College governance is a function of structure and of how people act within that structure. Organizational strategies no longer identify administrations as monopolies that possess all of the good ideas. Recent organizational management approaches to governance promote inclusiveness in decision-making and are at odds with the community college's historical structures, with K-12 roots, which foster strong, control-oriented leadership. This study describes and explains perspectives on shared governance among selected community college representative leaders at a Vanguard community college. Results indicate that community college governance coordination is not static and its success is based on historical and cultural influences. Colleges are socially constructed organizations influenced by current stakeholders building upon the foundation laid out by those before them. The social influences are both internal and external. Local and state funding decisions, accreditation requirements, legal decisions, social/cultural trends, economic demands, and leadership philosophies influence the governance of a community college. Many governance systems in colleges don't work because they address content (the knowledge, structure, and data in a college) or process (the activities and behaviors), but fail to address the context in which both of
those elements reside. The determinant of people's action isn't what they know but how they perceive the world around them. How to appropriately involve classified staff, faculty, managers, and students in decision-making is a concern for college presidents and boards. However, if they ignore the role college constituents can play in creative development and problem solving, presidents and boards run the risk of missing out on the best solutions facing the college.
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College governance is one of the most widely discussed and misunderstood topics in postsecondary education today (Alfred, 1998). The issues of authority, influence and power are often unclear to administrators, classified staff, and faculty working in today's community colleges. A need for clarity in decision-making processes becomes even more important when tight resources and the need for accountability become more intense. The ability of institutions to respond to state and local needs can mean the difference between a healthy organization and one mired in a quagmire of inflexibility and political strife. As Duderstadt (2004) states, "the greatest challenge and threat to institutions arises from the manner in which the institutions are governed, both from within and from without."

**Governance Models**

Governance is a function of structure and of how people act within that structure. Cohen and Brawer (1996) observe that one of Richardson's (1975) three descriptions of bureaucratic, political and collegial governance structures often materializes at community colleges. The bureaucratic model describes a traditional, rule-bound, hierarchical power structure similar to K-12 structures. Authority is
delegated from the top down with the faculty, staff and students each occupying respectively lower levels of the pyramid. The political model proposes a perpetual state of conflict between constituencies—trustees, administrators, faculty, staff and students—each with competing interests. The collegial model proposes a community of scholars, with consensual decision-making processes involving all constituencies affected by the decisions. Shared governance is usually seen in this third structure.

**Defining Shared Governance**

Shared governance has long been thought of as an ideal model for community colleges. Various meanings and terminology have been used to describe it, because employee groups and college leaders tend to define it according to their own goals. A governance model that engages the campus community in the decision-making process has been variously termed "shared governance," "participatory decision-making," or "team leadership." Definitions often focus on who participates in making the decisions and/or how decisions are made.

"Shared governance" is a term that some authors define as a process involving anyone affected by the outcome of the decision (Nussbaum, 1995; Schuetz, 1999). Those affected by the decision often include faculty, staff, students, representative councils, etc. In this definition the people are identified by their positions. Other authors focus their shared governance definition on a concept of team effort in mutual decision-making (Levin, 1998; Nussbaum, 1995).
From the review of various shared governance definitions, common themes emerge: inclusive decision-making, responsibility shared by those affected by decisions, right to collaborate, mutual decision-making, participation by constituencies, and right to advise the leaders on decision-making. Constituencies can include the governance board, administrators, classified staff, faculty, students, employee group councils/senates, and unions. As Tierney (2004) states, "like the U.S. population's definition of democracy, there are multiple and conflicting interpretations of shared governance, not simply from campus to campus but also within the institutions" (p. 202).

**Statement of Problem**

Shared governance has many definitions and a long, storied history of contentious debate at college and board levels. Institutions with strong governance councils, or unions operating in a political model of governance, have structures that frequently support ongoing faculty, classified, student, and administrative participation in institutional decision-making. Lack of opportunity for a governance system to mature and improve is a challenge. Understanding the barriers and perspectives of stakeholders in the system is imperative to continued governance-system development and success.

Among the challenges in college governance are competing interests and definitions. Do colleges actually function better if they have shared governance? Do competing interests and competing definitions provide an enhanced environment for solving political power struggles between employee groups, administration and board?
Does a college governance system impede the ability of the college president and administration to manage the college effectively? Do employees have more ownership in decisions when they participate in the decision-making process? These and other governance questions emerged during the research process.

**Statement of Purpose**

The purpose of this study is to describe and explain the perspectives on shared governance found among selected community college representative leaders at a Vanguard community college. The findings of this study may assist community college boards, faculty, presidents, and support staff in the future by providing a clearer understanding of constituency expectations of shared governance. Finally, this study examines the successes, pitfalls, cautions, and advice that leaders and governance participants need to know for successful implementation of a community college shared governance system.

