy ideas are coming from, where they are heading, and who is finalizing the policy before it reaches the board of trustees for its approval. Secondly, campus policy-makers need to follow through in giving staff and students their legislated opportunity to voice their views and opinions in the development of policies through their involvement in the college council and other campus committees. The board of trustees, administrative team and academic senate in particular need to be more consistent in carrying out their commitment, as outlined in the shared governance policy, to involve staff and students in the making and revising of campus policies prior to reaching mutual agreement. Finally, governance stakeholder groups should determine the causes for the bypassing of agreed upon governance processes and develop a plan of action to eliminate, or minimize, the reoccurrence of such actions.

A review of the literature indicates that the issues of implementation are plentiful throughout the California community colleges and contribute to negative campus climates. In fact, the issues surrounding governance revolve around its implementation and not with the language of the governance mandates of AB1725 (BOG, 1999). Unclear communication, deliberation, participation, and decision-making processes also amplify frustrations among all stakeholders in the implementation of their respective governance policies. The fact that such issues exist, in spite of the availability of documentation

outlining standards of good practice for the effective and efficient implementation of shared governance processes, indicates a need to develop a better understanding of the underlying problems of implementation.

Consequently, there are two interesting possibilities for further research. The first possibility is to investigate the relationship between participatory processes and decision-making processes. Determining differences and commonalities between the two kinds of processes may lead towards improving the governance processes of community colleges. The second possibility is to find out why there are so many implementation issues in the community college system. The significance of this issue cannot be understated because many governance stakeholders expend a lot of energy and resources, IVC included, to insure that campus groups and individuals are abiding by the agreed upon policies and procedures. An important corollary for this second question is documenting how colleges have successfully overcome such issues of implementation. Bergquist (1993) concluded, however, that understanding the transformation of an organization comes from focusing on the change in relationships, rather than the change in structures, among the members of an organization.

Recommendation four: Opportunities. Key governance players need to build upon the opportunities created by AB1725 to better guide its development and practice.

By requiring a change in the structures and governance processes of community colleges, the mandates of AB1725 have, in addition to delegating authority to academic senates, attempted to enhance the participation of faculty, staff, and students in the daily governance of their college. Yet, in spite of the many changes in structures and processes of community colleges, implementation and participatory issues continue to surface (California Student Association of Community Colleges, 2000; BOG, 1999; California Community Colleges Classified Senate, 1999). There is thus a need for new ideas to help address such implementation and participatory issues. By focusing on relationships, I

hope that the following discussion will generate insights to help practitioners, researchers and policy-makers better address them.

Past research (BOG, 1999; CCLC, 1998; Griffin, 1997; Flanigan, 1996; Harpster, 1995) has documented well the need to improve working relationships among campus constituents to facilitate the governance processes of their colleges. Findings of this case study such as, (a) having additional opportunities to participate, (b) sharing and voicing of more ideas, (c) working more closely with diverse campus constituents and knowing each other better, (d) developing a greater understanding of different positions taken by stakeholder groups, and (e) creating a greater sense of empowerment and getting buy-in from the individuals who participate in the governance process, point to positive aspects of governance that can serve as possible guideposts to help governance groups and individuals develop and improve their working relationships. However, the focus needs to turn towards developing a deeper understanding of the different types of working relationships that people establish and how governance structures and processes affect such relationships.

In 1997, Howell reported that shared governance participants attribute AB1725 with causing changes of authority, power, and influence in the governance matters of a college. With power, authority, and influence relationships as three types of working relationships that are present in community colleges, the importance to differentiate these three types of relationships becomes essential. When people impose their will over others (Marger, 1987), through the manipulation of sanctions, i.e. punishments and rewards, (Bacharach & Lawler, 1980), then the relationship is one of power. Consequently, in this kind of relationship, individuals use their resources *to coerce people*. On the other hand, in authority relationships, people assume responsibilities in established positions *to make decisions* directed towards the efficient and effective coordination of group action (Abbot & Caracheo, 1988). Finally, in an influence relationship, individuals attempt *to persuade each other* about their respective views to bring about changes (Bell, 1975).

With this rudimentary background information in mind, implementation issues may not be just due to inadequate governance structures and/or unclear governance processes of community colleges. Such issues may also be due to (a) resistance to changing the nature of past relationships, (b) governance structures and processes that support or limit the growth of certain types of relationships, and (c) stakeholders groups advocating emerging mutual relationships which are conducive to better meet the mission and goals of community colleges. Furthermore, according to Rost (1992), governance has to do with the day-to-day operations of a community college and depends on authority relationships to do so in an effective and efficient manner, while leadership depends on influence relationships to bring about, or attempt to bring about, substantive changes to a community college. Rost concluded, then, that equating governance with leadership is a mistake, and another possible cause for the implementation issues that still exist in the California Community College System.

Clearly, this discussion points towards many possibilities for further study. One possibility is to research, at a broader scale, the benefits for implementing shared governance. The conclusions of such an investigation can lead practitioners to develop standards of practice conducive to improving working relationships between governance stakeholder groups. Another option for further study, is to determine if specific types of relationships, such as power, authority, or influence, shape the forms of governance structures and processes that college stakeholders adopt. This type of information can assist in the making of structures and processes that enhance the type of relationships that colleges want to cultivate. The final implication for further research is to investigate how governance relationships differ from leadership relationships. The intent here is to apply such knowledge to develop prototypes of college structures and processes that integrate governance and leadership relationships, as defined by Rost (1991).

