Research into community college governance has in the past centered on the formal aspects of decision-making of these institutions. These past studies often ignore the informal governance practices and policies that operate within all organizations. Staff perceptions of community college governance have not been studied and possible disjunction between formal and informal decision-making ignored. This research explored the possible differences between what a community college says it does regarding governance, and what its staff perceives it really does.

Two study sites, both public community colleges, were chosen. One community college was from California and the other from Oregon, the choice of two different states to ascertain possible influence of state laws. The qualitative nature of this research prompted the
selection of college staff who could provide rich data on governance issues relating to the hiring of contracted faculty, general fund allocation, and educational program development. Study site documents were analyzed, providing information of the formal governance practices. Informants from the two study sites included administrators and contracted faculty with knowledge of these three college decisions.

The informants and documents from the Oregon Study Site described a set of more collaborative governance practices than the California Study Site. The California Study Site, in a state that mandates shared-governance, had informant responses that were less satisfied with governance than the Oregon Study Site informants. Informants from both study sites related "over-all satisfaction" with the way shared-governance was practiced at their college, with some minor concerns related in the interviews. Shared-governance was encouraged at the Oregon Study Site within a framework of a collaborative and inclusive decision-making structure.

Faculty informants from both sites described concerns about their lack of voice in general fund allocation.
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"Colleges are social organizations with their own rules". (Cohen & Brawer, p.94)

The manner in which organizations govern themselves is a topic of interest to a diverse set of research disciplines. Business management, management science, sociology, and anthropology have studied governance within organizations. Researchers seek to understand the dynamics of that governance in order to understand the culture of that organization. Organizational culture and governance will help determine the success or failure of organizations.

Governance is a widely studied and debated aspect of higher education. Governance (decision-making process) is an area of scholarship where many problems develop related to terminology and conceptual linkages. Most research about governance in higher education has focused on four-year
colleges and universities (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). Past research, when focused on community colleges, often examined the governance style or policies as they related to leadership. There has been little research into community college governance processes or structures (Levin, 2000).

Much of the recent literature on governance comes from business management rather than higher education. While there are similarities between business and higher education, there are also some significant differences. Especially evident in these differences are the contrasting missions of community colleges and entrepreneurial corporations. Most community colleges are public higher educational institutions, created by legislative and legal charters. Public community colleges are created and maintained to serve the educational and training needs of a community. Public laws and regulations more directly control community colleges than private corporations (London, 1978; Veysey, 1965).
Governance structures within a community college are a major factor in how the various parts of the organization work together (Birnbaum, 1988). The structures and rules of decision-making in a community college are designed to protect staff as much as they restrict staff. The governance policies and structures can provide effective channels of communication and collaboration.

Community college governance is both formal and informal in nature (Levin, 2000). Both informal and formal aspects of governance may operate outside the awareness of many college staff, and were an aspect of decision-making studied in this research.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study identified and explored the disjunction between the formal policies of governance and the informal perceptions of governance. The research sought to describe staff perceptions of governance at two separate community colleges. The formal, written governance policies of these two colleges
were compared to the staff perceptions of governance. In this research, the written governance policies were analyzed using hermeneutic qualitative research methods. These qualitative methods are described in chapter three.

There can be differences between what a college states it does within its formal written governance policies, and what staff experience that governance to be. In this study, interviews were conducted with selected staff at the two study sites to uncover these perceptions and experiences. These staff interviews were used to determine what the differences between the formal and informal governance might be. Selection of informants also was used to discover if any variance existed between faculty and administrators. The two study sites were community colleges; one located in central California, and the other in northwestern Oregon. The selection of two different locations was an attempt to reveal the possible effects of state laws upon their governance.
Past studies of community college governance have centered on the role of internal organizational cultures (Fox, 1998; Levin 1995). These studies utilized document analysis as their major source of data. Interviews of staff to reveal perceptions of governance were not used. These past studies often ignored the informal governance practices, and focused only on the formal written practices.

As the study of community college governance can be very broad, this research focused on these three aspects of governance:

a.) Who at the college makes the decision on the allocation of general fund money for the college?,

b.) Who at the college makes the decision on the hiring of contracted faculty?,

c.) Who at the college makes the decision to modify or create a new educational program?

These aspects of governance were used previously by Levin (2000), in his study of the linkage between state law and community college decision-making.
In this research, the informants were selected from study site staff for their potential to provide perceptions of governance based on experience with the three aspects of college decision-making listed above. The qualitative nature of this research meant that statistical sampling and a large sample size of informants was less important than the potential of the informants to provide “rich” data. The faculty and administration informant selection provided data from staff who had knowledge of their colleges’ governance.

The informants were selected from faculty and administration at the study sites. Interview questions were designed to acquire perceptions about governance at their community college. The interview questions asked in several ways for informant perceptions and provided an opportunity for the informants to describe informal governance practices.
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to describe the perceptions of community college staff (administrators and contracted faculty) regarding decision-making in three important aspects of their college. The staff perceptions were compared with the formal, written policies on governance at the study sites. Differences and similarities between the formal and informal governance practices were examined. Disjunction between formal and informal governance perceptions from faculty versus that of administrators was explored. If differences were noted in the research data between the two study sites, these were analyzed.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The culture of the community college is different from that of a four-year public or private college. Community colleges are the largest and most ambitious system of higher education in America,
accounting for over half the higher educational experiences of students after high school. Past research on community colleges has focused almost entirely on the formal written aspects of governance. Few researchers have examined staff perceptions of their college's governance (Levin, 2000). To more thoroughly understand governance at community colleges, informal governance must be examined through informant interviews. Governance frequently operates at more than one level in community colleges, and it takes on formal and informal processes (Kotter & Heskett, 1992; Scupin, 2002).

The formal aspects of community college governance have been studied most often. Birnbaum (2000) examined formal policies and processes, for example, in higher educational institutions. A more subtle level of governance, the informal or tacit level, operates within community colleges (and organizations in general). Tacit governance practices of an organization (such as a community college) may operate at the subconscious or un-
acknowledged level (Rousseau, 1990; Schein, 1999). Tacit governance practice often shapes "how" things operate and get done within the organization. The manner or style by which tasks get accomplished is connected to this tacit level of practice (thepeGroup, 2000).

Staff interviews enabled the researcher to identify some of the tacit governance practices at the study sites, an important element in governance not addressed by other researchers, but raised previously by Hughes (1961) as important. There were limits to the depth of the researchers' understanding about governance at the two study sites. These limits are due to different expectations and meanings existing between informants and researcher (Geertz, 1995).

For this study, informant perceptions were defined as:

the process by which people organize and interpret their experience, so as to give meaning to their environment (Robbins, p. 135).
Most research informants provided the researcher with selective perceptions. Selective perceptions were the informants' interpretations of reality based on their background, interests, attitudes and prior experiences.

This study was prompted by the researchers' interest of informal organizational governance, and the lack of research literature on the subject. In addition, the research promised to evaluate whether the two study sites practiced what they had formalized in their written governance documentation. Organizations with staff committed to their organizations' mission, and who can share in decision-making, tend to achieve superior results (thepeGroup, 2000; Pearson, 1987). Organizations with staff that are not committed to the mission, and that are not participating in decision-making, will tend to fall short of their potential.

Over the past ten years, the research literature has tended to ignore governance in community colleges. Governance, as it is currently practiced in community colleges, needs more attention from
researchers (Kezar, 2002). Levin (1995) argues that organizational success and survival depend on the empowerment of community college staff within a more open decision-making process.

RESEARCH PARAMETERS (LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS)

As this study included only two community colleges, the ability to generalize about all community colleges was very limited. The analysis of study site governance decisions relating to general fund allocation, hiring of contracted faculty, and development of an educational program was limited in its' ability to generalize about other aspects of governance. The informants were limited to administrators and contracted faculty, other elements of the study site staff were not interviewed (such as classified, adjunct faculty, students, or board members).

The study was limited in chronology, and provides a snapshot in time of the governance practices of these two study sites.
The study sites were limited to two community colleges, one in California and one in Oregon. This is a very small sample, but appropriate for a qualitative study of governance.

This study does provide valuable insights into a set of decisions that shapes these two community colleges as well as valuable insight into the disjunction of formal and informal governance practices.

DEFINITIONS OF THE TERMS

The following terms are used often in this research and are defined here for clarification:

**Governance** = the decision-making process, usually involved with decisions that are rational. In this research, governance will imply decisions that involve large amounts of money or decisions that effect many staff or students.

**Explicit governance** rules and processes = form of knowledge that people are consciously aware of, which is often written down and openly discussed.
People are aware of explicit knowledge, it is easier for people to share.

**Tacit governance** rules and processes = tacit culture knowledge is the component of culture that people often are unaware that they possess, it operates on the habitual or subconscious levels. It is often emotional; it often deals with what people in a culture think is "normal"

**Decision-making** = the process of making a decision at a community college, in most ways synonymous with governance.

**Legal structures** = federal or state laws, statutes, or regulations that shape the authority and decision-making within an organization such as a community college.

**Mores** = a form of rule or code of behavior, embedded in behavioral standards. Mores are tacit in nature, people who violate mores can be severely punished. Punishment
for violation of mores often comes in the form of ostracism, gossip, public ridicule or losing one’s job.

**Organizational cultures** = the internal sub-groupings of staff within a community college, often related to educational background, job descriptions, pay structure, and group outlook on the dynamics of the college operations.

**Shared Governance** = term used to describe a paradigm popularized in the late 1980’s that envisions a more decentralized knowledge base and decision-making within an organization.

**CHAPTER SUMMARY**

This research will compare the written governance policies of the two study sites (two public community colleges) to the perceptions of governance by the staff-informants. Similarities and differences will be explored between formal and informal governance practices. Chapter Two will review the research
literature on the topic, Chapter Three will document the research methods. Chapter Four will present the research findings, and Chapter Five will present the significance of the findings, with recommendations.
CHAPTER II. LITERATURE REVIEW

CULTURES AND DECISIONS

Governance is reflective of the structures of authority that are present within a culture or organization. Rules within a culture on making decisions are numerous. These governance rules and structures are complex in most present day cultures, they often operate on a conscious as well as a subconscious level. To completely understand decision-making, a researcher needs to study the broader culture from which it originates, and recognize that several types of governance may be in operation simultaneously. The researcher must recognize that governance is culturally based.

Culture can be defined as all learned behaviors of people within a group. People learn their culture from birth to death, in a process which anthropologists term "enculturation". Culture is complex, and often operates on several levels at the same time. Schein
(1992) used some important descriptors to define "culture", these were:

observed behavioral regularities when people interact, the language, customs, traditions, rituals, group norms, espoused values, formal philosophy, rules of the game, climate, habits of thinking, shared meanings. (Schein, pp.8-9).

Cultural knowledge includes the processes that people use to make decisions, and the rules that formalize these processes of decision-making. Written laws, statutes and rules are usually known to the people they govern. This form of culture knowledge is "explicit culture". Explicit culture is easier to share, and people are more aware of its presence and operation (Balick & Cox, 1996, Kluckhohn, 1962, and Levi-Strauss, 1963).

A more subtle level of cultural knowledge also exists within all groups, and it is often as complex. This form of cultural knowledge is termed "tacit culture". Tacit culture is the component of cultural knowledge that people often are unaware that they possess, it operates on the habitual or subconscious levels. It is often emotional, it often deals with what
people in a culture think is "normal" versus "abnormal", "right versus wrong" (Rousseau, 1990; Schein, 1999).

Decision-making within cultures (and organizations) may operate at this tacit cultural level and the level of operation may mean that people are often not even aware of the assumptions that facilitate decision-making (Kotter and Heskett, 1992). Anthropologists sometimes label these unwritten rules as "mores", these cultural mores are powerful components of cultural governance and social control (Scupin, 2002).

Tacit cultural knowledge often determines how the organization makes decisions and shapes the acceptance or rejection of the decisions (Saint-Onge, 1996). As much of this tacit cultural knowledge is not talked about or acknowledged, it can both hinder and/or facilitate governance. Tacit cultural knowledge helps determine administrators' perceptions of what their organization is, and its role/mission. Leaders perceptions can vary from the tacit cultural knowledge of other members of their organization, causing a lack of alignment and dysfunction (Saint-Onge, 1996).
Organizational culture of an institution or corporate entity is linked to the larger culture's values and beliefs. Anthropological research does not isolate or reduce the individual organization being studied from the larger whole. Anthropological research tends to be holistic, and tries to ascertain the interaction between the various segments and levels of structure within the whole society (Cohen, 1970). Frequently there are two, coexisting organizational structures operating concurrently. One form operating on the explicit level and the other at the tacit level. Such dual structures are often the products of historical developments and trends, and may or may not have a deeper level of unity between them (Levi-Strauss, 1963).

The complexity of organizational cultures (and decision-making) may necessitate the use of more than just documents as sources. Personal interviews and other ethnographic techniques may be needed to uncover formal and informal practices (Hughes, 1961).
Research interest concerning the culture within an organization starts to appear in the literature around the 1970's. Some other terms are used to describe the concept, these include "corporate culture", and "social structures of an organization". The research on governance in organizations and higher education utilizes principles from anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science and economics (Schmidtlein, 1987). By the late 1970's interest in applying this concept to higher educational institutions appears (Kotter and Heskett, 1992).

Within a few years, several books were published on corporate cultures, with suggestions on how to change and modify the culture of the reader's institution. By the late 1980's many writers abandoned research on corporate culture and instead developed prescriptive models for business (and higher education) institutions. These prescribed models were developed so corporations could compete more successfully with
Japanese corporations, who at that time in history, were doing better than their American counterparts.