**Significance of the Study**

Shared institutional governance has been a primary form of decision-making at many American colleges and universities for over a generation. According to Tierney (2004), shared governance is to higher education what mom and apple pie are to American culture (p. 202). Over the past decade, however, several trends have placed unexpected pressures on institutions of higher learning and on the governance systems that address these external pressures. These trends include fluctuations in state funding,
concerns over the escalating cost of tuition, calls by politicians and accreditation agencies for greater accountability, increased competition from for-profit institutions, and impacts of technology and distance learning. Conditions such as academic capitalism, increasing governmental interaction, and funding turbulence affect the balance of power and players in institutional decision-making.

Colleges find themselves in a position of increased accountability and responsibility from accreditation and legislative bodies. According to Ehrenberg (2004), accreditation agencies are playing a more interventionist role and requiring institutions to develop strategic plans. An increasingly complex web of principles and authorities define the relationship between a college and its staff. Such trends have forced colleges to look at their governance structures in an effort to improve productivity and control costs. Institutions that have historically utilized shared governance in their decision-making processes face the same need to adapt to change.

Despite differing influences in the governance of academic institutions, the role of faculty is both steeped in tradition and assumed as significant by those within the higher education community (Benjamin & Carroll, 1998; Lee, 1980-1981). Understanding these traditions requires constant attention to the changing face of governance in higher education. Some community college governance structures retain the vestiges of secondary education norms—e.g., rational, authoritarian decision-making processes—but such structures are slowly giving way to more participatory processes (Baker, Roueche, & Gillett-Karam, 1992; Cohen & Brawer, 1996).
Shared Governance System Studied

The community college chosen for this study is located in the Pacific Northwest. It is the third largest community college in its state and is governed by a locally elected board. The college is a member of the League for Innovation, which recognizes this college as a Vanguard College. As one of 12 Vanguard Learning Colleges, this college is serving as part of a learning college concept by working to build on values that place learning first throughout their institutions. To be part of this Vanguard project, member colleges must develop and strengthen policies, programs, and practices across their institutions with a focus on five projects: organizational culture, staff recruitment and development, technology, learning outcomes, and under-prepared students.

The college resides in a "college town," along with the largest state university and three private colleges. The college serves a 4,600-square-mile area. Its locations include a main campus, four smaller campus centers and seven community learning centers throughout the service region. Two unions exist at the college: one representing faculty and another representing the classified staff. The college board adopted a strategic plan in 2003 that includes a vision, mission and core values. Under the core value of collaboration and partnership, the board agreed to "promote meaningful participation in shared governance." To that end the college developed a college governance system for implementation the following year. The governance system's guiding principles are published on the college website (Table 1). The listed principles provide a governance framework to access the college governance system.
Focus of Study

This study provides information regarding the following questions:

1. What elements help or hinder community college representative leaders (i.e., board, faculty, president, student leaders, and support staff) in applying shared governance? Interview dialogues were conducted with community college representative leaders.

2. What variables influenced their perspectives? Interview dialogues were conducted with community college representative leaders. Research was analyzed and findings described, along with recommendations for further study.

3. What must be done to improve the effectiveness of shared governance? Interview dialogues were conducted with community college representative leaders. Analysis and description of research findings are provided, along with recommendations for further study.

The study describes and explains the perspectives of selected community college representative leaders at one Vanguard community college. The research (a) provides perspectives of participants engaged in a community college shared governance system, as grounded in organizational theory; and (b) describes the development and implementation of that governance system.
TABLE 1. Governance Principles

- Stakeholders have a right to representation on college governance committees.
- Governance system provides full participation for stakeholders at the earliest possible (feasible, practical or reasonable) moment.
- Support for participants is essential and should include skill/knowledge building, reassignment time/backfill, student support, and other resources as necessary.
- Stakeholders determine their representatives within their established processes.
- The governance system shall provide support necessary for staff and students to participate and contribute usefully.
- The governance system shall encourage and promote a wide range of opportunities for many people to provide leadership regardless of their formal positions at the college.
- The governance system shall provide for clear, frequent, consistent, and timely communication within governance groups and between groups and the wider college community.
- The governance system shall provide for consistent and accessible records.
- The governance system must balance the need to make decisions in an efficient and timely manner and the need to provide adequate time for participation in the decision-making process.
- The governance system should rely on the collective wisdom of the board, management, faculty, classified staff and students.
- Accountability is linked to authority.
- The president is accountable and responsible to the board for decisions made in the governance system.
- The governance system should be efficient and effective and result in timely and informed decisions.
- The governance system supports the college vision, mission, core values, strategic directions and learning-centered principles.
- The governance system embodies Valley's learning-centered principles and is conducted in a learning framework.
- When building the governance structures, types and levels of governance should be understood and addressed.
- Types: bureaucratic, political, and collegial.
- Levels: board, college, constituents.
- System of governance should clearly define and align the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among the board, managers, faculty, classified staff, and students.
- The college governance system provides for clear decision processes.
- As directed by the board, the president is responsible for developing and publishing a college governance system.
- The system of governance should include the ongoing management of college governance councils/teams/committees/task forces, including their charter, accountability sponsorships, deliverables, membership, termination, communication systems, and relationship to the college's mission, vision, core values, and goals.