Recommendation five: Participation. Key governance players need to identify and attend to existing barriers and issues that shape the participation of stakeholders.

By addressing the previously mentioned issues of unclear responsibilities, structural inconsistencies, and vague governance processes, key governance players will be taking the first steps to removing barriers that shape the participation of governance constituents. A review of the literature, though, indicates that other barriers and issues exist which affect the participation of administrators, faculty, staff, and students. For instance, managers noted the difficulties in making timely decisions to meet deadlines within the governance process (CCCHE, 1997). Alternatively, faculty members pointed to lack of trust and personal agendas as problems that affect participation and impede the improvement of the governance process (Flanigan, 1996). Staff, on the other hand, cited workload issues affecting their meaningful participation in shared governance (BOG, 1999). Finally, the California Student Association of Community Colleges (CalSACC) reported that, in addition to many districts still not recognizing their rights to participate in the governance process (CalSACC, 2000), students are now facing administrators who are beginning to exert more control over their resources and activities (CalSACC, 1997).

In addition to the typical barriers affecting participation, such as time constraints, scheduling conflicts, multiple responsibilities, and lack of interest, this case study adds to the current literature additional governance barriers and issues that affect constituent participation. First, study participants noted that the dynamics of committee work varies as the people in charge change. This in turn, affects the effectiveness and efficiency of the committee in carrying out its responsibilities. One possible way of addressing this issue is to develop a handbook outlining both the responsibilities of committee chairs and the function of the committee. Second, as the same people participate in the governance process, eventually these individuals get tired and have to stop participating. When this occurs, then the expertise and experience of those individuals is partially lost from the governance process. Then, the new people who step forward to participate in the governance process need time to understand the process itself and their responsibilities. Continuity, in other words, is temporarily lost and affects the implementation of shared

governance. A promising remedy is to develop staggering terms for participants and mentoring periods for new participants. Last, the impression of some stakeholders that their opinions or voices do not matter as much as others may, in turn, discourage or minimize their participation. Two points of view may help improve the understanding of this issue. On the one hand, by investing their time and energy, constituents develop rapport, influence, and expertise by their involvement in the governance process. Clearly, the voice of a new participant in the governance process will take time to have a similar amount of influence as the voices of other participants who have been part of the process for longer periods. On the other hand, the ignoring or diminishing of stakeholder voices can be due to the unwillingness of individuals to work within a governance framework that puts value to the input of all constituents on matters that affect them significantly. In this case, college policy-makers and decision makers need to take steps to insure the appropriate and effective involvement of these governance participants.

Most studies on governance have focused on faculty and administration. One consequence of this emphasis is a need to investigate in more detail the barriers and issues that affect the participation of classified staff and students. Such a study can provide a better picture of what staff and students face on a daily basis, and can result in recommendations to improve their participation.

Recommendation six: Communication. Key governance players need to endorse, espouse, and ensure the use of communication as means to enhance the flow of information, understanding of issues, and making of decisions.

The importance of communication for the effective and efficient implementation of a governance process is a recurring theme in the literature. In 1993, Duncan-Hall documented a lack of communication as an impediment to faculty participation in the governance process. In 1995, Harpster recommended that senate presidents and college superintendents/presidents work together to improve communication as a way to further develop the proper implementation of shared governance processes. Both Duncan-Hall's

conclusion and Harpster's recommendation are more than likely also applicable to staff and students. Finally, a joint task force of trustees, chief executive officers, and state academic representatives indicated the creation of settings for discussing issues helps maintain open communication channels and effective governance processes (CCLC, 1998).

With the number of standing committees, sub-committees, ad-hoc committees, and stakeholder organizations, there is no shortage of settings to communicate at Imperial Valley College. In addition, channels of communication, traditional and technological, abound as means to making information available and deliberating on campus matters. Not only that, all constituents agree that communication is important and a key to having a good governance process. Yet, in spite of all these structures and processes at IVC for communicating, most participants concluded that there is little communication at the college. Case in point is the different stakeholder perspectives about shared governance held by the participants of this study. Administrators generally felt that the governance process is working well and just needs some minor adjustments to work better. Faculty basically believed that the governance process is not working as it should be and needs major work. Classified staff, on the other hand, mainly sensed that people really don't want to have them participate. Students essentially thought that nobody is really listening to what they have to say. There is, in effect, little mutual understanding about the shared governance process among the stakeholder groups. Such incongruencies, between the participants' emphasis on the importance of communication and the problems with the communication process, show a need to present research on communication that may provide some clues on how to address these communication issues.

Morgan (1986) stated that the control of information allows individuals to affect the decision-making process. Morgan elaborated by stating that by controlling the flow of information and type of information made available to others, individuals can influence the perceptions and understanding of issues, and consequently, decisions. Not only that,

but Bergquist (1993) asserted that people usually interpret delays in communication to be a consequence of inefficiency, incompetence, or malevolence. Additionally, Elsbach and Eloffson (2000) reported that the type of language used to explain decisions, easy-to-understand versus hard-to-understand, affects perceptions of trustworthiness about the decision-making process and the decision maker. Finally, Senge (1990) declared that most conversations in organizations are discussions. In this type of conversations, clarified Senge, individuals develop positions about issues, defend their positions, and focus on trying to win the discussion in spite of the possible consequences. A crucial point to make, however, is that the findings of this study indicate that communication can be advantageous or disadvantageous dependent on what side governance stakeholders find themselves throughout the communication process. Of importance now is to elaborate on effective communication practices that are favorable to everyone involved in the process.