Several writers focused on similar organizational models for community colleges (Levin, 1995, Owen, 1995, and Berquist, 1992). Research findings on the cultures within the community college centered on these four major sub-cultures;

a.) faculty - discipline and teaching based, loyal to their discipline, hold a belief that their discipline is "unique and special". They want to make decisions at the college, but are often too busy teaching to participate,

b.) management - they are usually trained in business cultural values such as fiscal and legal responsibility. They value centralized control of decisions, some have little experience in teaching and their loyalty is to the college not an academic discipline,

c.) classified - they are usually in student services, maintenance, and facilities. They often feel faculty or management does not respect them,
and feel alienated from the mission of serving the student or the college,
d.) student advocates - this group can include members from the other three groups, they are loyal to serving the educational needs of the students. They often favor decentralized control, and often attempt to cross the boundaries drawn by the other groups (Berquist, 1992).

The unifying force that can bind these groups together is the mission of the community college. Without focus on the colleges mission for all groups, it can be difficult for them to work together.

ORGANIZATIONAL GOVERNANCE, POWER AND DECISIONS

Many researchers have attempted to deal with the issues of governance for society in general, and for entities such as business or municipal corporations. The body of literature is huge and beyond the limits of this research to cover. Several important points in the
literature do bear relevance to this study and are discussed here.

Societal governance issues in a democratic model were discussed by March and Olsen (1995). They dealt with the conditions needed in a society to make democracy successful. Their observation on democracy for large or small-scale groups was;

Democracy is partly a structure of laws and incentives by which less-than-perfect individuals are induced to act in the common good, while pursuing their own. (March & Olsen, p.49).

Power and its uses in society and corporate settings are also topics that have relevance to this research. The discipline of business management has in the past 40 years studied these topics. Henry Mintzberg (1983a) conducted surveys in an analysis of power and its use in organizations. In his work, Power In and Around Organizations, Mintzberg offers several findings;

Power is defined as...the capacity to effect organizational outcomes, and three bases of power are the control of:
 a.) a resource,
b.) a technical skill,
c.) a body of knowledge, critical to the organization...and these must be concentrated and non-substitutable. (Mintzberg,p.24)
Mintzberg's observations are general principles that can be applied to corporate entities such as public corporations or private corporations. Research into governance in higher education also has described many of the same phenomena.

Business management has studied organizational governance with the analysis of power and authority a major objective. The relationships between "follower" and "leader" in organizations were prime topics for these researchers. Robbins (1993) defined "authority" as the rights inherent in a management position to give orders and expect the orders to be obeyed. Mintzberg (1983b) described many organizational types, and derived the five parts principle, these are:

a.) the **operating core** = the employees who perform the basic work related to the mission of the organization,

b.) the **strategic apex** = the top level managers charged with the overall responsibility for the organization,
c.) the **technostructure** = analysts with responsibility for effecting certain forms of standardization,

d.) the **middle line** = managers who connect the operating core to the strategic apex,

e.) the **support staff** = indirect support services for the organization.

Organizational behaviorists and business management researchers have some useful definitions for use in this research, these include:

a.) **dependency** = person "B"'s relationship to person "A", when "A" possesses something that "B" requires,
b.) **locus of control** = the degree to which people believe they are masters of their own fate,
c.) **authoritarianism** = the belief that there should be status and power differences among people in organizations.  (Robbins, 1993).

Business management researchers also have described "participative management", which is synonymous with shared-governance, as when subordinates share a significant degree of decision-making power with their immediate supervisors. The advantages of participative
researchers, is that staff have more knowledge at their workplace, there is more "buy-in" for decisions, and there often is more variety in ideas that are used for problem solving. These researchers also indicate negatives such as the large amount of money and time that is needed to make participatory management work.

The potential problems of peer pressure, and accountability for decisions are also discussed by these researchers (Robbins, 1993).

HIGHER EDUCATION

Birnbaum (1988) described the internal and external factors of decision-making in higher education institutions and their governance. Birnbaum was one of the first researchers to develop an appreciation of the many federal and state agencies that partially control the internal decision-making of higher educational institutions. He also researched the internal dynamics of governance and described the ever increasing complexity of higher education institutions, their increasing scope of missions, and the rise of
increasing scope of missions, and the rise of collective bargaining - all of which tend to fragment their organizational cohesiveness and alignment (Birnbaum, 1988). Organizational alignment has been defined as,

the degree to which the interests and actions of each employee support the organizations key goals (Robinson & Stern, p. 89).

Of the several types of governance, Birnbaum’s research indicated that community colleges tend to be “bureaucracy” governance models. Bureaucracy in his research did not have the common negative connotation to it, but is more neutral. His definition of the community college bureaucracy model is;

bureaucracy...the type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals, so that the organization can become more efficient and effective. (Birnbaum, p.107).

Birnbaum stated that there is no perfect organizational structure, and that all were compromises with many forms of trade-off. Over the past 30 years there has been attempts to classify and categorize
These classifications often label the community college as either bureaucratic or political (Cohen and Brawer, 1989). The size of the college was widely held to be a major factor in the structure of governance that it used.

Attempts to de-centralize and/or democratize governance in community colleges have developed since the 1960's. Compelling arguments for democratizing governance in community colleges can be exemplified in works such as Thaxter and Grahams' recent article "Community College Faculty in Decision-Making" (1999). Movements and fads in management have come and gone, whether there is more democratic governance in community colleges is debatable.

Shared governance concepts also appeared in the literature of higher education in the 1980's. The term was usually used in the context of a democratic or de-centralized governance model. George Baker (1992) in his work, "Cultural Leadership: Inside America's Community Colleges", describes the development of the concept of shared-governance. Baker and other authors
detail more prescriptive organizational modifications to leadership, governance, and organizational culture.

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND GOVERNANCE

American culture is difficult to describe and most anthropologists would regard such an attempt as prone to error. The cultural values of independence, self-reliance, democracy and acceptance of authority are all in dynamic balance.

American college governance is based on the English tradition of a board of trustees. English boards were composed of learned scholars. Americans have until recently, tended to want local/community control lay board members (Duryea, 2000).

The literature of the late 1980's and early 1990's dealing with governance at community colleges often used terms such as:

a.) shared-governance,
b.) faculty empowerment,
c.) decentralized governance,
d.) decentralized decision-making,
e.) "new" leadership. (Baker, 1992).
Some authors referred to the increasing accountability to state and federal agencies, declining enrollments, and budget constraints as reasons for changing to new forms of governance.

Most of the researchers in the past twenty years have focused on the internal factors that shape governance at community colleges. From a historical approach, Cohen and Brawer (1989) document the evolution of board governance in community colleges from the time period when many junior colleges and community colleges were formed by local school boards from the "K through 12" systems. Enabling legislation from the states often reflected this school board model of governance. This school board model of governance structure is bureaucratic in nature, with faculty not directly involved in decisions.

All states regulate and enable the formation of community colleges. State laws, regulations and administrative rules provide the legal framework for community college operation and governance.

The vast majority of community colleges in the United States were formed by local legal/political
entities, as permitted by state legislation, and elected trustees as board members. Boards were charged with the hiring of a president (modeled on the business C.E.O.). State control of these local community college boards increased in 1972 with the Higher Education Amendments (Cohen and Brawer, 1989). Cohen and Brawer made these conclusions on community college governance:

The idea of a lay governing board that represents the people is an old concept in American education, and public education has used elected boards to reflect the collective will and wisdom of the people since earliest times. Ideally, the board is the bridge between college and community.

(Cohen & Brawer, p.110)

Also important in the consideration of governance in community colleges is the fact that the boards are public corporations and are therefore legally responsible for all college affairs. The external legislation of the state often mandates the boards' many responsibilities. Leadership in community colleges is complicated by all the internal and external constraints the legislative system imposes. Leadership is often viewed as a form of "social exchange", a transaction between leader and the group. The social
exchange provides the parties, of unequal status, with benefits or services that help both (Tschechtelin, 1994). This social exchange (dependency) operates in at least two dimensions, explicit and tacit levels.

Baker (et al., 1992) developed models on higher education governance types, to document how governance operated at community colleges. Cohen and Brawer (1989) mentioned external factors in their description of governance. No researchers could be found who examined the role of tacit cultural knowledge in community college governance.

Bess (1988) described models for governance at community colleges, and considered only the internal explicit governance dynamics. Birnbaum (2000) examined trends in higher education governance, and described explicit factors as major components of decision-making. The interaction of internal and external governance factors in community colleges was studied also by Levin (2000). This paucity of research on the role of tacit cultural knowledge in governance at community colleges is the prime motivator for this research.
A holistic, descriptive approach to the governance of a community college would prompt the examination of the tacit cultural knowledge of governance. Governance is part of an organizational system, it is interconnected, whether it is in a corporate entity such as a community college or in society in general (Cohen, 1970).

Community college administrators and faculty have shared values; many of these shared values are learned while at the workplace. These shared values are of two types as discussed earlier, explicit and tacit. Over the past 10 years, an emerging field in business management called "Knowledge Management" has concentrated on examining and sharing this knowledge within organizations to enhance governance (Saint-Onge, 1996).

COMMUNITY COLLEGE GOVERNANCE AND STATES

Governance at community colleges is shaped by state legislation and law (Birnbaum, 1988). The effect of state laws on community college governance might be
detected not only in the explicit aspects of decision-making, but also in the tacit aspects. Two community colleges, one in Oregon and one in California, were chosen to be the study sites. When in this research the tacit aspects of governance were examined, the effect of the different states legislation was considered.

Past research has identified four aspects of community college governance that are shaped by states, these are:

a.) provider - the state partially funds the community colleges,

b.) regulator - relationships to other types of educational institutions are delineated,

c.) advocate - the state directs funding often to specific programs or initiatives,

d.) steering - the state often steers certain types of students to the community college

(Richardson et al., 1998).

Traditional terms used to describe state structures for community colleges include consolidated governing boards, coordinating boards and planning agency boards.
California has consolidated governing boards, and Oregon has a coordinating board. California puts many legal, management and control responsibilities into "district boards" which are coordinated by a statewide Board of Governors (California Postsecondary Education Commission, 2002 and Levin, 2000). Locally elected trustees who are entrusted to be responsive to local demographic and economic needs, govern California Community College Districts.

Community college faculty organization was not modeled after the more self-governing faculty models of four-year colleges and universities. Faculty at community colleges was envisioned much the same way as they were in the "K through 12" systems, as not directly involved in the decision-making bureaucracy (Baker, 1992).

California also has promulgated the concept of shared-governance at its community colleges in the past two decades, even "mandating" it in Assembly Bill #1725. California's attempt to externally create shared-governance through A.B. 1725 differs from
Oregon, where no statewide legal or regulatory impetus has been evident (Kanter, 1994).

Oregon assigns limited responsibilities for program review, institutional authorization and budget to a state board controlled by the Department of Education. The Board of Education co-ordinates with the local governing boards of each Community College district. The governing boards at each district have governing authority. These boards are entrusted with the approval of general fund budget allocations, the hiring of contracted faculty, and the approval of educational programs (Levin, 2000).

Oregon has no legislation that addresses faculty governance roles directly. Indirectly Oregon legislation discourages faculty participation in governance by preventing faculty from serving on the local governing boards. Oregon has no specific legislation concerning governance roles for faculty.
A more comprehensive and detailed review of the existing literature on this topic was deferred until after the completion of the fieldwork, in an attempt to decrease researcher bias before conducting interviews with staff at the study sites. The portion of literature review dealing with shared-governance in the two study sites and study site locations is presented in chapter four as part of the triangulation process.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

Research in the study of governance at higher educational institutions has been based on business management, sociological, anthropological and management science frameworks. Abundant literature on governance of community colleges exists, almost entirely based on document studies from sample sites. The literature ignores the staff perceptions of governance, and has not used interviews of staff. The past research tends to focus on which “type” of
governance would work best, rather than what really is taking place in the community colleges. The role of staff perception and of tacit knowledge has been lightly visited in past research literature.
CHAPTER III. METHODOLOGY

The goal of this research was to describe staff perceptions of governance at two community colleges in comparison to the formal, written governance policies of these colleges. As there can be differences between what is stated in governance policies and what people perceive governance to be, interviews were conducted of selected faculty and administrators at the study sites. The interviews were used in an attempt to understand what these differences in governance might be.

Written governance policies of the two study sites were analyzed. This research used qualitative research to develop theory from the data. Qualitative research involves the use of interpretation of subject matter and an unbiased approach. The intent is to make sense of the phenomena being studied, with regard to the terms and meanings of the people being studied (Cresswell, 1998).
RESEARCHER INTERESTS

The researcher was interested in the role that tacit assumptions and knowledge play in governance at community colleges, and organizations in general. The researcher has over 15 years experience at community colleges, as contracted faculty, department chair and administrator. An anthropological background also prompted the researchers' explorations into governance and knowledge flow in organizations.

Anthropological theory believes that often there are two or more forms of governance being practiced at the same time in the same culture. No one person will know all the aspects or forms of governance in operation in their organization, most organizations are just too complex. There may be as many perspectives of what is going on with governance as there are informants and researchers. Researchers often face limits to the amount of understanding they can validly claim (Geertz, 1995).

This study was initiated to describe the governance of two community colleges, from the perspectives of
faculty and administrators and from what the colleges' own documents describe. A phenomenological approach was utilized in this research to explore and describe the informants' perspectives on important governance issues for their college. The descriptions by the informants were considered to be real at that place, at that time, and for them (and their experience). This researcher examined the phenomenon of community college governance at the two study sites with an effort at the reduction of bias before the initiation of the study. A non-judgmental attitude was used as the research approach. The researcher was not convinced that any one type of community college governance was "best". The essential elements of college governance were examined in this research. These research approaches were modeled after Patton (pp.407-408).

The use of documents was an attempt to discover the meaning of governance at the study sites using the written material available to the faculty and administrators who work at those colleges. A comparative analysis was used to reveal the document versus informant concepts of governance. After the
development of these sources of information, a theory emerged. This theory might improve the governance and communication at the study sites, and might be relevant to other community colleges. This theory is also analogous to "verstehen", defined by Schwandt as:

Grasping subjective meaning and symbolic activities that constitute social life.
(p.226)

The use of documents, in attempting to understand the governance at the study site, revealed explicit types of governance. Study site documents were used to obtain meaning. Hermeneutic research understanding is that subjective meaning is an entity or thing that is waiting to be "discovered" in text. Documents reveal aspects of the culture that produced them (Schwandt, pp. 226-227).