Researcher Disclosure

The college under study employs the researcher and has done so for the past 13 years. The researcher began employment as a part-time faculty member and classified staff member for one year. For the next 3½ years the researcher was employed as a contracted faculty member. For the following 8 years the researcher served as a division chair and chaired multiple instructional divisions. Presently, the researcher serves on the college executive team as an instructional associate vice-president. In these varied roles the researcher has served in numerous governance capacities, including service on governance councils, chairing and directing college-wide initiatives, and in union contract negotiations. In addition, the researcher serves on publicly elected boards in the college district.

Definition of Terms

Board: The five-member elected body that serves collectively as the governing body of the college.

Chair: This term refers to the elected or appointed leader of a governing body.

Effectiveness: The ability to produce the best result imaginable, which usually involves influencing the actions of others.

Efficiency: The ability to produce a result with the least time and/or resources.

Element: The basic factors, aspects, features, characteristics, traits and attributes that constitute the matter being studied.
**Governance:** The system of decision-making for setting the strategy of the institution.

**Leadership:** The ability to guide and influence internal coherence and harmony of a group or the institution.

**Perspective:** The epistemology "world view" of the participant.

**President:** The hired or elected representative of an employee/student group of the organization under study.
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW

To provide a framework for the study, the literature review focuses on two areas: (a) issues in shared governance and (b) the roles and responsibilities of college leaders in that organizational system. Given the qualitative nature of this study, literature is woven throughout the study, and new areas of research emerge.

From an historical perspective, universities have been the focus of most higher education governance research. Because published studies focused on community colleges are minimal in number, this review first focuses broadly on governance throughout higher education. A review of governance by institutional types follows. Governance structures in public 4-year universities and public 2-year community colleges have similarities and differences, which are identified. Roles of the president, faculty, students, and support staff in college governance are discussed.

Shared Governance in Higher Education

The mid-1960s were critical years in the history of higher education shared governance. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP), co-founded by John Dewey and Arthur Lovejoy in 1915 to promote "academic freedom," was an important group in the development of faculty involvement in governance of colleges and universities. The AAUP's "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" used the term "shared governance" in 1966, and the term began to emerge in the literature (American Association of University Professors [AAUP], 1966). The
statement promoted the idea that all internal stakeholders in higher education (i.e., boards, administrators, faculty, and students) should take a shared responsibility and cooperative action for the academic institution. In effect, the AAUP suggested that faculty members become co-managers of their institutions, a model that is called "joint effort" in the statement and has come to be called shared governance in academic parlance (Keller, 2004). By the end of the 1960s, the focused effort of the AAUP for increasing consultation and communication among institutional constituencies established an identifiable governance framework.

Participation in college governance grew in the early 1970s and signaled a turning point in institutional decision-making (Riley & Baldridge, 1977). Faculty and support staff unionization was growing at a rapid rate. Research on governance in the 1970s revealed shifts in student demographics, increasing faculty unionization, expansion of service roles, and intervention by external agencies (AAUP, 1966; Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977; Corson, 1960; Duryea, 1991; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978).

The 1980s was a continued period of growth. Governance was an issue of research as business practices of team building and empowerment gained favor among management in higher education. This was evident at community colleges with the passing of California's Assembly Bill 1725, approved in 1988. It codified the legal authority between a state board and local governing boards, while increasing the governance activities and responsibilities of faculty through academic senates. In addition to addressing the role of governance, Assembly Bill 1725 addressed the state's
community college mission and functions, affirmative action, student success and access to programs. California state legislation required that management allow faculty to participate in governance (Piland & Bublitz, 1998).

The 1990s brought increased board involvement in budget and program offerings. Declining resources and increased enrollments, continued governmental intervention, and public calls for accountability, resulted in increased interest in college governance (Alfred, 1998; Hardy, 1990; Hines, 2000; Levin, 2001; Morphew, 1999; Piland & Bublitz, 1998; Thaxter & Graham, 1999). Pressures from declining resources, resulting in program reductions or eliminations, increased the need for decisions that directly impacted employee groups. Colleges with unions often faced increased calls for shared decision-making in budget decisions.