Unlike discussion, dialogue is a type of conversation where people examine complicated issues from different perspectives (Bohm, 1996). With dialogue, the intent is not to win but rather to improve the group's understanding of the issues and gain better insights into their possible solutions. Being able to communicate openly and taking the time to reflect about the conversations are necessary for the effective exploration of issues (Senge, 1990). These aspects of dialogue are congruent with the intent of shared governance to provide stakeholders with the opportunity to participate and thus enhance the decision making processes of a college. There are three requirements for dialogue to occur, (a) individuals need to suspend their assumptions about the issue at hand, (b) individuals need to regard each other as colleagues with the mutual intent of helping each other increase their understanding about the issue, and (c) someone has to facilitate the process to insure that the conversation does not change from a dialogue to a discussion (Senge, 1990, p. 243).

Informed decision-making, wrote Block (1993), requires the complete disclosure of information to those who have the responsibility to make the decisions. This proposal applies to the communication of good news, bad news, and difficult issues (Block, 1993). The following steps can incorporate Block's proposal for full disclosure of information to enhance communication and decision-making; (a) providing participants with all the needed background information about the current issue, (b) giving participants time to converse on how the current issue came about, (c) allowing participants to explore external and internal trends that influence the current issue, think about a desired future with regards to the issue, and consider potential consequences if no change occurs, (d) developing possible action plans to reduce the gap between the desired future and potential consequence, (e) adjusting action plans and creating activities to carry-out said action plans, (f) incorporating action plans and activities into one master strategy, and (g) delegating responsibilities to groups and individuals to actualize the strategy (Weisbord, 1992). Finally, similar to Senge's recommendation, a facilitator can take steps to insure that the group environment and process assist in productive conversations among the individuals working together to address the issue.

Further research into the relationship between communication and participatory processes is necessary to provide additional guidelines to policy-makers, practitioners, and governance stakeholders on ways to improve such processes. Creating a better knowledge base on (a) how individuals communicate, (b) what individuals choose to communicate, and (c) when individuals decide to communicate, can present new possibilities to address issues of communication in the governance of colleges.

Leadership Implications

The aforementioned recommendations call for key governance players to bring about changes and change is a call for leadership. From a traditional perspective of leadership, individuals, typically in positions of authority, begin to formulate plans and ideas on how to bring about changes. Working from a bureaucratic framework, a leader

determines what others should do, and expects compliance. From a political framework, in order to bring about the changes they desire, leaders develop coalitions among key individuals and groups to get what the leaders want. Within a cultural framework, leaders develop value systems that encompass the changes they believe are necessary to address the issues at hand. Finally, leaders who operate from a collegial framework provide a vision to campus personnel and emphasize inclusive processes that help bring about the envisioned changes. A key point to make is that all these frameworks about leadership *revolve around the leader*, together with his or her power and authority, which knows what has to change and how, and leads others with the intent of changing an organization for the better. Yet, community college leaders, in this traditional sense, continue to have difficulties in transforming their organizations.

Perhaps part of this problem is the merging of thoughts on how to govern an organization efficiently and effectively versus how to transform an organization in an efficient and effective manner. Governance of an organization is about what to do and doing the day-to-day work of the college. Governance is about the coordination of people and resources for achieving a goal. The assignment of responsibilities, authority and duties to individuals is necessary for efficient, and hopefully effective, collective action. A significant change on *how* things are done in an organization, however, is not about governance or management; it's about the transformation of a system of governance, and transformation is an invitation for a leadership relationship that is *centered around a common purpose*, not a leader or a leader's purpose (Rost, 1991).

From this vantage point, then, the implications for leadership are significantly different from the traditional notions of leadership. The preceding recommendations are invitations for key governance players, which includes but is not limited to persons in positions of authority, to form leadership relationships around mutually desired changes. The basis of the relationship is influence, rather than authority or power, which allows people to better explore complex issues without fear of repercussions. More importantly,

who leads in the relationship can change and is dependent on who can best help the group in trying to bring about the change into reality. Finally, once the individuals involved in the leadership relationship are successful in having decision-makers, which may or may not be part of the leadership relationship, formally adopt a desired change, then the focus turns to the day-to-day implementation of the policy. At such a point in time, leadership takes a back seat to governance and authority until there is a need develop new leadership relationships to bring about again mutually desired changes in the governance process.

Conclusion

Change is difficult! Initially, issues about shared governance revolved around the creation of structures and processes to increase the involvement of campus constituents. Now, the issues revolve around the use, lack of use, or misuse of the participatory and decision-making governance processes that community college stakeholders created to fulfill the mandates of AB1725. Clearly, the research community needs to turn to new perspectives to develop a deeper understanding of the issues.

Ultimately, this study revealed that the current issues about governance revolve around relationships. Whereas previous works documented the impact of structures and processes on stakeholders, this study noted the importance of analyzing the governance of community colleges by studying how the relationships among stakeholders affect the development of governance structures and the implementation of governance processes. With a focus on relationships, particularly governance and leadership relationships, scholars may develop new insights on how to further develop AB1725.