This researcher assumed these beliefs prior to initiation of research, and provides these assumptions to the reader for consideration (modeled on LeCompte & Preissle, pp. 144-145). These beliefs are:

a.) Past experience for the researcher prompted the assumption that some faculty may have been
ambivalent about administrators' roles in governance at their workplace,
b.) That some administrators' may have sought to justify their roles in the power issues of governance,
c.) Faculty and administrators may have provided mistaken conceptions of governance at their workplace, either because of incorrect information and/or as a result of their reactions to past experiences with governance issues,
d.) This research is centered on the qualitatively different ways in which people understand and experience governance at their study site, the product of this research will reflect the informant's perceptions of governance.

The concept of shared-governance holds no special loyalty to the researcher; it is but one type of organizational decision-making. The experiences of the researcher at community colleges are considered an asset to the understanding of informant perceptions of governance at their study site (Gummesson, pp. 51-52).
RESEARCH METHODS

This research used a combination of research methods as described by Cresswell (1998). The attempt to understand the organizational governance practices of the two study sites was the research goal. To accomplish this, a blend of ethnographic, phenomenological, and hermeneutic methods were employed. This type of blending has been used successfully by others (Patton, 1990, and Hammerstedt & Loughlin, 2000).

The literature and documentation review for this research is described below:

a.) formulation of research topic,
b.) literature review of governance literature,
c.) use of bibliographies from these sources to develop new sources,
d.) use of computer databases and other search engines to find new sources,
e.) contact the two study sites via phone and Internet, sought source materials,
f.) reviewed textbooks in business management and
other disciplines for source materials.

At the point in literature review and research where site-specific literature became available, the researcher ceased reading and saved that material for use after the site-visits and interviews to mitigate potential bias. Then:

- **g.** after the interviews, several new sources were mentioned by the informants, these were acquired,
- **h.** serendipity was also used, i.e., areas of the library containing literature on higher education materials were inspected in person for titles that might be relevant to this research. Several new sources were found this way,
- **i.** additional materials were acquired after restarting this process and conducting more detailed searches using search engines on computer databases and in consultation with the research librarians at Oregon State University.

The researcher used the examination of documents (and other written materials) from the study sites in
order to construct the intent and meaning of the authors. The context and purpose of the documentation was considered when analysis was conducted.

The comparison/analysis of the transcripts and documents used a framework of methods modeled on Ritchie & Spencer (2002). This framework includes:

a.) data immersion (all sources),
b.) discovery of recurring themes,
c.) development of indices and diagrams,
d.) charting of themes and development of a synopsis,
e.) mapping and interpretation of themes to make cause-effect relationships. (Ritchie & Spencer, pp. 324-325).

When examining study-site governance, the focus of the research was narrowed to three important decisions that community colleges face;

a.) who decides the annual general fund allocations?,
b.) who makes the decisions on the hiring of contracted faculty?,
c.) who decides to modify or create an educational program?
These decisions have been used in a past study on community college governance, and were identified as being critical community college decisions (Levin, 2000).

These three governance decisions were studied at the two study sites using both document research/analysis, combined with informant interviews. Both Vance (2000) and Levin (2000) reviewed documents from their study sites in order to obtain information on governance. These documents included:

a.) internal college board policies, rules, association/union contracts, organizational diagrams, and accreditation reports,

b.) external accreditation reports on the study sites,

c.) other documents identified by the informants as being of potential value in the study.

Patton (1990) describes the use of records and documents in qualitative research, stating that; they are the basic source of information about program decisions and background, or
activities and processes, and can give the evaluator ideas about important questions to pursue through more direct observations and interviewing. (Patton, pp. 233-234).

Interviews were used to obtain the perceptions of staff on governance at the study site. The questions used in the interviews were a product of study site document review, goals of the research, and information from other researchers on this or similar topics. Some of the strengths of data collection from interviews include:

a.) data can be collected quickly, 
b.) cooperation with the researcher is facilitated, 
c.) immediate access to the informant to clarify questions and information, 
d.) data is collected in a natural, setting, 
e.) ability to uncover the other persons’ perspective of the phenomenon (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).

The same authors also discuss some weaknesses to the interview process in qualitative research. The informant honesty issue and degree of cooperation were raised. As informants in this interview were volunteers, it is less likely that cooperation issues were a major factor. The length of the interview, along
with the repetition of questions, would lessen these potential problems.

Research data acquired from interviews can be very difficult to replicate by another researcher. This qualitative research was designed to obtain staff perceptions of governance, and transferability of the research is left to the reader. The informants perceptions were revealed in their comments during the interviews, this research did not attempt to make sweeping generalizations about these perceptions. Informant comments often speak for themselves and analysis of this informant data was tightly bound to the informant transcripts.

Detailed literature on shared-governance issues for California and Oregon were not reviewed until after the interviews. Informants were chosen from study site administrators or faculty, as the critical decisions of governance of this research focuses on aspects of college organization that these two groups were invested in.

Perception was defined for this research as being the process by which individuals organize and interpret
their impressions in the attempt to give meaning to their environment. This perception may be selective, in that people often base perceptions on their interests, experiences, and needs (Robbins, 1993).

Informants were evaluated for cognitive dissonance, which was defined for this study as the incompatibility of two or more inconsistent attitudes at the same time. Researchers have commented that high degrees of cognitive dissonance can cause anxiety (Robbins, 1993). The concept of governance might well elicit from the informants cognitive dissonance as they discuss leadership and follower relationships.

The researcher is a community college administrator, and some research viewpoints might consider this a factor that would introduce bias in research. Gummesson (1991), however, considers this form of "pre-understanding" as vital for academic research. This pre-knowledge according to Gummesson includes attitudes and experience from the past, which are potentially both beneficial and deleterious to the objectivity of the research. A general knowledge of governance
principles in community colleges was viewed as an asset to research.

Fieldwork was approached with a non-judgmental attitude, and a holistic approach. A review of literature concerning governance at the study sites was delayed until after interviews were conducted, in an attempt to mitigate researcher bias, as modeled on principles from other qualitative researchers (Lancy, 1993).

RESEARCH FACTORS

This research included human subjects (informants, participants) who were a part of the organizational culture of their community college. This researcher, as an "outsider", needed to consider that informants may often mean something different that from what an "outsider" might interpret them to be saying. This relates to a concept from cultural anthropology termed "emic", where what insiders do and say and perceive about their own culture is to some extent only understood within the confines of that inside culture.
“Etic” research findings are from the outsiders’ references and perceptions, and their attempt to understand (Harris, p.184).

There is one school of thought in anthropology that rejects all etic research as biased, and without validity (Schwandt, 1998, and Harris, 2001). This “Interpretivist” school tries to only acquire emic data. This researcher believes that etic data is prone to bias, but this bias can be mitigated. Some techniques that were used in this research to mitigate etic bias included:

a.) the use of written documentation from the study site and it’s analysis,

b.) the feedback from informants on their meanings of terms/words during the interview,

c.) repeating interview questions in an attempt to elicit bias from the researcher, and overcome it,

d.) seeking voluntary feedback on the interview coding from the informants (no participation occurred however).
These techniques are suggested from readings by Gummesson (1991).

VALIDITY AND TRIANGULATION

Validity was viewed by this researcher as the accuracy of the data and the reasonableness of findings and conclusions (Levin, 2001). The ability of another researcher to initiate and obtain similar data from the same sources at the time of this study, is referred to as reliability, and was a goal of this study. This was qualitative research, with emphasis on the perceptions of staff. The use of informant interviews and of document analysis is more subjective in nature, reliability of the information will be proven through descriptions of research method and data analysis to the reader.

The choice of informants was guided by a paradigm of purposeful sampling, whereby the researcher chooses a sample population that fits the characteristics of the study's purpose (Patton, 1990 and Levin, 2001). Two administrators from each study site were chosen, one
with over three years experience in their administrative position and the other a recent appointment. Three faculty were chosen from each study site. One faculty informant from each college was the president of the Faculty Association (or equivalent). The other faculty informants were one experienced faculty and the other a recent hire. The total number of informants was decided not by a sample size, but rather the consistency of the informant information and perspectives. This research is qualitative in nature, and a sample size based on statistics was not employed. The main criterion for informant choice was richness of data as described by Patton (1990), and Denzin and Lincoln (1998).

Two study sites were chosen, one in California and one in Oregon. The use of two sites in two different states was an attempt to uncover possible external effects of state policies on governance of community colleges. The study site in California was part a community college district. The annual headcount for the California study site was around 29,000 students in 2001.
The second study site, located in Oregon, was an independent community college with an annual headcount of around 28,000 students in 2001. There are differences in the tabulation of these headcounts in each state. The California study site was larger than the Oregon study site. These study sites will be referred to as the "Oregon Study Site" and the "California Study Site" in this document.

The fieldwork for this research was conducted during the summer months, and informant availability was another factor. Many faculty were not present at the study site during the summer months, so summer class schedules were used to choose faculty to be interviewed. Faculty association presidents were chosen from internal document references. All informants were contacted by mail prior to interview, with human subject’s materials from Oregon State University mailed to them for review in all but one case. All informants did receive a description of the research, and an informed consent document. All interviews were held only after the informant had read and signed the
informed consent document. No informant received any compensation for their participation in this research.

Triangulation of the research findings was accomplished by comparing the results of this research to available literature on the topic. Informant feedback on the coding of transcripts was attempted, but informants elected not to participate. The review of literature on the governance of the two study sites was not undertaken until after the field interviews and coding had been completed. This delay was an attempt to decrease researcher bias and pre-judgment about the two study sites.

Internal and external documents were obtained on the two study sites, including self-study reports for accreditation. The external accreditation reports that were conducted of the two study sites were considered valuable points of triangulation, and were used for both study sites. Less specific and more general reviews of community college governance issues were also used in the triangulation process.
The documents that were used to obtain data on governance at the study sites varied to some extent. The governance structures at the California Study Site were different than those at the Oregon Study Site. The documentation reflected this structural difference, with California Community College district documentation on governance being a primary source for the California Study Site. The Oregon Study Site, as a more independent educational entity, did not use documentation that was focused on external governance issues (other than general reference to state statutes).

Documents that were older than five years were not utilized directly as an example of current governance practice. The age of the documentation was considered important to the currency of the governance data it provided. Some older documents were referenced for historical or background information purposes. Current documentation was most often consulted, so that
informant perspectives could be matched to present-day governance policies and practices (in written form).

Hermeneutic methods were employed in the analysis of the documents. Hermeneutic methods used on the documents were modeled from Forster (1994), and employed these steps:

a.) understanding the meanings of individual texts,
b.) identifying themes in these readings,
c.) clustering themes,
d.) triangulating with other documents,
e.) checking validity with other sources or informants,
f.) revising the document data as needed,
g.) checking to determine if all relevant documents have been studied.

The documents may not present a complete picture of the governance policies or procedures at the study site. The documents may not be written in a clear and concise way, the documents may contain omissions, and the documents may use terms that are not completely understood by the researcher. The documents do provide
an indicator of what is available to staff at the study sites in their attempts to understand the explicit rules of governance.

INFORMANT INTERVIEWS

Interviews were conducted with selected informants from the study sites. The interviews were structured to be the same format for each informant, with an interview checklist that was completed before, during and after the interview. The interview checklist covered topics and concepts that could affect the interaction with the informant, and included these factors:

a.) review of interview questions and goals,
b.) checking audiotape equipment and notes,
c.) description of the setting,
d.) age, gender and job title of the informant,
e.) attitude and non-verbal cues,
f.) my clothing and appearance (consistency),
g.) other factors.
These checklist items were prompted from readings on research interviewing from Eckstein and Baruth (1996), and Jennerich and Jennerich (1997). A copy of this checklist is included in the appendices.

In all but one case, audiotapes were made during the interviews. The informants had a hardcopy of the interview questions for their review and were encouraged to retain these for their records. A copy of the signed informed consent document was made for any informant who asked for one.

Interview questions were determined primarily by reference to the goals of this study, and were approved by the Institutional Research Office of Oregon State University prior to fieldwork. The interviews were held at the informants' office at the study sites, and hand-written notes were taken during the interviews (Downs, Smeyak, & Martin, 1980).

Audiotapes were replayed within days of the interviews and transcribed by the researcher, in consultation with the hand-written notes. The transcripts were evaluated for recurring themes and
concepts, which were compared to other data from this research.

INFORMANT INTERVIEW PROCESS

Informants were chosen from contracted faculty in order to permit the informant having direct contact with governance issues in their workplace. The assumption was made that informants who were non-contracted faculty might not have much direct experience with governance issues at the study site. Another significant factor was potential availability. The interviews were conducted during summer months, and many faculty were not available for those months.

Using rosters of faculty from study site documents, one faculty member was chosen, as was one administrator. Other informants were often selected based on recommendations of the initial informants, such as the selection and use of faculty association presidents at each study site. The researcher at the California Study Site knew one administrator, this informant was helpful in the selection of several
informants from that site. Two faculty informants at the California Study Site were selected at random from a list of courses, based on their teaching schedule during the summer months.

At the Oregon Study Site none of the informants were known to the researcher, but were selected based on their job title, availability during the summer and in one case, referral by another informant. No classified staff were interviewed because the research questions on governance were not directly applicable to their jobs.

Prior to all interviews the interview checklist was used and all informants provided ample time to discuss their perceptions on governance.

The first four questions were developed to help ease the informant into the interview process. Questions #6 through #15 were repeated at the end of the interview to provide informants an opportunity to revise or add to their comments. Terms or definitions used in the interview were discussed by the researcher with the informant to clarify joint meanings. Each informant was given ample opportunity at the end of the interview to
add anything to the session that was relevant to governance at his or her work site.