The AAUP website provided faculty leadership with recommended policy and contract language for increasing the faculty role in college governance. In addition to legal restrictions, many other issues impacted governance structures in higher education. The Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (Tierney & Minor, 2003) reported that challenges for governance included extreme fluctuations in states' budgets, concerns about rising costs of higher education, calls for greater accountability from educational institutions, increasing competition for new postsecondary providers, and the growth of distance learning. These trends led to greater scrutiny of institutional decision-making and calls for a restructuring of academic governance to improve productivity and control costs (Tierney & Minor, 2003, p. 1).
Union Involvement in Shared Governance

Faculty Unions hold a major role in the promotion of shared governance at colleges and universities. According to Keller (2004), U.S. instructors and professors have always regarded themselves as professionals attached to a college or university, not as employees. University professors tended to shun unionization until recently. Community college faculty, as early as the 1960s, started to form unions to bargain with boards over working conditions, pay, faculty privileges, and similar issues (Keller, 2004). In the 1970s the AAUP started to organize college faculty for collective bargaining. Today there are 500 unionized colleges and universities (out of 3,700), mostly public colleges.

Many public community college faculty are bound by collective agreements. In 1998, certified bargaining agents represented 116,018 faculty at public 2-year colleges (Hurd, Bloom, & Johnson, 1998). "This represents 47.5 percent of all unionized professors at public institutions" (Hurd et al., 1998, p. xii). In the same year, 1998, there were a total of 336 faculty collective bargaining agreements in public community colleges in the United States (Hurd et al., 1998). Thus, collective bargaining plays a significant role in the governance of public community colleges.

Community College Shared Governance

Community colleges' history, mission, and goals are different from those of a university. Community colleges are often more dependent on state governmental funding and policy and thus more influenced by regional, national, and international
forces. Emphases in the community college include a stronger role in workforce development. A global economy further alters state-funding stability because of job outsourcing, and changes due to the information age also affect community college governance systems. Presidents, as community college boards' primary representatives and the persons directly responsible and accountable for organizational effectiveness, have recognized that the utilization of an effective governance system is essential for organizational success.

Compared to the extensive body of research on university governance, research on community college governance is limited. Community college governance structures, which harbor vestiges of secondary education's authoritative decision-making processes, continue to give way to more participatory processes (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). At many community colleges the collective bargaining process has allowed for the development of shared or participatory decision-making (Levin, 2000).

Role of Shared Governance Participants

Alfred (1998) offers a discussion of the misunderstandings and various interpretations of shared governance. The idea of shared governance appears to vary from college to college, as each institution views it a little bit differently (Piland & Bublitz, 1998). Collegial decision-making comes with both positive and negative attributes. Alfred (1998) identified these advantages of shared governance:

- Sense of empowerment,
- Better buy-in to decisions,
- Acceptance of responsibility for decisions,
• Improved morale and an improved college environment,
• Increase in the breadth of understanding related to issues,
• Improved communication,
• Fostering of divergent points of view,
• Improved likelihood that the college will move forward in responding to critical issues. (p. 4)

Alfred (1998) also identified these negative aspects of shared governance:

• Slows decision making,
• Hampers effective management,
• Limits efficiency,
• Diminishes the quality of decisions,
• Slows progress in institutional development,
• Adds to the responsibility of administrators while reducing their authority,
• Makes teaching and learning a secondary responsibility,
• Takes administrators away from strategic responsibilities,
• Disguises the self-serving agendas and political maneuvering of faculty and staff,
• Results in unfavorable amount of power,
• Causes role confusion,
• Causes polarization and adversarial relations. (p. 5)

In summary, the greatest challenge and threat to institutions arises from the manner in which the institutions are governed, both from within and from without (Duderstadt, 2004). Judging effectiveness of shared governance may depend upon the position one holds in the institution. Implementing shared governance may slow decision-making and polarize rather than unite campus constituencies (Schuetz, 1999).

On the other hand, shared governance may help improve campus communication, increase the breadth of understanding related to issues, and promote buy-in to decisions by all parties (Cohen & Brawer, 2003). Community College governance, as described in the literature, varies considerably, perhaps because the implementation of shared governance and research about it originated in research universities.
CHAPTER III: DESIGN OF STUDY

This chapter describes the methodology used in this study. It includes sections on the research design, the selection of participants, the process of data collection and analysis, the study's credibility, the role of the researcher, and ethical considerations.

The purpose of a phenomenological approach in research is to illuminate the specific, to identify phenomena via perceptions of them held by the actors involved. In the human sphere, this normally translates into gathering "deep" information and perceptions through inductive, qualitative methods—e.g., interviews, discussions and participant observation—and representing that data from the perspective of the research participant(s). Phenomenology is concerned with the study of experience from the perspective of the individuals' assumptions and usual ways of perceiving. As such, it enjoys the advantage of drawing observers into the phenomenological complexity of the world, where they can witness connections, correlations and causes and learn how they unfold. Researchers "see things first hand" (Merriam, 2001, p. 96) and try to "fully understand the complexities of many situations" (Patton, 1990, p. 25) that are not revealed through other forms of data collection.