REFERENCES

- Abbot, M. G., & Caracheo, F. (1988). Power, authority, and bureaucracy. In N. J. Boyan, (Ed.), *Handbook of research and educational administration*. New York: Longman.
- Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges. (1997). Standard ten: Governance and administration. In *Standards for Accreditation* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.wascweb.org/accjc/standard.htm>
- Allison, G. T. (1971). *Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis*. Harper Collins.
- American Association of University Professors. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.aaup.org/govern.htm>
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1996). *Renewing the academic presidency: stronger leadership for tougher times* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.agb.org/acadpresl2.cfm>
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1998). *AGB statement on institutional governance* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.agb.org./governance.htm>
- Bacharach, S. B., & Lawler, E. J. (1980). *Power and politics in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Baldrige, J. V., Curtis, D. V., Ecker, G. P., and Riley, G. L. (1977). Alternatives model of governance in higher education. In G. L. Riley and J. V. Baldrige (Eds.), *Governing academic organizations*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing.
- Bell, D. V. J. (1979). *Power, influence, and authority*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Bensimon, E. M. (1994). Understanding administrative work. In A. M. Cohen (Ed.), *Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice* (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bergquist, W. (1993). *The postmodern organization: Mastering the art of irreversible change*. San Francisco, CA; Jossey-Bass.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Block, P. (1993). *Stewardship: Choosing service over self-interest*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Board of Governors. (1986). *Understanding community college governance*. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office.

Board of Governors. (1990a, July 12-13). Agenda item #6: *Strengthening academic senates*. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office.

Board of Governors. (1990b, July 12-13). Agenda item #7: *Shared governance in the California community colleges*. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office.

Board of Governors. (1990c, July 12-13). Attachment to agenda item #6: *Policy on shared governance in the California community colleges*. Sacramento, CA: Chancellor's Office.

Board of Governors. (1999). *Task force for the review of faculty, staff, and student participation in college and district governance: Final report* [On-line].

Available: <http://www.cccco.edu/cccco/consult/shgov799.htm>

Bohm, D. (1996). *On dialogue* (L. Nichol, Ed.). New York: Routledge.

Burleigh, R. L. (1990). In pursuit of the professional mantle: An evaluation of the effect of faculty peer review in California's community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

California Citizens Commission on Higher Education. (1999). *Toward a state of learning: California higher education for the twenty-first century* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccche.org/finalreport.pdf>

California Citizens Commission on Higher Education. (1997). *Through the looking glass: The California community colleges as seen through AB1725* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccche.org/AB1725summary.htm>

California Community Colleges Classified Senate (1999). *Shared/Participatory governance: A position paper* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccccs.org/pospapers.htm>

California Education Code, (1999). §70900-70902 [On-line]. Available: <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/>

California Postsecondary Education Commission (1998). *Toward a unified state system: A report and recommendations on the governance of the California community colleges* [On-line]. Available: <http://cpec.ca.gov/publications/ListingsByTopic.ASP?87>

California Student Association of Community Colleges (2000). *CalSACC's policy agenda 2000* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.calsacc.org/reports/PolicyAgenda%20.htm>

California Student Association of Community Colleges (1997). *Student rights in shared governance* [on-line]. Available: <http://www.cccco.edu/cccco/co/shgv1197.htm>

Chrislip, D. D., & Larson, C. E. (1994). *Collaborative leadership: How citizens and civic leaders can make a difference*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Community College League of California. (1999). *Community college governance: A joint statement of the board of governors and trustees of community college districts* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccleague.org/pubs/policy.jtstmt.htm>

Community College League of California. (1998). *Draft guidelines related to participation in district and college governance: Participating effectively in district and college governance*. Sacramento, CA.

Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1994). The challenging environment. In A. M. Cohen (Ed.), *Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice* (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experiences and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher*, 19 (5), pp. 2-14.

Cota, S. A. (1993). A critical analysis of metaphors in the implementation of shared governance in two selected California community college districts. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Creswell, J. W. (1994). *Research design: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Darnell, D. R. (1994). Similarities and difference in perceptions of faculty involvement in the role of instructional administrators in a California community college shared governance structure. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

de Russy, C. (1996). Public universities need rigorous oversight by 'activist' trustees. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, pp. B3-B4.

Duncan-Hall, R. L. (1993). Faculty participation in institutional planning in California community colleges: theory and reality. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Eisner, E. W. (1997). The promise and perils of alternative forms of data representation. *Educational Researcher*, 26 (6), pp. 4-10.

Elsbach, K. D., & Eloffson, G. (2000). How the packaging of decision explanations affects perceptions of trustworthiness. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43 (1), pp. 9-25.

Flanigan, P. K. (1996). From educational reform to change: The California community college model for faculty governance. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Fryer, T. W., & Lovas, J. C. (1990). *Leadership in governance: Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gerber, L. G. (1997). Reaffirming the value of shared governance. *Academe*, 83 (5), pp. 14-18.

Giese, R. J. (1995). Assessing the organizational cultures of the California community colleges that have and have not implemented shared governance. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Griffin, R. E. (1997). Implementing faculty shared governance: Organizational change in selected California community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hanson, G. W. (1995). Guidelines for implementation of the governance provisions of AB 1725 in the California community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Harpster, J. (1995). Implementing faculty shared governance: Organizational change in California community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Howell, C. D. (1997). An assessment of the implementation of shared governance provisions of AB1725 (1988) at selected California community colleges [On-line]. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 21, pp. 637-650.

Imperial Valley College (1998). *Board of Trustees Policy Manual*. Imperial, CA.

Kanter, M. J. (1994). Instructional programs. In A. M. Cohen (Ed.), *Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice* (pp. 219-246). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Kotter, J. P. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, 73, pp. 59 – 67.