INFORMANT TRANSCRIPT CODING

After transcription of the interview was completed, it was set aside until all others were finished. The ten transcripts were then read several times, with the researcher attempting to identify recurring themes in the perceptions of the informants. Field notes were consulted, and audio-tapes were again reviewed. This data immersion technique was modeled from Patton (1990). The recurrent themes were adopted as codes, with trials from three transcripts used for code development, and then these trial codes were used for the rest of the transcripts. Modifications and adjustments to the codes were made. The total of eleven codes or themes is a product of this process. Definitions for these codes were developed and this procedure follows past practices from Northcutt (2001) and Carspecken (1996).
CODING ANALYSIS

The thematic codes were analyzed with regard to frequency of the code usage in the transcripts, and for cause-effect relationships (affinities). The techniques used were adapted from Northcutt (2001), Plewes (2002) and Carspecken (1996). The cause-effect analysis and frequency of thematic codes for this research will be presented in Chapter Four.

TRANSCRIPT ANALYSIS

Transcripts were directly compared with each other for certain informant perceptions on governance. Some interview questions lent themselves readily for comparisons, especially the open-ended questions that sought informant perceptions and interpretations on governance. A synopsis of informant perceptions was compiled for each question, for each study site, and for faculty versus, administrator. When appropriate, governance topics were directly compared from the written documents to the synopsis findings from the
study sites in a table format. The diagram below depicts the research structure used in this study:

**Diagram 1: Research Flow Chart**

1. **Define research question**
2. **Research literature, collect documents**
3. **Develop interview questions and get approval from O.S.U./I.R.B.**
4. **Conduct interviews after consent form read/signed, and checklist completion**
5. **Conduct literature review and document review**
6. **Develop qualitative research methods to be used:**
   - Document analysis
   - Informant interviews
7. **Select study sites and select data-rich informants from these sites**
8. **Using field notes, transcripts and audio-tapes - develop recurring themes and synopsis of interviews**
9. **Compare/contrast documents to informant perceptions, develop findings and theory that emerges from the process**
10. **Triangulate with literature review and accreditation reports of study sites**
CHAPTER SUMMARY

Hermeneutic document analysis and informant interviews from select administrators and faculty served as sources of data for this research. The qualitative nature of this research prompted the selection of staff at the two study sites who could provide rich data on the governance issues of general fund allocation, the hiring of contracted faculty, and the development of a new educational program. The phenomenon of governance was approached as a combination of subjective perceptions and document-generated governance processes/rules.
CHAPTER IV - RESEARCH FINDINGS

SECTION ONE: STUDY SITES - SETTINGS AND DESCRIPTIONS

The California Study Site was located in central California. It was part of a larger community college district, which contains three other community colleges. The California Study Site had an annual student headcount of approximately 70,000. An economic recession beginning in the fall of 2001 had impacted California's state budget. The California Study Site was facing a budget crisis when the interviews were conducted in the summer of 2002. An external, regional accreditation visit was also imminent when the interviews were conducted. These may have been an important in informant perceptions at that college, and were considered in the analysis of data from this site.

The Oregon Study Site was located in the Portland metropolitan area of Oregon. The college was not part of any formal state community college structure, but was loosely guided (externally) by the Oregon Department of Education. The Oregon Study Site had an
annual student headcount of approximately 28,500. An economic recession starting in the fall of 2001 had impacted the states' budget, and this site was facing a budget crisis when interviews were conducted in the summer of 2002. The college had a new president. The new president had succeeded a very popular, dynamic president who had led the college for over ten years. These factors were considered in the analysis of data from this site.

Documents and Document Analysis

One method utilized in this research to discover and understand governance at the two study sites was the acquisition and analysis of their documents. The formal, written rules, policies and procedures of governance are contained in the documents that were acquired from the two study sites. The reading and analysis of these study site documents, is hermeneutic qualitative research.

The two study sites provided different documents for research, due to their different governance structures,
and different types of documentation. The documents that were studied and analyzed were products of:

a.) informant suggestion,
b.) document availability,
c.) date of publication (documents older than five years were used only for background information, documents less than five years were considered more relevant to the study sites' current governance issues),
d.) relevance to the research question.

These study site documents may not present a completely accurate picture of the governance policies. Errors in document interpretation may be present in the findings. The reasons for possible error in document analysis include:

a.) the documents themselves may not be written in a clear and concise way,
b.) the documents may contain omissions,
c.) the documents may have used terms that were not completely understood by the researcher.
The documents from the two study sites were not viewed by the researcher as totally complete or totally accurate. These documents do provide a valuable indicator of what was available to staff at the study sites in their attempts to understand the explicit rules of governance.

CALIFORNIA STUDY SITE

California Study Site Governance Documents

The following documents were reviewed as sources of explicit governance policies for this site:

a.) Hiring Manual for Full-Time Faculty - California Study Site District (November 2001),
b.) California Study Site District - Offer of Employment,
c.) California Study Site: Institutional Self-Study (July 2000),
d.) California Study Site District Strategic Plan (August 1997 - background information only),
General Fund Allocation

Based on the documents from this site, the District appeared to control most of the general fund allocations for the colleges that comprise it. The general fund budget allocations were based on funding formulas and ratios. The California Study Site had very little independent control over their general fund allocation. The California Study Site (and the District) used a rollover budget each year for the general fund, i.e., the old budget served as the basis
of a continuing service level budget to which additional monies, if available, were added.

The California Study Site did have a Budget Committee that makes recommendations to the president on the use of discretionary funds within its general fund (California Study Site Self-Study, 2000, and California Study Site Budget Committee Minutes, 2002). The discretionary funds of the general fund were less than 2% of the total annual general fund allocation.

The California Study Site Budget Committee was composed of a mix of faculty, administrators, classified and student representatives. Over twenty representatives made up this group, their function was:

a.) provide an avenue of communication among the students, staff and administration on campus budgetary matters,

b.) review and monitor the budgeting process and procedures, and make recommendations to the president,

c.) identify budget problems with district-wide implication, and make recommendations for improvement or solution to the president,
d.) develop institution-wide budget recommendations, review budget proposals in public meetings,
e.) institutional goals and objectives (California Study Site Standing Committee Membership, 2001 and California Study Site Budget Committee Minutes, September 9, 2002).

These documents suggest that the Budget Committee at the California Study Site was not a decision-making body, but provided recommendations to the people making decisions. The importance of these recommendations, the weight they carried, was not disclosed in the wording of this document.

The California Study Site Institutional Self-Study document described this committee as making recommendations to the president on the use of general fund "discretionary" funds. These discretionary funds were difficult to discern from the documents made available to the researcher. Another document on general fund allocation (California Study Site Summary
2001-2002 Budget) indicated that distribution of the discretionary funds was made on this basis:

a.) Vice-president of instruction = 41% of total made at their discretion,

b.) vice-president of student services = 11% of total made at their discretion,

c.) vice-president of administration = 38% of total made at their discretion,

d.) college president = 10% made at their discretion.

The Self-Study document presented internal survey results, conducted of California Study Site faculty in the past year, which revealed faculty satisfaction with the budget planning process was the lowest score that respondents could choose.

The district wide document "Mapping the District" provided written explanations of financial governance policies. This document stated that the distribution of funding for the colleges within the district (which includes California Study Site) was almost exclusively a district function. The District performed this
function because of California state laws regulating the distribution of restricted funds.

The allocation of unrestricted funds was based upon factors and formulas developed by the district. Any funds that are not allocated for salaries and benefits became the discretionary funds that are available for the individual colleges to allocate on their own. The documents from California Study Site indicate that the people who make the final decisions on these funds were the Vice-Presidents (as mentioned previously) and the deans.

The actual texts of the documents need to be reviewed at this point. Some of the documents from the California Study Site used these words to describe the role of the Budget Committee:

the committee recommends changes in the proposal to the college president, which if accepted, are incorporated in the plan submitted to the district, and college discretionary funds were recommended for allocation by the Budget Committee based upon proposals of the use of the funds submitted by faculty and campus wide staff in the past. (California Study Site Budget Committee Minutes, 2002)
The California Study Site Budget Committee was considered by the researcher to be a body that makes recommendations on general fund allocation (the discretionary portion) not final decisions. This conclusion was based on the terms/words in the documents and other phrasing related to that committee.

Hiring of Contracted Faculty

The documents from this study site indicated that the college president had the final word in the hiring of contracted faculty. The board would vote on this recommendation for hiring, formalizing the decision. These documents were examined to determine the hiring governance policy at this site:

a.) Hiring Manual for Full-Time Faculty (November 2001),

b.) California Study Site District - Offer of Employment (March 1991),

c.) 2002-2005 California Study Site District Agreement With the College Federation of
Teachers, Local ###, Study Site Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO (August 2002),

d) Supervision and Control P-3112, Office of the General Counsel - District (July 2001).

These documents indicated that the hiring process was initiated at the departmental faculty level and then followed a prescribed procedure so that a hiring committee was formed. The hiring committee composition was structured, with faculty representatives (within the affected department and faculty from other departments), the academic dean/director, and Human Resources representative (a student representative may also sit on this committee).

The hiring committee followed a process, clearly delineated in the hiring manual, in the search for a suitable faculty candidate. Human Resources would initiate the recruitment. The hiring manual included some very specific recommendations to the people in the hiring committee, such as, "how to look or appear attentive" during the interviews.
The hiring committee then made two or three hiring recommendations to the college President, who would conduct their own interviews of these finalists before making the final decision. The college President presented the name of the selected finalist to the District Chancellor and Board of Trustees. The finalist was legally hired by a vote of the district Board. The documents indicated that the President made the final decision on the hiring of contracted faculty. The documents did not educate the reader on the level of collaboration or power sharing between the hiring committee and the college President.

Educational Program Development

The District appeared to control the development and approval for educational programs at the California Study Site. The documents indicate that California Study Site had limited autonomy in the development of a new educational program. The District controlled program development within its’ member colleges, attempting to avoid redundancy and excess competition
within the district. These documents were used in the examination of educational program development;

a.) District Strategic Plan (August 1997),
b.) Supervision and Control, Office of the General Counsel - District (July 2001).

The Faculty Handbook (2002) stated that the Faculty (Academic) Senate made recommendations to the study site college on educational program development. The California Study Sites' Curriculum Committee would decide to recommend or not recommend to the higher District Curriculum Committee, proposals for development of an educational program brought to them. Only educational program proposals that made it through the college level Curriculum Committee would be forwarded to the Districts' Curriculum Committee.

The study site documents indicated that the District Curriculum Committee "advised" the District Board of Trustees on matters related to curricular issues within the District. The District Board made the final decisions on curriculum (and educational programs)
based on the recommendations from the Districts' Curriculum Committee.

General Document Comments

Many of the documents for the study site were available online through either California Study Site's website, or through the District website. The college and district made these policies available to staff through this medium. Paper or booklet materials were not readily obtainable to the researcher, or most of the informants interviewed in this research.

OREGON STUDY SITE

These documents were obtained from this study site for examination and analysis;

a.) Oregon Study Site Board Policy Manual (2002),

b.) Oregon Study Site Organizational Chart (2002),

c.) Accreditation Self-Study (1996),
General Fund Allocation

The seven documents listed above indicated that at Oregon Study Site the Board of Trustees made the final decision on general fund allocation, based on the recommendations of the college president. The Board of Trustees formalized recommendations from the college president and the college Budget Committee. The number of times or frequency that the Board of Trustees did not approve of these recommendations is not revealed in the college documents.

The college faculty, through their respective departments, had input into the general fund allocation
process. The study site documents indicated that
departmental faculty developed decision packages
(funding requests) that were then sent to the
Presidents' Council, the Budget Committee and then the
college president. The level of faculty involvement was
described in the documents as;

- develop base budgets and decision packages,
- budget originators in each department adjust
  and reallocate their base budgets as needed
  and may submit decision packages (requests
  for additional resources beyond base budgets).
- Presidents' Council reviews all decision
  package requests, then develops a proposed
  budget.  
  (Visions Booklet, 2002).

The documents include many references to shared-
governance in general, here is a sample of the wording
used;

- Decision-making: the college maintains an
  open and inclusive organizational structure,
  which enables all members of staff to
  participate in the decision-making process.
  (Visions Booklet, 2002).

Hiring of Contracted Faculty

The Oregon Study Site documents described a process
that was initiated when an existing contracted faculty
position became vacant. At that time, the responsible
de dean consulted with the appropriate director/associate
dean regarding the hiring of a replacement. The
decision to replace or not replace involved that
appropriate dean who then consulted the affected
department faculty. If the replacement met the deans'
approval, that dean would initiate a replacement
request. This replacement request was then sent to the
Presidents' Council to obtain authorization to actually
open the position for recruitment.

A screening committee was then formed. That
screening committee included relevant faculty from the
effected department as well as faculty from other
areas, and a representative from Human Resources. The
screening committee initiated the interviews following
recruitment through Human Resources. At this study
site, internal (adjunct faculty members) candidates
were examined first, and then new external candidates.
Human Resources were asked for input on candidate
qualifications, and then finalists were chosen
following interviews.
The finalists selected by the screening committee had their references checked. The Dean of Instructional Services and college president then interviewed these final candidates. The president recommended to the Board of Trustees the finalist selected by the screening committee for hiring, in most cases. The documents indicate that this is a collaborative decision between the screening committee and the Dean of Instructional Services and the President. The vote of the Board of Trustees made the hiring official.

Another mechanism in the hiring process was described in the college documents, this process involved a quota or limit placed on new hires by the Presidents Council for each academic year. The Presidents' Council decides to fund a certain number of contracted faculty positions each year at this study site.

According to the college documents, an annual forum was held for faculty to review all contracted position requests from campus departments that would be influenced by this quota from the Presidents Council. The college documents do not describe what level of
input or power there was to the faculty in this annual forum.

Educational Program Development

The Oregon Study Site Board of Trustees was given responsibility under state legislation/regulation and college policies, for the decision to develop a new educational program.

The process of program development started at the department level. The department faculty developed the statement of need, budget projections, negative impact on other curricula, and enrollment estimates.