Epistemologically, phenomenological approaches are based in a paradigm of personal knowledge and subjectivity. Moreover, these approaches emphasize the importance of personal perspective and interpretation. Phenomenology is powerful for understanding subjective experience, gaining insights into people's motivations and actions, and cutting through the clutter of taken-for-granted assumptions and
conventional wisdom. Phenomenological methods are particularly effective at bringing to the fore the experiences and perceptions of individuals from their own perspectives; therefore, these methods are also effective at challenging structural or normative assumptions. Adding an interpretive dimension to phenomenological research—i.e., enabling it to be used as the basis for practical theory—allows it to inform, support or challenge policy and action.

Phenomenological inquiries use qualitative and naturalistic approaches to deductively and holistically understand human experience in a particular group (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 2000). Community college campus leaders are an ideal population to place in a position to "self-reflect" on their lived experiences in a shared (or not-so-shared) governance system. Community college campus leaders who have experience in a shared governance environment are in an ideal position to bring about important changes to the system of college governance. A case study utilizing a phenomenological approach allows the researcher to explore in greater depth than quantitative methods usually allow.

This study looks in depth at a college working to adapt a college governance system based upon a stated value of shared governance.

**Research Design**

The study describes and explains the perspectives on effective shared governance among selected community college leaders at one institution. A qualitative methodology and case study design was employed to answer the questions in this study.
The questions lent themselves to the utilization of a qualitative research methodology to provide an understanding of "the meaning people have constructed, that is, how they make sense of their world and the experiences they have in the world" (Merriam, 2001, p. 6). Qualitative research provides an opportunity to "focus on naturally occurring, ordinary events in natural settings," which can ground the study in reality (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). Studying the participants in their "social setting" (Janesick, 2001, p. 539) or "social world" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10) provides insight into an understanding of their interaction and relationships with others, thus facilitating further understanding regarding the reality of their situation. The qualitative researcher has the opportunity to become the "instrument" (Janesick, 2001, p. 533; Merriam, 2001, p. 7) used to describe people, places and things in "thick, rich" terms (Merriam, 2001, p. 29) with sufficient "depth and detail" (Patton, 1990, p. 165). It creates a "holism" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10) that highlights the study. To create a descriptive and holistic view of the problem being studied and to understand the "complex interrelationships among all that exists" (Stake, 1995, p. 37), this qualitative research employed a number of data-gathering methods.

A case study design was utilized. Miles and Huberman (1994) define a case study as "a phenomenon of some sort carried out in a bounded context" (p. 25). Stake (1995) defines a case as "a specific, complex functioning thing" (p. 2). Merriam (1998) views a case as the "end product" of the research (p. 27). Yin (1994) offers a comprehensive two-part definition. First, he says, a case study "investigates a
contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context, especially when the boundaries
between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident" (p. 9). Secondly, a case study
copes with the technically distinctive situation in which there will be
many more variables of interest than data points, and as one result relies
on multiple sources of evidence, with data needing to converge in a
triangulating fashion, and as another result, benefits from the prior
development of theoretical propositions that guide data collection and
analysis. (p. 13)

This study fulfilled the requirements of a case study. The perspectives of board
members, faculty, classified staff, students, and administrative leaders at a public 2-year
community college encompassed a bounded system. In addition, this study reviewed
numerous variables of interest and several different methods of collecting evidence.
Finally, this study benefited from the review of theory that guided the collection and
analysis of data. A case study design was employed because it was the intention of the
researcher to identify a single bounded system at a specific community college. The
researcher conducted in-depth interviews, utilized direct observations, and reviewed
written documents. In addition, field notes and a reflective journal were used to
document perceptions and thoughts.

A League for Innovation Community College was selected as the focus of this
study. The League for Innovation selected the community college as one of 12
Vanguard Learning Colleges to serve as incubators and catalysts for the Learning
College concept by working to build on values that place learning first throughout the
institution. To this end, the college under study implemented a new governance system.
At the college, there were over 50 governance council representatives serving on the
seven defined governance councils. In order to efficiently and effectively narrow the field of potential participants in this study, the researcher elicited the aid of the respective group presidents. This allowed the researcher to utilize personal knowledge in identifying 12 to 20 governance leaders who had demonstrated governance leadership experience.

The researcher made the final decision regarding choice of participants for the study. A representative in the new governance system was selected, in addition to the individuals assigned via their leadership position. All came from a pool recommended by the representative group leaders (presidents/chairs). These recommendations were based on an analysis of the challenges each potential member faced as well as the effectiveness of their responses to those challenges. The challenges included, but were not limited to, issues facing the college in these areas: student learning, student services, finance, diversity, facilities, technology, and college-wide concerns.