Leatherman, C. (1998). Trustee's group, in draft report on governance, calls for speedier decision making [On-line]. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44, pp. A8-A9.

Laffoon-Villegas, R. (n.d.). A brief primer on higher education governance in california [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccche.org/governance.html>

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Little Hoover Commission. (2000). *Open doors and open minds* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.lhc.ca.gov/lhc.html>

Marger, M. N. (1987). *Elites and masses: An introduction to political sociology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (1995). *Designing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B. (1989). *Designing qualitative research*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Merriam, S. B. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, M. A. (1998). Speed up the pace of campus governance, or lose the authority to make decisions. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45, pp. B6-B7.

Miller, M. T., Vacik, S. M., and Benton, C. (1998). Community college faculty involvement in institutional governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22, pp. 645-654.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nussbaum, T. J. (1998, March). *Reforming the governance of california community colleges*. Paper presented as the 20th Annual Earl V. Pullias Lecture, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA.

O'Toole, J. (1995). *Leading change: Overcoming the ideology of comfort and the tyranny of custom*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Owens, R. G. (1998). *Organizational behavior in education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Phillips, D. C. (1994). Telling it straight: Issues in assessing narrative research. *Educational Psychology*, 29 (1), pp. 13-21.

Piland, W. E. (1994). The governing board. In A. M. Cohen (Ed.), *Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice* (pp. 79-100). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass:

Piland, W. E., & Bublitz, R. F. (1998). Faculty perceptions of shared governance in California community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22 (2), 99-110.

Polkinghorne, D. E. (1995). Narrative configuration in qualitative analysis. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8 (1), pp. 5-23.

Ramo, K. (1997). Reforming shared governance: Do the arguments hold up? *Academe*, 83 (2), 38-43.

Reyes, P. (1985). Toward an explanatory and predictive theoretical model of organization for institutions of higher education. *Dissertations Abstracts Online*.

Richardson, J. T. (1999). Centralizing governance isn't simply wrong: It's bad business, too [On-line]. Available: <http://aaup.org/Opedjr.htm>

Richardson, R. C. (1997). *State structures for the governance of higher education* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.policycenter.org/California/calif.htm>

Rockwell, R. G. (n.d.). *A brief primer on AB1725 and california community college finance and governance* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.ccche.org/AB1725.html>

Rollin, D. A. (1997). Student participation in shared governance in California's community colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Rost, J. C. (1992, March). Leadership and shared governance in community colleges. Paper presented at the "Shared Governance: Seizing the Opportunity for Educational Leadership" workshop for community college administrators, Costa Mesa, CA.

- Rost, J. C. (1991). *Leadership for the twenty-first century*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Sanders, J. R. (1981). Case study methodology: A critique. In W.W. Welsh (Ed.), *Case study methodology in educational evaluation: Proceedings of the 1981 Minnesota Evaluation Conference*. Minneapolis, MN: Research and Evaluation Center.
- Scott, J. V. (1997). Death by inattention: The strange fate of faculty governance. *Academe*, 83 (6), pp. 28-33.
- Scott, J. V. (1996). Defending the tradition of shared governance. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 42, pp. B1-B2.
- Segesvary, I. (1997). One community college's attempt to implement shared governance in its budget process. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency Doubleday.
- Seymour, D. T. (1993). *On Q: Causing quality in higher education*. Phoenix, AZ: The Oryx Press.
- Shihadi, M. M. (1996). Involvement of full-time occupational educators in participative faculty governance at Cypress and Orange Coast colleges (California). *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.
- Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart, Winston.
- Stake, R. E. (1994). Case studies. In N. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of educational research*. Thousand Oaks, CA; Sage.
- Starratt, R. J. (1993). *The drama of leadership*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Title 5, California Code of Regulations (1999). [On-line]. Available: <http://ccr.oal.ca.gov/>

Tjosvold, D., & Tjosvold, M. M. (1995). *Psychology for leaders: Using motivation, conflict, and power to manage more effectively*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Trombley, W. (1997). *Shared governance: An elusive goal* [On-line].
Available:http://www.policycenter.org/ct_0297/cts_0297.html

Van Manen, M. (1990). *Researching lived experience: Human science for an action sensitive pedagogy*. New York: SUNY Press.

Vaughan, G. B. (1994). Effective presidential leadership: Twelve areas of focus. In A. M. Cohen (Ed.), *Managing community colleges: A handbook for effective practice* (pp. 5-21). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Weisbord, M. R. (1992). *Discovering common ground: How future search conferences bring people together to achieve breakthrough innovation, empowerment, shared vision, and collaborative action*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Wheeler, A. (1995). Assembly bill 1725: Redesigning the California community colleges governance. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

Wilson, D. C. (1992). *A strategy for change: Concepts and controversies in the management of change*. London: Routledge.

Wishart, B. (1998). A balancing act of power. *Community College Week*, 11 (2),4-5. [On-line].

Wurst, S. K. (1997). Redefining the scope of collective bargaining for Californiacommunity colleges. *Dissertation Abstracts Online*.

APPENDICES

Appendix A – Requesting Permission to Conduct Study Letter

December, 1998
2491 Brighton Ave.
El Centro, CA 92243

Dr. Dominguez, President/Superintendent
Imperial Valley College
380 E. Aten Road
Imperial, CA 92251

Dr. Dominguez:

As a doctoral student at the University of San Diego, I am currently in the beginning stages of my doctoral dissertation. The topic that I chose for my dissertation is shared governance. As explained in the attached abstract, I would like to do an in-depth study of the implementation of shared governance in a community college.