Advisory groups or committees, if in place, were used in the development of the program proposal, if no advisory group was in place, an interim advisory group or committee was formed. The associate deans or directors of that area then reviewed these proposals, collaborated with the initiators, and sent the proposal to the deans. The President’s Council reviewed these proposals for the development of a new educational program.
The Budget Committee reviewed the fiscal aspects of the proposal, and then the Board of Trustees decided if the program is implemented.

General Document Comments

Oregon Study Site provided all department chairs and administrators with a paper copy of the Board Policy Manual. This Board Policy Manual was a relatively complete compilation of governance policies for the college, and the manual facilitated staff knowledge in governance issues. It was updated on an annual basis for all staff.
DOCUMENTS - WHAT DO THEY SAY IN GENERAL ABOUT GOVERNANCE?

California Study Site

The documents examined in this research for the California Study Site mentioned collegiality and shared-governance in the "District Strategic Plan", and the "District College Federation of Teachers Contract: 2002-05". A sampling of these includes:

- collegiality = we value cooperative and dynamic relationships. Informed and Decentralized Decision Making = we value informed decisions made by people close to the issues. (District S.P., 1997)

and shared governance is defined:

Shared governance is a collaborative goal setting and problem-solving process built on trust and communication. The process involves representatives from appropriate constituent groups who engage in open discussion and timely recommendation in areas of District policy development and implementation not specifically restricted by any legal and policy parameters. (District C.F.T.C., 2002).

No internal college documents were discovered that explained the college's philosophy or vision on governance at the California Study Site.
Oregon Study Site

The documents used in this research from Oregon Study Site contained more references to shared governance and decision-making than the California site. Some samples include:

an integrated system involving all staff in decision-making and planning has emerged. This has led to fundamental improvement in the communication among the different campus groups, this is paralleled by a nonconfrontive, collaborative bargaining process that has led to multi-year contracts. (O.S.S.-A.S.S., 1996).

The annual college catalog contains;

the college maintains an open and inclusive organizational structure which enables all members of staff to participate in the decision-making process. We believe that institutional direction is driven by information received from the staff, the students, and the community...all employees should have a clear understanding of how they are connected to the decision-making process, we achieve a balance of decentralized and centralized decision-making. (O.S.S. Catalog, 2002).

In the “Visions to Reality” document, given to all employees of the college, numerous diagrams and descriptions were provided that educated the reader
about governance at the study site. This document had a flow chart, which depicted the "decision-making networks at Oregon Study Site". The diagram is illustrated below:

**Diagram 2: Decision-Making Network at Oregon Study Site**  
(from the "Visions to Reality" Booklet, 2002)

The Board Policy Manual also included several references defining what was meant by the term, shared-governance. Other statements on shared-governance come
from the annual college catalog and part of Board Policy # 105. The Oregon Study Site Board Policy Manual was a three-inch thick document that provided information on governance; it included references to state laws on governance in community colleges.

Another document that provided insight into meaning and context for Oregon Study Site governance was the clear and concise definition of faculty roles in the "Faculty Agreement" (Contract, 2002). The definitions in that section of the document assisted in the understanding that developed by the researcher on faculty roles and governance. An example of some of this description includes:

The primary responsibility of Oregon Study Site instructors are to instruct. Faculty members should prepare and present the content and material of their courses... instruction is the primary function of the College; all operations of the institution exist to facilitate this goal...a full-time instructional assignment is a full-time job. Other outside work or work responsibilities may serve to detract from the instructors’ effectiveness... in addition, to instruction, related assignments include...attending and participating in department, division, and College meetings and committee concerns (Faculty Agreement, 2002).
This researcher could not locate any comparable diagram in a document from California Study Site. The "California Study Site Institutional Self-Study" document did contain a section with a written description of the decision-making process at the college and district levels. This description of governance has been used to generate the summary in this research. The California Study Site Self-Study documents would have had limited availability for faculty reference or use.

SECTION TWO: THE INTERVIEWS

The interviews averaged 50 minutes in length, and all but one was audiotaped. All interviews had hand-written notes taken by the researcher. Most of the questions of the interview were repeated at the end of the interview in case the informant had more to add. Field notes were taken immediately after each interview by the researcher, with informant information, reactions and setting data included in
these notes. Transcription was completed within weeks of each interview. Field notes were consulted during the transcription process. Informant transcripts were reviewed and compared with field notes, any corrections necessary were completed at that time.

The informant transcripts were then analyzed looking for:

a.) recurring, shared perceptions on key questions, and,

b.) thematic code development.

The transcript data is presented by study site and informant job status.

California Study Site Informant Characteristics

These were some of the informant characteristics potentially relevant to the research;

**Informant A** = female, administrator, 4 years experience as an administrator, 40 to 50 years of age,

**Informant B** = female, contracted faculty, 6 years experience as contracted faculty, 30 to 40 years of
age,

**Informant C** = male, contracted faculty, 2 years experience as contracted faculty, 30 to 40 years of age,

**Informant D** = female, administrator, less than 1 year experience as administrator, 40 to 50 years of age,

**Informant E** = male, contracted faculty, 8 years experience as contracted faculty, 40 to 50 years of age.

Transcript Content Analysis

The informant transcripts were reviewed for recurring themes and perceptions as modeled from the work of Ritchie and Spencer (2002), and Riessman (2002). Informant transcripts were viewed as the primary source of data on staff perceptions. These are the recurring perceptions and themes found in the transcripts;

a.) the general fund is fixed, i.e., it is "rolled
over" each year based on a funding ratio/formula, to avoid conflict between divisions and colleges within the District (three out of five informants),
b.) deans have the major decision-making capability with the discretionary funds left over in the general fund (four of the five informants),
c.) hiring of contracted faculty starts at the departmental level, but the president of the college has the real power to hire (four of the five informants),
d.) educational program development or modification is initiated by the departments, the process is complex and time-consuming, and the decision is made at District level (four of the five informants).

One informant who was as administrator, voiced opinions that faculty were not "fully informed" or trained in the governance policies at California Study Site. The other administrator-informant shared the opinion that their college was "minimalist" in written documentation of governance procedures and policies, forgetting that these written documents are one method
of informing and teaching faculty about shared-governance.

Faculty informants shared a concern that they wanted more information and training on governance policies, but did not get this from administration (*two of the three faculty informants*). There was an implied expectation that administration should be training faculty on shared-governance by faculty members. The administrators implied that faculty should initiate training on shared-governance, that it was not their job as administrators to have to train their staff. The written documents from this study site and from its district did not address this need for training, it is assumed by the researcher that this is a tacit knowledge issue.

The faculty informants also shared a concern that the unwritten rules on decision-making were significant to them in governance issues at California Study Site. The informants who were administrators did not mention these unwritten aspects of governance in their interviews. The unwritten assumptions and processes of
governance became more apparent at California Study Site with this shared-governance training issue.

Response Comparisons and Trends

This qualitative research into staff perceptions of governance depends heavily on the informant transcripts. The use of transcript segments to illustrate staff perceptions to the reader is important in the process of informing.

These selections of the interview responses were indicative of informant perceptions on question 10. Question 10 was worded as, “What do you know about your colleges' policies and rules on governance (decision-making)?”. Relevant portions of the statements are in bold print;

Well, I’ve learned over the past two years that the academic senate is really and should be, and does serve as the voice of the faculty. I have had an opportunity to attend their meetings, and see what the budget committee does. I serve on the budget committee, as well as the planning committee. It deals with governance structure, so if you want to see faculty governance sharing, it is in these committees, especially the academic senate. (Informant C - faculty)
I could not locate a (single document or website) that identifies the governance here, simply because it has been formed by the past tradition or history of the institution, and partly because we've been rather minimalist in writing it down. Does this help the outsider understand the policies or practices? No, it doesn't, but it works for us. It is flexible and works. (Informant E - faculty)

I know a lot about the college's policies because of all the time I have had here, the faculty have input a lot, but often do not understand the exact meanings or intents of wording in documents and processes. They often miss the goal that is there, and sometimes they (the department chairs) do not entirely represent their departments. So, the process has some problems. I often act as an intermediary between higher management and the departments, explaining things to both. (Informant A - administrator)

The informant responses to question 11 were also indicative of perceptions of governance. Question 11 was worded as "What explanations or understandings have your college provided you regarding governance (on the three decisions mentioned above)?"

The general fund allocation (governance policy) I have nothing written down. I do have something in writing on how to request something (like equipment or a guest speaker), but how the general funds are allocated and where funds come from, I have never seen anything (written), my knowledge comes from
discussion in the department with other faculty. Our department chair often tells us (faculty) about the money and limits in meetings, and we often really do not pay much attention. The understanding is most often what we hear, not read. The WHY is not dealt with, the faculty handbook does talk about the procedure and such, but not the WHY. How long has it been this way? I am not sure, our union has had a lot to do with it. (Informant B - faculty)

Well most of my understandings of these topics come through my participation on committees, and lately through talking with people up and down these halls on things like "why do we do this?" We have a lot of people retiring and we are losing their knowledge, and with this huge change in the guard we are loosing the way and why things are done here. The committees are important as learning through involvement. (Informant C - faculty)

You go to people and ask them for the information you need. I think that the material is written down and formal. (Informant D - administrator)

As an officer of the faculty (he was faculty association president) I understand what the normal faculty member would not know, the Faculty handbook actually does a good job explaining the process to them, most faculty probably do not really know much about it (decision-making) and are surprised when they later go to it (the handbook). (Informant E - faculty)

More open-ended questions such as question 14 (wording was "What are the colleges' rules regarding
governance for the three topics mentioned in questions 6, 7, 8?"") attempted to get at the informants perceptions of governance in the college, here are some excerpts of their responses;

The web site has the best information (on governance)...the faculty contract also deals with many of the topics too. (Informant A - administrator)

The specifics about where the money comes from, I have not seen that written down. I can get a booklet for myself about the annual budget if I want it from administration...if the question was about why do we have the present hiring policy, then that is not covered (in any booklet). The same with the budget which would all be published as to the amounts and where it is going, but as to the WHY or WHAT decisions got it there, then no, it is not covered (in documents). I know of nothing in any written materials to deal with the WHY mechanism, it is all general, and usually dealt with by talking. (Informant B - faculty)

Yeah, I could show you the written policies on governance. There would be some areas not covered, it seems to work though. (Informant D - administrator)

It is not in one piece, it is in Title 5 and State law and the mission statement (of the college) and the faculty senate and the contract. (Informant E - faculty)
Oregon Study Site - Informant Characteristics

These were some of the informant characteristics potentially relevant to the research:

**Informant A** = female, contracted faculty, over 20 years experience as faculty, 40-50 years of age,

**Informant B** = male, administrator, less than 1 year experience as administrator, 40-50 years of age,

**Informant C** = female, contracted faculty, 4 years experience as faculty, 30-40 years of age,

**Informant D** = male, contracted faculty, 8 years experience as faculty, 40-50 years of age,

**Informant E** = female, administrator, over 10 years experience as administrator, 40-50 years of age.

Transcript Content Analysis

Informant transcripts were viewed as the primary source of data on staff perceptions. Based on the informant transcripts and the analysis of informant answers, these are the recurring perceptions found:

a.) all the informants shared the perception that
collaboration is important at this site, this included the process of deciding the allocation of general fund money (five of five informants), b.) most informants shared the perception that unwritten rules and policies of governance were important to how decisions were made (four of the five informants), c.) all faculty informants had concerns that governance would change with the new president, d.) most informants did not know the procedures detailed in documents concerning the hiring of contracted faculty (four of the five informants).

Response Comparisons and Trends

This qualitative research into staff perceptions of governance depends heavily on the informant transcripts. The use of transcript selections to illustrate staff perceptions to the reader is important in the process of informing. These selections of the interview responses were indicative of informant
perceptions on question 10 (Question 10 was worded as, "What do you know about your colleges' policies and rules on governance (decision-making)?"

there is a decision process that is widely known, it is not a top down process for the most part, it is collegial and works through committees and such. (Informant A - faculty)

a lot of the rules here are...some of the rules are formal, like the board policy is established for really critical decisions, a lot of rules are not formal, a lot are based on history on what we did in the past. (Informant B - administrator)

Official written rules? No, there is a Notebook of the boards' policies that I have looked at from time to time when questions come up. I can go back to that notebook when I need to. We also adhere to the contracts...there is a lot of input, a surprising amount of input, by the faculty on decisions here. (Informant D - faculty)

Number one I think Oregon Study Site has a long history of this departmental governance, and very strong faculty participation. So what happened was about 17 to 18 years ago we had a new president come on who believed in participatory governance. He believed in it strongly, and he formalized it, wrote it down. (Informant E - administrator)

The informant responses to question 11 also were indicative of perceptions of governance. Question 11 was worded as "What explanations or understandings
have your college provided you regarding governance
(on the three decisions mentioned above)?"

I learned this stuff from the old timers, the people who had been here when I was hired, there was nothing written down. Oregon Study Site is a value-based place, there is no training, I want it for the department chairs in particular...there are too many new faculty and department chairs coming in who know next to nothing! (Informant A - faculty)

no training, its’ been on the job training here. I basically had no job training. (Informant B - administrator)

typically there is a lot of input (by faculty) into the budget decisions. It is a long process but good decisions come out of that process, and there is buy-in by the faculty. (Informant D - faculty)

it was initially mostly verbal, and I have been involved in all that. Now I find myself discussing the history of this (values/philosophy) and that seems strange at this point in my life. (Informant E - administrator)

The more open-ended question, number 14 (wording was "What are the colleges’ rules regarding governance for the three topics mentioned in questions 6,7,8?") provided these responses from the informants;

There is no specific document or booklet on that, we rely on unwritten policies and rules
and traditions a lot. As people have retired there is a knowledge loss and more inefficiencies and questions. There should be better training for A.D.'s (Associate Deans) and department chairs, there is none right now that I know of.

(Informant A - faculty)

No, I have books on college regulations (he can't find it in his office and laughs), I would have to ask my assistant to help me find it. I have checked this book twice and I think less than 5% of the policies are written down.

(Informant B - administrator)

I do not have a copy (of the Board Policies), but we have it in the department (each department chair gets a copy)...the policies cover the majority of problems, when a new problem arises then often a new policy is created to deal with it, there are gray areas that are okay, it allows flexibility.