Participants also were selected based upon their accessibility and willingness to participate. A direct E-mail introducing the study was sent to each participant after an initial conversation (e.g., direct dialogue, telephone contact; see Appendix A). The researcher followed up the E-mail contact with a personal conversation or telephone call to discuss the study. Each participant signed an Informed Consent Form (see Appendix B). The consent form explained the study. A copy of the signed consent form was given to each participant. In addition, the researcher developed a Participant Information Sheet in order to organize the schedule of interviews, record vital contact information and track the data collected.
The method of selecting participants is referred to as "purposeful sampling" (Patton, 1990, p. 169). Patton sees this method as useful for "selecting information-rich cases for study in-depth to satisfy the purpose of the research." "Purposeful sampling is based on the assumption that the investigator wants to discover, understand, and gain insight and therefore must select a sample from which the most can be learned" (Merriam, 1998, p. 61). In this study, the researcher employed a combination of techniques identified by Patton (1990) as "snowballing or chain sampling" and "intensity sampling" (p. 182). The first round of selection, snowballing or chain sampling, was focused on identification of potential participants by the board chair, college president, faculty union president, classified union president, and student body president. Patton (1990) described this method as identifying interesting cases through the recommendation of others who know which cases will have good quality participants for the study.

The final selection method was based on intensity sampling. Intensity sampling identifies "information-rich cases that manifest the phenomenon intensely, but not extremely" (p. 182). The identification of quality participants and information-rich cases provided the greatest opportunity to understand the perspectives of the community college leaders regarding the role of shared governance in effective college decision-making. The chair and presidents ultimately identified candidates for this study who provided the necessary thick, rich descriptive data that is essential for a qualitative study.
Data Collection

Patton (1990) outlined three types of data gathering for qualitative studies: in-depth, open-ended interviews; direct observation; and written documents. Creswell (1998) later added audio-visual materials as a fourth type of data. Interviews, observations, and document analysis were utilized. Field notes and a reflective journal were used to document researcher ideas.

Observation

Adler and Adler (1994) describe qualitative observation as fundamentally naturalistic in essence; it occurs in the context of actors who would naturally be participating, and follows the natural stream of everyday life. For this study, observation of the participants was often conducted at open governance meetings. According to Max Van Manen (1990), a lived experience can be understood as a prereflective experience. This approach aimed at a deeper understanding of the nature and meaning of everyday experiences. The experience was questioned, and this study attempts to provide insightful descriptions of prereflective experiences without systematizing, categorizing, or abstracting. Observation of the governance participants in nonformal settings were recorded if deemed relevant to the study. Field notes were taken during all observation sessions. Written documents made available during public meetings were collected for later analysis. The College Archives and website were investigated for historical documents. A field-observation form was developed for use
in this study to record the setting, events and behaviors of individuals participating during the sessions.

Observations provided valuable information for triangulating the data. Governance leaders were seen in a setting where their actions were recorded and later compared to the responses they had provided in interview questions. In addition, the observations provided insight into the emotional context involved. Emotion surrounding an event or an issue is an element that usually cannot be captured by reading documents or conducting interviews.

**Interviews**

Interviews were conducted to provide another approach to the collection of data. Patton (1990) states that the purpose of interviewing is "to allow us to enter the other person's perspective" and to "find out from them things that we cannot directly observe" (p. 218). Janesick (1998) defines interviewing as a "meeting of two persons to exchange information and ideas through questions and responses, resulting in communication and joint construction of meaning about a particular topic" (p. 30). Rubin and Rubin (1995) stress the role of the interviewee as a "conversational partner" intricately involved in the evolving nature and character of the interview (p. 11). The researcher interviewed each selected shared governance participant.

The purpose of interviewing the president and a selected shared governance participant from each group was to develop additional rich descriptive information and gain a better understanding of multiple perspectives. Interviews were structured around
a set of questions designed to encourage the active engagement of each participant. Rubin and Rubin (1995) suggested three types of interview questions: main questions, probes, and follow-ups. Main questions are used to start the interview, probes help clarify or elicit further information, and follow-ups go deeper into areas generally covered by main questions. Janesick (1998) provides a more detailed breakdown of interview questions. He offered six types of interview questions: basic descriptive questions, follow-up questions, experience/example questions, simple clarification questions, structural paradigmatic questions, and comparison/contrast questions.

The researcher based the interview inquiries on Janesick's (1998) six types of interview questions. Basic descriptive questions were employed to elicit general background information. Experience/example questions elicited information on the role of the governance participant. Structural paradigmatic questions were used to elicit information on actions taken to reveal the issues and problems facing the participants. Follow-up and simple clarification questions were used as needed. All interviews were scheduled directly with the interviewees at his/her convenience as to time and location. The interviews were tailored to each interviewee.

The researcher expected that some interviewees would not be as forthcoming with information as others. While some interviewees were more comfortable with the process and thus provided a truer reflective reply to each question, others needed additional questions to prompt a complete answer. The interviews provided the majority of the data used in this study. All interviews were digitally recorded, and a typed summary was delivered to each participant with a request for verification of
responses. The researcher typed notes and checked each response for consistency. The typed summaries and checking process provided the researcher with additional insight into the perspectives of each participant and created a close interaction with the data. The researcher listened to the interviews and reviewed each typed summary multiple times to identify potential subject areas in the development of themes. In the interviews and throughout this dissertation, pseudonyms are used to protect the identities of the participants and college.