I believe that with the 1994 approval of Imperial Valley College's shared governance policy, the five-year experience provides adequate time to ascertain the status of shared governance at IVC from the perspective of the different individuals and groups charged with implementing the shared governance process. It is my hope that this study will help Imperial Valley College with the future implementation of shared governance.

The purpose of this letter, then, is to request permission to make Imperial Valley College the setting for conducting the case study. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Gregorio Ponce

Appendix B – Approval to Conduct Study Letter

Imperial Valley College

Serving Imperial County

380 East Aten Road
Post Office Box 158
Imperial, California 92251-0158
(760) 355-6219
FAX: (760) 355-6114

Gilbert M. Dominguez, Ed.D.
Superintendent/President

**Imperial Community College District
Board of Trustees**
Rudy Cardenas, Jr., President
Romualdo J. Medina, Clerk
Claudine Duff
Kelly Keithly
Marian A. Long
Robert Noble
Rebecca L. Ramirez

November 23, 1998

Mr. Gregorio Ponce
Mathematics Instructor
Imperial Valley College

Dear Mr. Ponce:

This letter confirms the District's approval and authorization to conduct a study on shared governance at Imperial Valley College.

Major governance bodies and leaders have been notified that meetings, documents, records, and minutes should be made accessible to you for the purposes of completing this worthwhile search.

I am looking forward to reading what information you discover which will be of value to our community college.

If there is any support my office or I can provide to assist you in this endeavor, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Gilbert M. Dominguez, Ed.D.
Superintendent/President

sh

Appendix C – Letter of Introduction to Campus Committees

Gregorio A. Ponce
(760) 355-6300
gponce@imperial.cc.ca.us

[Appropriate Date]

[Name of Committee Chair]
[Name of Governance Committee]
Imperial Valley College

Dear Sir or Madam:

As a doctoral student at the University of San Diego, I am currently in the beginning stages of collecting data for my doctoral dissertation. The topic that I chose for my dissertation is shared governance processes of community colleges. On November, 1998 I requested permission and received authorization by the College President to make Imperial Valley College the setting for conducting a case study of shared governance. Please find attached a copy of the President's letter confirming the District's approval to conduct the study.

On January 1999, I presented the proposal to the dissertation committee at the University of San Diego. The committee approved the dissertation proposal. I have attached an abstract of the proposal outlining the background, purpose, and design to conduct the case study. Please let me know if you need for your records a copy of the complete dissertation proposal.

As stated in the abstract, in order to better understand the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College I will need to attend meetings throughout this semester. In addition, I will also need to conduct interviews. However, I am currently requesting authorization from the University of San Diego to conduct interviews and expect approval later this month. Thus, I respectfully request that committee members be informed about this case study to facilitate the data collection process.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Gregorio A. Ponce
Doctoral Student, University of San Diego

Cc: Dr. Dominguez, President/Superintendent

A CASE STUDY OF SHARED GOVERNANCE AT IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE

In 1988, the California State Legislature adopted Assembly Bill 1725, which required community colleges to change their governance structures and processes. Specifically, Assembly Bill 1725 required local governing boards to consult collegially with their academic senates on academic and professional matters.

In 1994, the **Imperial Valley College Board of Trustees adopted a shared governance policy** with respect to the role of the academic senate on academic and professional matters. The policy detailed the areas in which the board would rely primarily on the academic senate and the areas in which the board would seek mutual agreement with the academic senate.

In addition, Assembly Bill 1725 required local governing boards to establish procedures so that faculty, staff, and students could have a voice and express their opinions at the campus level. Thus, in **1996 the Board of Trustees updated its shared governance policy** and formed the college council so that all campus groups could have a forum to voice their voice and opinions.

Broad-scaled studies on Assembly Bill 1725 have indicated that the governance processes at community colleges were highly participative. Other broad-scaled studies, however, have also documented a need to improve the shared governance processes throughout California's colleges. In addition, scholars have also studied specific aspects of the shared governance mandates at the campus level. Even though these studies were helpful to develop either a macro-level understanding of the shared governance process or a detailed understanding of specific aspects of the shared governance process, there is a need to carry out an extensive study of the shared governance process at the campus level.

The purpose of this study, then, is to analyze and synthesize the perceptions and experiences of individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College. The intent is to fill a void in the understanding of shared governance at community colleges because there has been no comprehensive study of the implementation of Assembly Bill 1725 at the campus level. In particular, there is a need to explore the full implications of the shared governance process from the perspective of the individuals and groups who implement the shared governance process on a day-to-day basis.

The design for this study will be a case study because with a case study "educational processes, problems, and programs can be examined to bring about understanding than in turn can affect and perhaps even improve practice" (Merriam, 1988). Noting that the use of multiple sources of data collection adds to the reliability and internal validity of a study, I will use the following sources and techniques to both gather and triangulate the data of the case study.

Interviews. I will divide the interview process into three phases; structured, semi-structured, and unstructured. Prior to starting the interview I will go over a consent form as required by the University of San Diego Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects.

Observations. Initially, I plan to conduct observations during public meetings of the Board of Trustees, College Council, and Academic Senate. As the study progresses, I will determine other sites for conducting observations that will be helpful in meeting the goals of this study.

Document. At the onset of the study, I will search for written materials that outline the shared governance process. I will search for documents that identify the individuals and groups responsible for maintaining, updating, and implementing the shared governance process.