(Informant D - faculty)

(She pulls out the Visions booklet and explained the values system) This booklet is our attempt to communicate our values and philosophy to people. It explains how all the different groups are involved (she points to the diagram on decision-making). As you can see this is a very organic system here, and this reveals how people are all connected to this process, we spend a lot of time talking about processes first before we get into the decision-making. So in that we are always sort of re-doing the process, re-inventing it, we spend less time having to explain to people what happened (with the decisions) though.

(Informant E - administrator)
Coding was developed for all of the informant transcripts. The purpose for code development was to find recurring themes, and to facilitate transcript analysis. Coding creates artificial categories of transcript data that have common elements; it is the linkage between the raw data of the transcripts and the researchers' question. The procedures and methods used to develop the coding for this research were modeled on works by Coffey & Atkinson (1996), Strauss (1987), Northcutt (2000), and Plewes (2002).

The codes developed from the transcripts for this study were (with their definitions):

a.) knowledge (informant's description of what they know about governance at their community college, more objective in nature)

b.) perception (informant's feelings or "take" on governance related issues at their community college, with a stated or implied value judgment, more subjective in nature),

c.) why (informant's description as to why
governance at their workplace operates in a certain way),

d.) who (informant's description of who makes decisions at their workplace, it does not always imply the "final" decision but the process of making decisions),

e.) process (informant's description of the governance process at their workplace),

f.) climate (informant's description on others people's satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the governance process at their community college),

g.) tacit (informant's description of governance rules that are not formal, or written, but based on the organizational culture and history of the community college),

h.) yin-yang (informant's description of governance that references a theme of balance or harmony at their college with respect to the way decisions are made),

i.) effect (informant's description of intentional or unintentional effects of governance practice at their community college),
j.) time (informant’s description about the amount of the time that is involved in the decision-making processes at their college),

k.) learning ( informant’s description of how they or others learn about governance at their college).

These codes were developed or piloted from the first three transcripts, and then refined as the other seven transcripts were analyzed. The final codes were tested three times in different readings of the transcripts, twice by the researcher and once with an outside consultant.

Analysis of Transcript Coding

The total number of times a code was attached to transcript sections was tabulated. The total number of times a code (theme, idea, concept) appeared in the informant transcripts was viewed as an indicator of attitudes about governance. The more frequently a theme or code was brought-up by the informants, the more important it might be in the understanding of their
perceptions of governance (Patton, 1990 and Plewes, 2002).

Table 1: Code (Theme) Frequency and Ranking - Both Sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Code (theme)</th>
<th>total times used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>perception</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>why</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>who</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>climate</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>learning</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tacit</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>effect</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>yin-yang</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>time</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The potential impact of the interview questions on the informant's responses was considered. Most of the interview questions were developed attempting to
"discover" the informant's perceptions of governance issues at their workplace. The questions often centered on "who" and "why" issues of governance, with some open-ended questions attempting to cover their perceptions.

The informants most often talked about their perceptions, with "who" and "why" as part of their answers.

Table 2: Ranking of Codes Based on Study Site
Table 2 depicts the differences between the code frequency use at the two study sites. The solid line in the table shows the Oregon Study Site responses, and the dashed line shows the California Study Site responses. The minor differences in the ranking of code (responses) may indicate subtle differences in staff perceptions at the study sites. The differences are not significantly large.

Some similarities between the two study sites include these codes and their ranking in frequency use:

a.) who,
b.) process,
c.) perception,
d.) time,
e.) climate

Differences between the two study sites include these codes and their ranking in frequency use:

a.) knowledge,
b.) effect,
c.) why,
d.) tacit,
e.) learning,
f.) yin-yang.

Both study sites response ranking were similar for the code of "who", which is the informants' description as to who at their workplace makes decisions. The largest difference was in the use of the code/theme of "climate", with Oregon Study Site informants much more frequently describing the governance "climate" at their college than California Study Site informants. The use of "learning" and "yin-yang" themes/codes were more frequent in the Oregon Study Site transcripts than in California Study Site transcripts.
The ranking of frequency code/theme use, when examined between faculty and administrative informants, varied little. The highest ranking for both groups is "perception", which is the goal of the interview, i.e., to uncover the perceptions of the informants on governance. The faculty then talked about "who" at their college made decisions, while the administrators went on secondarily to discuss the "why" of governance. Faculty and administrator informants both used the theme/code of "knowledge"
about the same. The faculty informants talked about “tacit” governance more often than administrators.

Code Analysis

The codes were compared with each other to determine cause and effect relationships, using techniques modeled after Northcutt (2001), Robbins (1993), and Plewes (2002). The number of times a coding was encountered in the transcripts was also a factor in the development of the cause and effect relationship. The codes derived from the informant transcripts could be clustered into categories related to the informants’ understanding of governance at their community college as shown in diagram 3.
Diagram 3: Code Clusters

learning

why

perception + tacit + knowledge

who + process + effect + time + yin-yang

climate

The clustering of the codes as above, lends itself to cause and effect relationship analysis, using inductive reasoning (Robbins, 1993 and Northcutt, 2001). The following diagram depicts the probable flow of cause and effect in the interview transcript analysis:
Diagram 4: Probable Cause and Effect of Codes/Themes

The informant's "perception", "knowledge" and "tacit" appear to be the driving force in their understanding of the governance at their workplace.

Their understanding appears to be shaped by "why" and "learning". "Why" and "learning" moderate and influence their understanding of "who", "process", "effect", "yin-yang" and "time". "Learning" is the mechanism that permits explicit and tacit knowledge.
acquisition, and shapes perceptions and causation (why). The overall perception of "climate" as it concerns governance at their community college is the final product of their perception process.

Comparison of Document Governance and Informant Perceptions

This research was a comparison of the written governance rules and processes of the two study sites, with the perceptions of select staff on governance rules and processes. The table below was designed to facilitate the comparison of these two different sources, and the findings of the two sources. Tables 4 and 5 are a summary of the document and informant data findings.

**Table 4: California Study Site Data Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong>: the documents describe the District as rolling over budgets (continuing service level) from year to year, with small amounts of discretionary</td>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong>: most informants understood, in general terms, the process as published in the district and college documents (4 of the 5). Specific concepts and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The District makes decisions on general fund allocations to the colleges within the district. Directors and deans make the decisions on the use of these discretionary funds at the study site. A Budget Committee with representatives of administration, faculty, classified and students can make recommendations to the deans at the California Study Site.

The documents state that the department (faculty) initiate the process of hiring, and that a hiring committee composed of administration and faculty and human resources interviews the qualified candidates, the finalists are interviewed by the college president who makes the final decision. The president makes the recommendation to the District Chancellor and Board who formally hire the finalist.

Important points were often omitted.

4 of 5 informants did not mention the role of deans in the process.

3 of 5 informants did not mention one or more components of the process.

3 of the 5 informants did not mention the role of the district.

One informant stated the funding was FTE driven, another informant stated that FTE was ignored.

### Hiring of Contracted Faculty:

- The documents state that the department (faculty) initiate the process of hiring, and that a hiring committee composed of administration and faculty and human resources interviews the qualified candidates, the finalists are interviewed by the college president who makes the final decision.

- The president makes the recommendation to the District Chancellor and Board who formally hire the finalist.

- All the informants indicated that the process started with the department and then proceeded as described in the documentation of California Study Site and its District.

- There was general understanding and acceptance of the rules and processes as outlined in the documents at California Study Site.
**Educational Program:** the documents indicated that the process started at the departmental faculty or advisory committee level, and then proceeded to the college Curriculum Committee for their approval. If approved by the college's Curriculum Committee, the process continued to the District Curriculum Committee, and then the district Board. This District Board approved or disapproved of the concept (makes the final decision).

**Educational Program:** the informants were able to describe the documented process only once (1 out of 5), with most informants not aware of the role of all the college Curriculum Committee or the District Curriculum Committee.

Informants not familiar with this process.

---

**Table 5: Oregon Study Site Data Comparison**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund:</strong> documents indicate that continuing service level budgets are common, with departments sending in requests for additional general fund money through the decision-package method.</td>
<td><strong>General Fund:</strong> only two of the five informants knew the budget process as described in the documents. All informants did identify the role of the departments initiating decision-package requests.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These requests go to the Presidents' Council who make the final decision on the general fund allocations.

The President's Council collaborates with the Budget Committee and the Board, and the Board makes the final decision based on these recommendations.

The Executive Council is described in documents as meeting only to decide on issues relating to personnel and collective bargaining.

**Hiring:** the documents describe where the responsible dean works with the director or associate dean to initiate a request for a position.

Once approved by the Presidents' Council, this allows the departmental faculty to help form a screening committee. The screening committee interviews candidates, and send the finalists to the President and Dean of Instructional Services.

**Hiring:** 4 out of the 5 informants were able to describe the most of the hiring process as documented.

The authorization process to fill a position by the Presidents' Council was missed by many informants (3 of 5).

Two faculty informants voiced concern at the president's power in the hiring of contracted faculty, they felt only faculty should handle it.

Faculty seems unaware that the Board is legally

Most did not know the entire role of the Presidents' Council (3 of 5).

**Two informants described the role of the Executive Council as having decision-making roles in general fund allocation.** This perception differs from the written descriptions of the Executive Council.

3 of the 5 informants did use words like "open" or "collaborative" in describing the general fund allocation process.
If they approve of the candidate, the Board formalizes the hiring. entrusted in the hiring of contracted faculty. Presidents Council allocates an annual number of hiring slots for faculty. No informants discussed the provision of governance policy related to an allocation of slots from the Presidents Council.

**Educational Program:**

documents describe the department as initiating the process, and their associate dean or director reviewing the request, which is then sent to the Presidents' Council.

The Presidents' Council makes the decision as to whether to authorize the request, which is formalized by vote of the Board.

**Educational Program:** 2 of the 5 informants described the documented process, most did not know of the process past the point of the department initiating a request.

Informants appear to not use this process often, and are not familiar with the published process.

---

**California Study Site Governance - Analysis and Discussion**

Based on the informant transcripts from this study site, most of the informants from this study site appear to understand the general fund allocation process only in general terms. Informant responses often left out one or more important aspects of the
process. The role of the District was not mentioned by three of the five informants.

Three of the five informants felt the reason for the lack of flexibility and innovation in the allocation of the general fund was to avoid conflict and competition between departments and colleges within the district. One informant mentioned frustration with not obtaining additional money over the past few years, although enrollments had steadily increased in their department. These perceptions on the general fund allocation do not match any published materials from the study site or its’ district. The avoidance of conflict over general fund allocation that these informants describe might be a tacit understanding within the district and study site.

The California Study Site informants did not mention or identify written governance materials 3 of the 5 times they were asked about such materials. At this study site, 4 of the 5 informants talked about learning the rules of governance through informal talks and discussion, or by experience (tacit rules). Informant
reference to written materials that had been used for training was absent.

The faculty informants all questioned the role of the president in the hiring process, and voiced reservations about the complexity and elaborate nature of the hiring process. The faculty informants felt that they had only a small role to play in the selection of people who they had to work with on a daily basis.

The study site informants did not indicate any negative perceptions on the development of an educational program process, maybe because most did not know the process. The informants at California Study Site have less experience at community colleges than the informants at Oregon Study Site.

All of the California Study Site informants were active participants in the college committees that participate in shared-governance. All participants voiced satisfaction in general with the shared-governance at their college. The informants appear to feel content with the exiting system of participation in governance.
Based on the informant transcripts, all of the informants from Oregon Study Site voiced statements that used terms such as "open" and "collaborative" in their descriptions of governance. Two of the five informants were not sure of the general fund allocation process. The informants (3 of 5) talked about how important dialogue and discussion was to the governance process in order to reach consensus and make decisions. Three of four informants discussed the importance of tacit rules of governance in making decisions at their college (unprompted comments).

The Oregon informants appear to feel that they had input even if they did not fully understand the processes of decision-making. Two of the three faculty informants were very involved in campus committees with input into decision-making. All faculty informants shared concerns about the possible change to the way decisions are made with the arrival of the new college president. Three of the five informants could identify a written policy manual or document that provides them
with some of the policies on governance at their college.

The Oregon informants shared perceptions about the amount of time it took to make decisions, what the climate or perceptions of satisfaction were, and the importance of balance (between leader and follower, too much involvement in decisions versus too little) much more than the informants at the California Study Site.

STUDY SITE CONCLUSIONS

The Oregon Study Site informants described a more collaborative governance process and atmosphere at their college than the California Study Site informants. The Oregon informants appear to be better informed about their colleges' governance policy and procedures. The Oregon Study Site informants more often included perceptions regarding the importance of tacit governance rules. These same informants often mentioned dialogue and discussion as being important to their processes.
This researcher identified workplace loyalty and pride in some informant responses. The California Study Site informants seemed reluctant to share negative perspectives with the "outsider". This possible factor in the informant's responses was considered when analysis was undertaken.

The cause for the differences between study sites staff perceptions might be:

a.) Oregon Study Site had more documentation available to staff regarding governance and college values, and there was more perception of training efforts by some informants,
b.) At California Study Site most documents were produced at district level, and not specific to that college. California Study Site had most documents that they did produce on their Intranet (online database),
c.) Oregon Study Site informants had been at their college longer than the California Study Site informants, and exposed to governance processes for a longer time,
d.) Oregon Study Site is an independent college with a possibly more cohesive staff identity (as an independent college) than California Study Site, which is a larger college and part of a larger community college District.

Despite these differences, the informants at both study sites uniformly appeared to be content with their shared-governance systems, and voiced the general perception that they had input into decisions. This satisfaction appears to be a product of the informant’s point of reference, i.e., they are making their judgment on governance with reference to their institution, and their experiences at that site.

The lone California Study Site informant who voiced concerns about the governance in specific areas, had worked at a university prior to accepting the position at one of the study sites. That informant had a different perspective and experience than most of the other informants. The informants appeared to have a locus of control, i.e., they feel that they have input into the decisions of their college. Inference was made
that the informants, especially the administrator informants, tacitly believe in authoritarianism.