**Document Analysis**

Written documents provided the qualitative researcher with "mute evidence—that is, with written text and artifacts" to use in the development of a case study (Hodder, 2000, p. 703). Merriam (1998) referred to this type of evidence as physical material "already present" (p. 118) at the institution that may contain information that is unrelated to the study or "clues, even offering startling insights into the phenomenon under study" (p. 119). Document analysis provided a "behind-the-scenes look at a program that may not have been observable and about which the interviewer might not have asked appropriate questions without the leads provided through documents" (Patton, 1990, p. 345). Stake (1995) pointed out that the researcher should estimate the "potential usefulness of different documents" (p. 68) and develop a plan for wise time allocation in the review of documents. Yin (1994) stated that in a case study, "the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment the evidence from other sources" (p. 81). This researcher retrieved all relevant written
documents from the college for review. Appendix C lists the documents reviewed. The researcher collected minutes of the bimonthly governance meetings and entered personal observations in a journal. This data identified controversial issues that arose and also served as a tool to verify or refute other data. Other documentary data included the student newspaper, board meeting minutes, master plans and strategic plans, the college website, faculty materials, and institutional research data. These items were not used in the development of the themes but served to triangulate the data sources. A sample of governance council meeting minutes is provided in Appendix D.

Field Notes and Reflective Journal

Field notes were used to provide "descriptions of what is being observed, the observer's feelings and reactions to what is being observed, and field-generated insights and interpretations" (Patton, 1990, p. 242). Merriam (1998) compared field notes to the interview transcript because field notes represented the observation in written form. Where appropriate, field notes included the following information: descriptions of settings, the people, and the activities; direct quotations or the substance of the conversations; and the observer's comments, including feelings, and reactions (Merriam, 2001). Field notes were taken by hand or laptop. The field notes provided thick, rich, descriptive information on the setting, the participants, and the issues. The notes also attempted to portray a sense of the emotional context generated during the observations. The original field notes were transcribed as data following the same format. The process of transcribing the field notes provided an opportunity for the researcher to
reflect on the event depicted in the field notes and assisted in the development of the reflective journal. Field notes of each interview and observation were reviewed in conjunction with the related summary notes and documents so that the researcher could revisit the entire experience during the data analysis process. Field notes from observations were used in the triangulation of data to support the themes presented. A sample of transcribed field notes is provided in Appendix E.

A reflective journal was kept to record the thoughts of the researcher during all phases of the study. Janesick (1999) identified journal writing as a "major source of data" (p. 507) derived from the researcher's reflections on the observations, interviews, and documents collected during the study. Miles and Huberman (1994) state that field worker's reflections can include information on the relationship with the participants, second thoughts on interviews, questions on the quality of the data, explanations of observations, mental notes on future activities, connections to other data, personal reactions to data, and elaboration or clarification of events. The reflective electronic journal (i.e., e-journal) for this study was started during the initial framing (i.e., proposal) phase of the study and continued through to the conclusion of the study. The reflective e-journal became a centralized place to hold developing ideas and themes for later review and additional reflection. It was regularly reviewed along with the related transcripts, field notes and documents during the data analysis process. A sample of the researcher's e-journal is provided in Appendix F.
Credibility of Study

The credibility of a qualitative study depends on three elements (Patton, 1990). Patton described these elements as

(a) rigorous techniques and methods for gathering high-quality data that are carefully analyzed, with attention to validity, reliability, and triangulation; (b) the credibility of the researcher, which is dependent on training, experience, track record, status, and presentation of self; and (c) philosophical belief in the phenomenological paradigm—that is, a fundamental appreciation of naturalistic inquiry, qualitative methods, inductive analysis, and holistic thinking. (p. 461)

This study met the requirements set by Patton. First, rigor is found in the very nature of this qualitative study because it required extensive fieldwork. Extensive time was required for conducting interviews and meeting observations in an effort to gain a complete understanding of the perspectives of representational leaders in the shared governance system. Also, multiple methods of purposeful sampling were established to ensure that information-rich participants were included in the study. Validity and reliability in this study is found in the copious use of direct quotations from the interviewees to provide a "true description of a given reality" (Janesick, 1998, p. 119). In addition, triangulation was provided by the use of multiple methods of data collection that included observations, interviews, document analysis, field notes and a reflective journal to determine that "we have it right" (Stake, 1995, p. 107).