Professional Literature. As themes emerge from the collection and analysis of the data, I will search for past research that might be useful in understanding the participants' experiences.

The timeline for collecting data at Imperial Valley College is from February 1999 to June 1999. I do not anticipate any risks to the participants. I do anticipate that the results of this study can be beneficial to the members of Imperial Valley College for improving their shared governance process. Finally, there is no expense to the participants of this study.

Appendix D – Informed Consent Form

I understand that the purpose of this study is to describe and explore the experience of implementing shared governance at Imperial Valley College in order to understand the benefits, drawbacks, and issues of the process.

I understand that this study will provide individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance process at Imperial Valley College the opportunity to voice their experiences through the interview process.

I understand that the researcher, Gregorio A. Ponce, will be conducting interviews, collecting documents, and making observations throughout Imperial Valley College as part of the data collection process.

I understand that the procedure for an interview is as follows:

- The interviewer will give me an overview of the case study.
- The interviewer will go over this informed consent form.
- If I agree to participate in the study, by signing this consent form, then the interview process will continue. Otherwise, the interview process will be over.
- By initialing here _____, I agree to have the interview audiotaped.
- By initialing here _____, I agree to have the interviewer take notes for the duration of the interview.
- By initialing here _____, I request that the information that I share remain confidential.
- The approximate duration of the interview will be thirty minutes.

I understand that no risks or benefits are anticipated from the interview. In addition, I understand that there is no agreement, written or verbal, beyond that expressed on this consent form.

I understand that all data gathered for this study will be from February 1999 to June 1999.

Participation is voluntary and I understand that I am free to stop participation at any time. Prior to signing this consent form, I can ask questions about the project and receive answers.

There will be no expense involved to anyone participating in this study. When appropriate, as indicated above, all responses and information collected during this project will be kept confidential.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and on that basis, I give consent to my voluntary participation in this research.

Signature of the participant

Date

Location (e.g. Imperial, CA)

Signature of Researcher

Date

Appendix E – Interview Guide for Structured Section

Name of participant: _____ Date of interview: _____

Location of interview: _____ Starting Time: _____ Ending Time: _____

1. How do you classify yourself at IVC? student staff faculty administrator board member
2. What is your position at the college? _____
3. How long have you been at IVC? _____
4. What committees have you served since 1994?

5. How long have you served in each of those committees?

6. Which of these committees do you consider to be shared governance committees?

7. What are your current campus committee assignments:

8. What is shared governance?

Appendix F – Interview Guide for Semi-Structured Section

Guiding Research Questions.

1. Who are the individuals and groups directly involved with the shared governance process?
 - Who are the individuals responsible for maintaining and updating the shared governance policy?
 - Who are the individuals and groups responsible for implementing the shared governance policy?
 - Who are the individuals and groups that seem to be missing from the shared governance process?
2. How has the shared governance process been operationalized?
 - What is the shared governance committee structure?
 - What is the shared governance process to develop or change policy?
 - How do individuals and groups maintain, updated, and implement the shared governance policy?
3. How do the individuals and groups responsible for implementing shared governance view the process as a way to develop or change policies and procedures?
 - What issues have there been in implementing the shared governance policy?
 - Which issues do not exist anymore and how were these issues overcome?
 - Which issues continue to exist and why?
4. What are the results of implementing the shared governance policy?
 - What are the benefits from implementing the shared governance policy?
 - What are the drawbacks from implementing the shared governance policy?
5. What generalizations can be made to other community colleges about the perceptions of administrators, board members, faculty, staff, and students concerning the efficacy of shared governance?

Appendix G – Concept Map Illustration

Appendix H – Domain Analysis Worksheet

Semantic Relationship	
FORM	
EXAMPLE	
INCLUDED TERMS	
Structural Question	

Semantic Relationship	
Form	
Example	
INCLUDED TERMS	
Structural Question	

Appendix I – Domain Analysis Illustration

Semantic Relationship	Function
FORM	x is used for y
EXAMPLE	a pencil is used for writing
INCLUDED TERMS	<pre> graph LR SR[Semantic Relation] --- AR[are used for] AR --- C[Communicating] C --- CT[Cover Term] </pre>
Agendas	
Minutes	
Report	
Letters	
Handouts	
Memos	
Memorandums of Understanding	
Handbooks	
Newsletters	
Policy and Procedural Manuals	
Constitutions	
Bylaws	
Resolutions	
Presentations	
Reports	
Formal and informal meetings	
e-mails	
Informational Updates	
Web pages and agendas	
Faxes	
Voice mails	
Structural Question	What are the different types of tools used for communicating?

Appendix J – Emergent Categories

Administration not communicating	Administrative Turnover	Advisory Roles
Buy-in	Committee Composition	Communication—Interpretation
Communication—After decisions	Communication—Lacking	Communication—Importance
Communication—Difficulty	Decision Makers	Decisions Without Input
Decisions and Shared Governance	Dual Responsibilities	Expertise
Fragmented	Ideas	Influence on Board
Input Ignored	Individuals with Authority	Key Groups
Key Individuals	Knowing Each Other	Less Conflict
Limiting Participation	Long, Slow Process	Missing, Lack of Involvement
More Involvement	Morale	Opportunity—Exists
Opportunity—Not Taken	Opportunity—To Learn	Participation—Improved
People—Same Doing Work	Policy Formation	Perspectives Understood
President Not Following Process	Recognition of People	Reasons Affecting Participation
Responsibility—To Maintain	Responsibility—For Outcome	Responsibility—To Communicate
Responsibility—To Implement	Resistance to Process	Process—Had to be Mandated
Process—Needs Work	Process—Not followed	Process—Works Well
Process—Is Important	Shared Governance Vehicle	Sharing of Information
Time—To Communicate	Time—Away from Job	Time—To Meet
Time—Needed	Unclear Process and Role	Unions
Voice	Watchdog	Improved Relations
Theory vs Practice	Representation	Structures for Improvement
Cumbersome Process	Unequal Influence	Intent of Shared Governance
College Council	Improved Processes	