One surprising observation that numerous informants discussed, was the importance of learning the college process and method of governance through experience and informal discussion. Most informants mentioned dialogue or discussions as the primary way they learned about governance, instead of through documents or formal trainings.

Some sample comments of this method of learning include:

if you want to see faculty governance sharing, it is in these committees.
(Informant C - California Study Site)

a lot of rules are not formal, a lot are based on history on what we did in the past.
(Informant B - Oregon Study Site)

We are very short on policy so we always say we are not a rule driven college but rather a values driven college. It is difficult to put all this (philosophy and values) in written form, we spend a lot to time talking with new faculty instead, discussing this with them. So, in the last 12 years we have done more of that discussion and that
sharing with all the staff turnover, there has been trouble with the transmission of the culture and its values. In the past few years we have hired a few people as deans, directors or associate deans from the outside. They come into Oregon Study Site very skilled, who can feel stymied because others can block them by saying “but that is not the way we do things here”, even if this is not really the case. Things are often not written down (on rules or process or the ways things get done), (Informant E - Oregon Study Site)

Yeah (I could show you the written, formal policies on governance). There would be some areas not covered. (Informant D - California Study Site)

The more experienced informants often talked about the transmission of their organizational culture and values to new staff. These informants shared concerns that much of the organizational culture was being lost as people left for retirements. As these people leave, the informants shared the sense of loss of the tacit cultural knowledge, of the unwritten rules going out the door with them.

The loss of the unwritten, often subconscious tacit knowledge as experienced staff retires at these colleges does not seem to be discussed in the
documentation from the study sites, although external accreditation teams mentioned it to Oregon Study Site.

The arrival of new staff will provide either an opportunity for the colleges to enculturate them into the existing organizational culture, or for these newcomers to bring with them outside cultural values that will cause changes to occur more rapidly in the college. The study sites will change, but the loss of the historical and tacit knowledge will cause more time and money to be spent on re-inventing their culture. If the retiring staff could be used as mentors to explain to the newcomers the tacit culture of the college, time and energy might be conserved.

The differences between the study sites and the type of shared-governance, might be explained by one informant’s comments:

> I think that this college has a long history of this department governance, and very strong faculty participation. So what happened was about 17 to 18 years ago we had a new president come on who believed in participatory governance, he then formalized it. The documents talked about all this, about the department decision-making process and over the years we review it, revisit it. (Informant E - Oregon Study Site)
The staff at Oregon Study Site internally developed, over an extended time period, a broad-based concept of shared-governance. They spent time, money and energy to encourage it to evolve and grow. There was "buy-in" by staff.

At California Study Site, the history appears different. The documents suggest that shared-governance was mandated from the external (through state legislation and regulations), and that there also has been less time spent developing the concept and values. California Study Site through its documents, devotes much less effort in explaining shared values and in consensus building. The California Study Site tends to follow a more bureaucratic governance model as described by Birnbaum (1988) due to its larger size.

One informant (administrator) at California Study Site voiced the opinion that faculty were not "fully informed" or trained in shared-governance principles. That informant felt their role as an administrator was to be the "middleman" and broker. All faculty at California Study Site felt they needed more training
and education in shared-governance. The tacit understanding between the two groups was that the other group should initiate training and "learn" shared-governance. Faculty appeared to expect administrators to help them learn shared-governance, and administrators seemed to expect faculty to just "know it". Discussion on who should help develop a mutual understanding of shared-governance had not occurred at that study site.

SECTION FOUR - TRIANGULATION OF FINDINGS

Comparison of this researchers findings to the findings of other researchers, is the primary method of triangulating the validity of this study. There are several authors who have examined the practice of shared-governance in American community colleges in general. A few of these researchers have investigated California and Oregon community college governance.

Many of these researchers findings indicate that bureaucratic and political factors often thwart the successful implementation of shared-governance (Cohen
and Brawer, 1996 and Levin, 2000). Some authors suggest that staff in community colleges is not any more involved in real decisions now, than they were thirty years ago (Kezar, 1998).

The effects of Assembly Bill 1725 upon California's community colleges have been studied by other researchers. The law was intended to:

- increase the power and influence of local academic senates, and separate community colleges from their K-12 roots by placing them more clearly in a higher education model. (Kozeracki, 1998).

The implementation of A.B. 1725 has had negative results, resistance to legally mandated shared-governance in California was found in research by Nussbaum (1998). Incentives for incorporating shared-governance in community colleges are rare; instead it is often mandated externally through legislation or accreditation agencies. These externally driven mandates for shared-governance do not have high rates of success (Schuetz, 1999). The consensus of most past researchers is that "top-down" or "bottom-up" movements to adopt shared-governance rarely are successful. The
findings of these researchers include the observation that shared-governance must be developed from within the administration and faculty together, to be successful.

The term "shared-governance" itself has been viewed as imprecise and as leading to confusion. The suggestion has been made that "shared" denotes equal status or responsibility, when that is not the case (Nussbaum, 2000). Some authors suggest that a new term such as "participatory governance" is more precise, and might lead to more mutual understanding of the real intent and purpose of the decision-making process.

Kozeracki identifies some other problems in shared-governance and California's community colleges in:

a lack of consensus on the meaning, intent, or goals of the concept, suspicion on the part of the different constituencies that led to an inability to cooperate and gridlock resulting from decision-making by committee. (Kozeracki, 1998).

Some of these authors argue that ultimately each community college is unique and has its own needs and culture. Imposing a philosophy and set of cultural values from the outside is not always going to be
successful. Some surveyed faculty regard shared-governance as an oxymoron, and they lack confidence in the philosophy's implementation (Cohen and Brawer, 1996).

The informants in this study were often unsure of what the term "shared-governance" meant. Informant comments indicated that the term shared-governance meant input, with administrators and faculty differing on the extent of the input. California Study Site informants indicated in their comments, that recommendations to the people who actually made the decisions, was what they meant by shared-governance.

Oregon Study Site informants appear through the documents and transcripts, to have more input and more weight to their recommendations. This difference in the two study sites once again, may reflect the more independent nature of governance in general at that location.

The lack of training and education for faculty participation in shared-governance is another barrier discussed by other researchers (Nussbaum, 2000). This factor in successful shared-governance, was noted in
comments from both study sites in this research. Faculty informants from both study sites mentioned a need for more training on shared-governance. One administrator-informant at Oregon Study Site discussed at length, the need for dialogue and discussion with faculty on shared-governance.

Mid-level managers also have little training regarding their role in shared-governance, especially on issues related to accountability for decisions. The implementation of A.B. 1725 in California has not made the community colleges develop collegial governance styles according to Nussbaum (1995).

California Study Site

The findings of this research were not as negative as the previously cited authors might lead one to assume. The informants related to this researcher overall general satisfaction with shared-governance at California Study Site. The lone informant with concerns about general fund allocation did come from faculty.
External accreditation evaluators of California Study Site observed:

open and honest communication among and between all college constituencies where trust, mutual respect and positive problem solving are clearly evidenced, the District and college budget allocation systems are formula driven, reducing tensions created by potential annual shifts in funding. (Yglesias, 2000).

Internal evaluators from California Study Site made these observations in a recent survey for accreditation (Lorimer, 2002);

a.) faculty rate communication with administration as a B-, and the spirit of shared-governance as a B-,

b.) administrators rate communication with faculty as a A-, and the spirit of shared-governance as B+,

c.) the overall grade for faculty regarding meaningful input into the budget, the grade was C, one of the lowest scores in the self-study.

This research did not note these differences. The faculty informants from California Study Site were more
positive than the results from the accreditation self-study from the California Study Site. The reasons for this difference are not clear. One possible reason for the more positive tone of faculty informants at this site may be informant reluctance to voice negative comments to the "outsider". The researchers selection of informants may have missed the segment of faculty who felt negative about shared-governance; they may have a tendency not to work in summer.

Other findings in this same California accreditation self-study include:

Table 6: Comparison of California Study Site Faculty and Administrators Responses to Shared-Governance Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>survey question and response categories</th>
<th>Faculty Respondents</th>
<th>Administrator Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;do you believe you have the opportunity for meaningful input into the budget allocation process?&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolutely, yes</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly, yes</td>
<td>21.5%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uncertain</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mostly, no</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>Percentages</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely, no</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Do you believe that the spirit of shared-governance is actually practiced on this campus?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely, yes</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly, yes</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mostly, no</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely, no</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This trend for administrators to rate perceptions of shared-governance higher than faculty, is also noted in other research in California by Flanigan (1994). The informants in this survey at California Study Site followed the same trend.

The problems of turf wars and divisiveness alluded to by Schuetz (1999) are mitigated at California Study Site by the district use of funding formulas and ratios. The small amounts of money that shared-governance deals with at this college (1-2% of general fund allocation), mitigates to some extent, legal
accountability issues and risk. The informants of this study did not indicate problems with divisiveness, only concerns with a lack of funding for parts of their college that had grown. Possible inference could be made that this is tied to possible conflict if the parts of the college that grew received more funding than the other segments of the college (that did not grow).

Oregon Study Site

Oregon Study Site faculty-informants felt they should have more input into governance. Pritchett (1973) surveyed faculty at this study site, with results indicating a desire for more faculty input into decision-making. Her work also uncovered a need for administrators to do a better job informing and educating faculty about the college mission and governance structures. Pritchett indicated that faculty at Oregon Study Site did not understand education program development or approval, a finding that this researcher also uncovered in interviews.
Oregon Study Site was visited in 1996 by the N.W. Association of Schools and Colleges Accreditation team. In their report of the study, they discussed the governance at this site as:

fostering a culture of respect for all individuals as evidenced by the participatory nature of governance (Oregon Study Site Accreditation Report, 1996).

These findings in the accreditation report match the findings in this research. The accreditation report is older than four years, and the findings may have been less reliable due to that time gap. The findings on Oregon Study Site were more difficult to triangulate due to less past research. The strengths of the interviews at the two study sites include the large amount of governance perceptions acquired from the staff, and the ability to obtain clarification of informant perceptions in a safe, natural setting from the informants (Marshall & Rossman, 1995).
CONCLUSIONS

Both transcripts and document-based findings were triangulated with internal and external research. The California Study Site had an internal self-study report and an external regional accreditation report that were used for testing the validity of the findings of this research. The Oregon Study Site had an external regional accreditation report available for use in triangulation, and an older research study of the college from the 1970's. Some aspects of this research were not well suited to triangulation, due to the subjective and temporal nature of the informants' perceptions. Feedback from the informants was solicited for coding, none elected to participate. The lack of informant participation in the transcript coding did not hamper the research.

When this research was initiated, the goal was to describe staff perceptions of governance, and then compare those perceptions to the written (explicit) governance practices. The focus on shared-governance emerged during searches into literature on community
college decision-making, and in the conversations with informants at the two study sites. The documentation of the study sites discussed the use of, and importance of, shared-governance.

The researcher had no assumptions about shared-governance being any better or any worse than other forms of college governance. The researcher had assumed that governance was a product of the complex interaction of college leadership style, organizational culture, organizational history, and staff expectations.

The study site informants were almost always incomplete in their descriptions of the governance processes described in their colleges’ documentation. Most informants, both faculty and administrators, omitted aspects of the governance processes for general fund allocation, the hiring of contracted faculty, and educational program development. This was not an unanticipated outcome, as most college staff does not memorize college policies. The administrator-informants with experience provided the most accurate descriptions of these governance processes.
The informants were universally helpful, thoughtful and sincere. They made efforts to help the researcher understand their perceptions and understanding of governance at their college. The faculty informants often had different perceptions than administrators. The informants from California Study Site had some different perceptions of governance than the informants from Oregon Study Site. These different types of informants, with their varied roles and experiences, shared with the researcher their versions of governance reality. The tendency for administrators to have different perceptions than faculty was documented by Berquist (1992). His study of faculty and administrator perceptions of decision-making at other community colleges revealed a similar pattern.

The two community colleges studied must ultimately balance the positive and negative aspects of shared-governance for their institutions. The informants and the literature, both describe the process of shared-governance as time consuming and burdensome. The same sources also shared the positives such as staff “buy-in” and enhanced collaboration.
After all the literature analysis and informant sharing, the unanticipated finding was that Oregon Study Site has a higher quality of shared-governance than California Study Site does at the time of the study. California, with A.B. 1725, mandates shared-governance from state government level. The informants from California Study Site all shared their enthusiasm for their version of shared-governance.

Oregon Study Site, located in a state, which has legislation that is neutral at best on shared-governance, had a richer, deeper and more pervasive form of shared-governance. Oregon law actually forbids community college staff from participating on the local boards. California has no such laws, and mandates through A.B. 1725 collaboration and shared-governance. Both colleges have accreditation pressures to develop collaborative governance, but these accreditation agencies are not specific on what form that should take.

The informants and the documentation of the two study sites suggest, that shared-governance, like governance in general, is a cultural “value-set”.
Oregon Study Site developed their value-set over a span of over twenty years from within, a product of their organizational culture. Shared-governance must be adopted by the community colleges' organizational culture over time, it must grow from within, and meet the needs of each individual college. It cannot be mandated externally and be successful. The environment for the successful development of shared-governance would appear to include:

a.) a community college administration willing to spend time and money in faculty workloads to facilitate dialogue, discussion, and joint meetings where shared-governance concepts can be shared and developed,
b.) commitment from the college president and other administrators to the philosophy of shared-governance, with a willingness to spend years of time in its' development,
c.) individual community colleges cannot follow a prescribed form of shared-governance, it appears in the data from this research, that each college will need to tailor shared-governance to meet
it's unique and special needs, 

d.) shared-governance will change with time, especially if staff turnover is significant. Shared-governance is not static and it will evolve and move in new directions, it must be guided by a core of committed staff at the college through this process, 

e.) shared-governance has different meanings to different people, and only through much effort in discussions and dialogue can common meanings be derived.