Appendix K – Summary of California Governance Statutes and Regulations

Local Governing Boards – (Education Code, Section 70902.b.7) Shall establish procedures not inconsistent with minimum standards established by the Board of Governors to ensure faculty, staff, and students the opportunity to express their opinions at the campus level and to ensure that these opinions are given every reasonable consideration, and the right to participate effectively in district and college governance, and the right of academic senates to assume primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.		
Faculty – (Title 5, 53203)	Staff – (Title 5, Section 51023.5)	Students – (Title 5, Section 51023.7)
<p>1. The governing board shall adopt policies for appropriate delegation of authority to its academic senate. Said policies shall provide that the governing board, or designees, will consult collegially with the academic senate when adopting policies and procedures on academic and professional matters.</p> <p>2. Consult collegially is the process in which the governing board shall develop policies on academic and professional matters in either or both of the following methods:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Rely primarily on the advice and judgment of the academic senate, where the recommendations will normally be accepted, and only for compelling reasons and exceptional circumstances will the recommendations not be accepted. Reach mutual agreement with the academic senate. When agreement has not been reached, existing policy shall remain in effect unless such policy exposes the district to legal liability or substantial financial hardship. When agreement has not been reached and there is no existing policy or existing policy needs to change due to legal liability or substantial financial hardship, the governing board may act, after a good faith effort to reach agreement, only for compelling legal, fiscal, or organizational reasons. <p>3. Academic and professional matters refers to: (a) curriculum, including establishing prerequisites and placing courses within disciplines, (b) degree and certificate requirements, (c) grading policies, (d) educational and program development, (e) standards or policies regarding student preparation and success, (f) governance structures, as related to faculty roles, (g) faculty roles and involvement in accreditation processes, including self studies and annual reports, (h) policies for professional development activities, (i) processes for program review, (j) processes for institutional planning and budget development, and (k) other matters as mutually agreed upon.</p> <p>4. While consulting collegially, the academic senate shall retain the right to meet with or to appear before the governing board regarding the views, recommendations, and proposals of the academic senate. In addition, after consultation with the administration, the academic senate may present its views and recommendations to the governing board.</p> <p>5. The appointment of faculty members to serve on task forces, committees, or groups dealing with academic and professional matters shall be made, after consultation with the chief executive officer, by the senate.</p>	<p>1. The governing board shall adopt policies and procedures that provide staff the opportunity to participate effectively in the governance of the college.</p> <p>2. Staff shall be provided with opportunities to participate in the development of policies and procedures, and in those processes for jointly developing recommendations to the governing board, that the board reasonably determines, after consultation with staff, have or will have a significant effect on staff.</p> <p>3. Except in unforeseeable, emergency situations, the governing board shall not take action on matters significantly affecting staff until it has provided staff an opportunity to participate in the development of those matters through appropriate structures and procedures as determined by the board.</p> <p>4. The policies and procedures of the governing board shall ensure that the recommendations and opinions of staff are given every reasonable consideration.</p> <p>5. The selection of staff representatives to serve on task forces, committees, or other governance groups shall, when required by law, be made by those councils, committees, employee organizations, or other staff groups that the governing board has officially recognized in its policies and procedures for staff participation.</p>	<p>1. The governing board shall adopt policies and procedures that provide students the opportunity to participate effectively in the governance of the college.</p> <p>2. Students shall be provided an opportunity to participate in the development of policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. This right includes the opportunity to participate in processes for jointly developing recommendations to the governing board regarding such policies and procedures.</p> <p>3. Policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students includes: (a) grading policies, (b) codes of student conduct, (c) academic disciplinary policies, (d) curriculum development, (e) courses or programs which should be initiated or discontinued, (f) processes for institutional planning and budget development, (g) standards and policies regarding student preparation and success, (h) student services planning and development, (i) student fees within the authority of the district to adopt, and (j) any other matter that the governing board determines it will have a significant effect on students.</p> <p>4. Except in unforeseeable, emergency situations, the governing board shall not take action on a matter having a significant effect on students until it has provided students with an opportunity to participate in formulating the policy or procedure or the joint development of recommendations regarding the action.</p> <p>5. Governing board procedures shall ensure that recommendations and positions developed by students are given every reasonable consideration.</p> <p>6. The governing board shall recognize each associated student organization or its equivalent as the representative body of the students to offer opinions and to make recommendations to the administration and the governing board with regard to policies and procedures that have or will have a significant effect on students. The selection of student representatives to serve on college task forces, committees, or other governance bodies shall be made, after consultation with designated parties, by the appropriately officially recognized associated student organizations.</p> <p>7. The governing board shall give reasonable consideration to recommendations and positions developed by students regarding policies and procedures pertaining to the hiring and evaluation of faculty, staff, and administration.</p>
<i>Note: In view that this is intended to be brief summary; please refer to current statutes and regulations for further clarification.</i>		