CHAPTER SUMMARY

The informants and documents indicate that shared-governance at the two study sites means that faculty make recommendations on:

a.) general fund allocation, 

b.) the hiring of contracted faculty, 

c.) and the creation of a new educational program.

The informants from Oregon Study Site were more experienced, and had been at their college longer, than
the California Study Site informants. The informants and documents from Oregon Study Site described a more collaborative governance process and culture, than the documents and informants at California Study Site. California Study Site was a larger college, with a more segmented district governance structure. The Oregon Study Site informants appear to have more input into their colleges' decisions than the California Study Site informants.

Tacit governance practices were mentioned more often at Oregon Study Site. The loss of tacit knowledge due to retirements of mature staff was mentioned at both study sites.
CHAPTER V. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The informants related to this researcher over-all satisfaction with shared-governance at the two study sites. Concerns about general fund allocation did come from some faculty at both colleges, with California Study Site faculty voicing concerns on FTE growth and lack of funding support. Oregon Study Site faculty voiced concerns about a new president changing the collaborative nature of governance, and potential impacts of retirements on their organizational culture.

The problems of competition and divisiveness within the various constituencies of the college alluded to by Schuetz (1999) are mitigated at California Study Site by the college and district use of funding formulas and ratios. The small amounts of money that shared-governance processes deals with at California Study Site (1-2% of general fund allocation) mitigate to some extent legal accountability issues and risk. The staff at California Study Site appears to perceive this input into decision-making on 1-2% of budget, as real shared-
governance. It also may be contributing to their frustration on not obtaining general fund support for all the growth they have experienced.

Pritchett in 1973 surveyed faculty at Oregon Study Site. Her results indicated a faculty desire for more input into decision-making almost thirty years ago. Her work also uncovered a need for administrators to do a better job informing and educating faculty about the college mission and governance structures. Pritchett indicated that faculty at this site did not understand education program development or approval, a finding that this researcher also uncovered in interviews.

The informants at Oregon Study Site, in this research, did not indicate dissatisfaction with the amount of input on governance issues as faculty had in 1973. The efforts of Oregon Study Site in the past twenty years to develop and implement shared-governance may have accounted for this difference in results between Pritchett and this research.

The administrators at California Study Site either did not make comments about their responsibility for training faculty on shared-governance, or noted only
that faculty at the college were not informed. At Oregon Study Site, one administrator-informant commented at length about the need to train faculty (all staff) on shared-governance, and the other administrator, who was new to the college, made no such comment. While this is a very small sample, this does point out that administration at Oregon Study Site seems more sensitive to their need to educate staff. It is through time and workload allocation, that faculty will be trained into the cultural value set of shared-governance. The Oregon Study Site administrator who commented on the past trainings, discussion and dialogue, appears to understand that shared-governance is not something that can just be written down on a piece of paper and then assimilated.

If a study site (community college) describes itself as practicing shared-governance, then it needs to provide the time and money for the dialogue/discussion that will be needed to develop that complex cultural value-set. The declaration of shared-governance in documents without the provisions to allow it to develop, will lead to cognitive dissonance and
confusion. The mixed messages will hamper and alienate staff, they will not be able to reconcile the explicit declaration of shared-governance to the tacit practices of the bureaucratic governance model.

RECOMMENDATIONS

"Real Shared Governance"

The need for training and dialogue concerning shared-governance within a community college to successfully implement that model of governance, is one theme that emerged from the informant transcripts. Tacit knowledge and how it is imbedded in the governance operations of the college also emerged from the research data. If a community college declares shared-governance as its governance model, it needs to invest in that model and embed that model into it's culture. Administrators have the responsibility to invest in this governance model. If administrators do not choose to adopt this model of governance, they need to be honest with their staff about that. The
bureaucratic model works well for larger community colleges, but it does not sound very attractive. The importance of matching the explicit governance practices to the actual, tacit governance practices cannot be overstated.

Shared-governance sounds nice, it sounds democratic and egalitarian - and it can be, if it practiced in a committed organizational culture. Externally mandated shared-governance is likely doomed to failure.

"The Retirement Drain"

The retention of tacit knowledge during times of high staff turnover emerged as another theme from the informant interviews. Many informants from the two study sites discussed the impacts of mature staff on the culture of their community college. The loss of tacit (and explicit) knowledge was mentioned often. The cohesiveness and alignment of the college was being affected according to the informants.

Research into existing literature on the topic of tacit knowledge led to "knowledge management" research.
"Knowledge management" is the process of finding, retaining and sharing an organization’s tacit knowledge (Kidwell, Vander Linde, & Johnson, 2000). Some examples of organizational tacit knowledge would include:

a.) staff competencies and skills at the workplace,
b.) staff experience,
c.) internal and external inter-personal relationships that facilitates partnerships of organizations,
d.) staff beliefs, values and ideas.

Knowledge management is a process that was used in the business world first, and more recently adapted by a few organizations of higher education (Unknown author, 2002). Knowledge management centers on the use of both information technology and increased interpersonal relations (Komito, 2002, and Luan & Serban, 2002).

Gruber and Duxbury (2002) in research on organizations that have successfully used knowledge management, found these organizational/cultural traits:

a.) openness - the willingness to put all cards on
the table,
b.) trust - no hidden agendas,
c.) top management support - president or C.E.O.,
d.) reward structures within the organization that fosters sharing and collaboration.

These two researchers found in their work that tacit knowledge is best shared "face to face". Explicit organizational knowledge is best shared by written materials, and tacit by personal contact (Gruber & Duxbury, 2002). These researchers cited these other factors;

a.) people in the organization recognized that tacit knowledge had value,
b.) people wanted to improve workplace relationships within the organization,
c.) management needed to increase the opportunities for people in the organization to interact and share,
d.) people needed to make a formal commitment to share their knowledge for the good of the organization.
The benefits of the successful use of tacit knowledge sharing include better decision-making, reduced waste of time (through increased use of best practices), improved innovation and creativity, and faster orientation of new staff (Ward & Alexander, 2002, and Kidwell, Vander Linde & Johnson, 2000).

In this study of two community colleges, informants shared these relevant perceptions:

a.) tacit knowledge is important to governance at their college,

b.) there is not as much communication between faculty and administration as there could be,

c.) retirement of experienced staff is occurring at their colleges with the loss of that knowledge.

As the experience and tacit knowledge walks out the door of these two community colleges, the burden falls on the remaining staff to operate their college. Knowledge management might assist these two community colleges in this situation. The informants all shared general satisfaction with governance as it was
practiced at their workplace, this foundation of communication and trust could enable the staff to successfully utilize knowledge management.

The recovery and sharing of this tacit knowledge and experience would need to be done quickly, and there would need to be leadership from college administration in educating staff in the benefits and methods. The colleges would add knowledge, and save time re-educating and re-inventing a system that worked.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE STUDY SITES

The California Study Site administration appears to defer to their District in communicating shared-governance values to their employees. No documents originate from the California Study Site that share or educate their staff in the philosophy and practice of participatory management. The California Study Site omission may be a lost opportunity for the dialogue and discussions that are the foundation of successful shared-governance.
The internal self-study of the California Study Site indicated faculty dissatisfaction with their participation in decisions on budget. Senges’ (1990) management approach of a “learning organization” might be a model that the California Study Site should adopt. This model of organizational philosophy is an adoption of a long-term commitment to training, education and discussion within the staff of the organization to share information.

The administrators of the California Study Site need to provide time and training to the faculty (and other staff) so that tacit governance issues can be discussed and shared. The administration of that college must provide this collaborative and open dialogue so that shared-governance can operate. Assembly Bill 1725 mandated the need for the college staff to have input into the decision making of their institution. That bill was a noble attempt to provide college staff a voice in governance, with the outcome of a more committed and energized employee in return.

The Oregon Study Site with its new president, large number of retirements and faculty anxiety, is at a
point in its history where it can either grow stronger or slowly sink into bureaucratic apathy. The Oregon Study Site organizational culture has evolved into a unique form of shared governance. This organizational culture is in transition, and the senior administration needs to re-affirm its' own commitment to shared governance at this critical time. Senge's model of a learning organization might also serve the Oregon Study Site well in its' attempts to deal with this time of transition. Shared governance, a fragile organizational philosophy, will need to be re-invented and re-affirmed at the Oregon Study Site.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This research was limited in scope to two community colleges and to the staff perceptions of governance at these sites. Explicit, written governance policies and procedures were compared with the way staff felt governance really operated. There was overall informant satisfaction at both sites for the way the governance process was operating, with some hesitations on the
part of faculty about their real role in decisions. There is limited ability to generalize from this study with a more global perspective. A larger number of community colleges might provide more data that supports a broader appreciation of how staff perceives governance. The need to study additional sites and the need for follow-up on the potential use of knowledge management are areas for future research.

A follow-up study of the same two study sites would be useful, to discover the staff perceptions of governance after large budget cuts and new leadership had created catalysts for change.
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APPENDICES
Appendix 1

Informed Consent Document  April 14, 2002

School of Education
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

A. Title of Research Project: Staff Perceptions on Community College Governance

B. Investigators: Dr. Betty Duvall, Professor and James Bell, Doctoral Candidate, Community College Leadership Program, College of Education, Oregon State University.

C. Purpose of Investigation: The focus of the study will be to determine if there are differences between what the staff perceptions of governance are, and what the policies (board rules, protocols, contracts and formal administrative policies) at the community college study sites. These differences, if present, will be explored.

D. Procedures: I understand that as a participant in this study the following things will happen:

1.) Pre-study screening - the investigator has researched public documents of the community college study sites to find suitable staff and board members to participate in the research. The investigator-selected staff will be asked by the investigator to be a
research participant through email, phone calls or a letter.

2.) what participants will do during the study -
(a.) talk and discuss with the investigator their perceptions of college governance, telephone or email follow-up with participants may be needed,
(b.) share their knowledge with the investigator,
(c.) review and comment on their input to the investigator,
(d.) one, possibly two sessions will be needed, with time estimates of 1 to 2 hours per session,
(e.) confidentiality of participants will be kept from their institution and in all publications,
(f.) all audiotapes from the interviews will be destroyed at the completion of this research project (which is at the end of the doctoral thesis defense).

3.) Foreseeable risks or discomforts - Mr. Bell will take measures to reduce risk and gain your approval to be a participant in the interview process. Confidentiality will be maintained as described. The informants will be given a fictitious name or letter of the alphabet to provide some anonymity to their responses. The nature of some of their responses could identify them to others from their institution if people from the study site read the doctoral thesis. When feasible, paraphrasing will be used to reduce that possibility.

4.) Benefits to be expected from the research -
(a.) participants may acquire more information and insight into the governance of their own college, this may increase their workplace knowledge,
(b.) the research findings may help community college staff better understand governance at their institution.

5.) Alternative procedures or course of treatment - none.

Confidentiality: I understand that because of the nature of this research, the identity of the participant does not have to be given in the findings. Any information obtained with this study that can be identified with me will be kept confidential to the full extent of the law. A code letter or number will be used to identify sources of information, neither my name nor other identifying information will be used in any data summaries or publication. There is the possibility that a future reader of this research from your institution might formulate a theory as to which an informant was, based on your responses. They will have no real way of determining your identity and the researcher will not release your identity. As a participant you will have the opportunity to review your interviews’ findings. All tape recordings will be erased and destroyed when this study has been completed. All notes/papers and digital records will also be destroyed once this research study has been
completed. You may decline to respond to parts of the interview.

**Voluntary Participation Statement:** I understand that my participation in this study is completely voluntary and that I may either refuse to participate or withdraw from the study at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

*If I have questions:* If I have any questions about the research study I can contact **James Bell** at 541-917-4547 or email at: bellj@proaxis.com or **Dr. Betty Duvall** at 541- 737-5197. If I have questions about my rights as a research subject I should contact the **IRB Coordinator**, OSU Research Office, (541) 737- 3437 (email = IRB@oregonstate.edu)

My signature below indicates that I have read and that I understand the procedures described above and gives my informed and voluntary consent to participate in this study. I understand that I will receive a signed copy of this consent form.

__________________________  name of subject:

signature of subject (or subject's legally authorized representative)

Date signed:

__________________________ subjects phone number:

**subject's present address**

__________________________ signature of investigator  ______________ date signed:
The Institutional Research Office at Oregon State University approved this document.
Appendix 2:  

Interview Questions

These are the questions utilized in the interviews with informants at the two study sites:

1. Informants’ Name =

2. Informants’ work area/status =

3. Informants’ work phone/email =

4. Number of years at study site =

5. faculty, administration (circle one)

6. Describe whom at the college makes the decisions on the allocation of general fund money for the annual budget.

7. Who makes the decisions on the hiring of contracted faculty for the college?

8. Who makes the decisions on development or modification of an educational program at the college?

9. Why does _______________ (their answer from above) make the decision for:

   a.) general fund allocation,

   b.) hiring of contracted faculty,
c.) development/modification of educational programs?

10. What do you know about your college’s policies and rules on governance (decision making)?

11. What explanations or understandings have your college provided you regarding governance on those three decisions (mentioned above)?

12. Would you like to have more participation in these decisions?

13. Would you like to know why certain people or groups make these decisions?

14. What are the colleges’ rules regarding governance for the three topics mentioned in questions 6, 7, 8?

15. Has governance changed in the college recently?
Appendix 3

James Bell, Research Interview Checklist 07/02

Prior to the Interview -
1. Check tape recorder and notebook.
2. Check attitude and non-verbal communication.
3. Review the interview questions and goals.
4. Arrive on time.

During the Interview -
1. Remain an active participant/observer.
2. Record as much possible with distracting yourself or the informant.
3. Clarify and develop definitions, concepts, and findings.
4. Restate the informants responses at the end of the interview, encourage their editorial suggestions.

After the Interview -
1. Ask questions of the informant such as:
   - what do you mean by ..........?
   - what questions or concepts do you think should be asked?
2. Record the details of the surroundings, events and emotional components of the interview (time, responses of the informant, non-verbal communications, etc.).

3. Review the notes and tape recording.

4. Send a thank-you letter to informant.