In order to achieve an understanding of the perspectives of the community college leaders regarding the new shared governance system, the following data-collection methods were utilized: interviews, observations, and document analysis. In addition, field notes and a reflective electronic journal were kept during the study to
provide a method of expression for the researcher's perspective and thoughts. The presentation of the data consists of a narrative describing each case and the persons, places, and events that occurred. The narrative is followed by a presentation of the elements that constitute the perspectives of the representative leaders and the variables that influenced their perspective. The themes that emerged from the data were identified and defined. A "pooled case comparison" analysis (Merriam, 1998, p. 196) was utilized as the method of data analysis. In addition, successes, pitfalls, recommendations were developed based on the themes that emerged. The data presentation and analysis closes with summary conclusions drawn from the study, and recommendations for further research.

**Participant Selection**

The researcher interviewed campus leaders engaged in the governance system. Prior to starting the participant-selection process, the researcher received permission to conduct the study from the college president and institutional research assessment and planning director. The researcher requested that the college president notify the college board of the study. This request was granted and implemented by the college president. Following the approval to conduct the study, the board chair, classified union president, college president, faculty union president, management senate chair, and student body president were contacted to identify two additional members from their respective groups (i.e., administration, board, classified, faculty, management, and students) to participate in this study. These two additional participants had also been actively
engaged in the governance system. Representative leaders were asked to assist the researcher in identifying potential participants and help narrow the field of over 50 eligible participants to 10 of the most qualified participants (i.e., two recommendations from each group). In addition to the six representative leaders, the researcher selected six additional governance representatives to participate. The goal to seek representative experience with the college—as well as age, race, and gender balance—in the inquiry was achieved.

Data-Collection Procedures

Data collection for this study was accomplished via in-depth individual interviews with the selected population. The in-depth interviews were open-ended, with research questions guiding the initial part of the discussion. The interviews helped develop shared themes. The interview focus moved from discussing relevant issues of shared governance to a full dialogue on each participant's perceived barriers and reasons for success in the existing shared governance model.

The primary data-collection method for this interpretive study was the interview process, or more appropriately, a dialogic interview process (hereafter referred to as a "dialogue"). The term "dialogue" refers to the process of actively engaging with participants, because it more aptly describes the reciprocal nature of the conversations (Freire & Freire, 1997; Van Manen, 1990). Generally speaking, the interactions were focused on emergent interaction between the participants and the researcher.
The purpose for the dialogic focus was to engage the shared governance representative leaders in a face-to-face environment and thus more fully understand their own experiences in college governance. The mode of questioning represented an open-ended inquiry that reflects a guided interview style (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998). The questions were intended to encourage dialogue within a particular area of interest (e.g., what helps and/or hinders the participants in the governance system?) and were designed to lead to other topics and issues as initiated by the participants. In this way, the dialogues were not "structured" or "standardized" in any way, but were emergent.

Data from the interviews were then grouped into themes. The themes were consolidated until a focused level of description in meaning and understanding emerged. From this focus, participants engaged in a critical discussion of their own use of governance as well as challenges they faced.

**Data-Analysis Procedures**

According to Stake (1995), "there is no particular moment when data analysis begins" (p. 71). The collection and analysis of data comprise a "simultaneous activity in qualitative research" (Merriam, 2001, p. 151). "The analysis is complete when you feel you can share with others what your interpretations mean" (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 227). Impressions and facts were stored in an electronic-journal (i.e., e-journal) throughout the study. Thoughts and impressions were recorded daily. Eventually, the process became more formalized as the study continued, the amount of data increased, and themes began to take form and emerge from the data. This study utilized Creswell's
(1998) framework for data analysis and representation. Creswell outlined six areas of data analysis and representation for a case study: (a) data managing: create and organize titles for data; (b) reading and memorizing: read through text, make marginal notes, form initial codes; (c) describing: describe the case and its contents; (d) classifying: use categorical aggregation, establish patterns of categories; (e) interpreting: use direct interpretation, develop naturalistic generalizations; and (f) representing: use visualization while presenting narrative augmented by tables and figures (pp. 148-149).

Data accumulated from observations, interviews, documents, field notes and the reflective journal were organized, presented and analyzed under Creswell's framework. Data were collected, reviewed, and sorted by representative group. In fact, the researcher continuously reviewed data, beginning with the interview and transcription process. The typed summaries were reviewed and highlighted to identify correlating common areas. The data were categorized by subject area and developed into themes.

In the literature on governance, empirical research has been the primary mode of inquiry. The purpose of this research wasn't to search for an overriding "truth" as it pertains to the perspectives of campus leaders and their use of a shared governance model. Instead, college governance participants engaged in a dialogue with the researcher on his/her realities and "truths." In this way it can be asserted that no "truth" is more or less "truer" than any other, but simply differently experienced, perceived, and known (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). This research explored how these various truths and
experiences generated themes to describe the "lived experience" of the participants in a new college governance system.

A variety of terms were employed to describe the methodology for this study: e.g., "qualitative research," "phenomenological," "case study," "naturalistic inquiry," "ethnographic methodologies," and "interpretive research" (Bogdan & Biklin, 1998; Gall, Gall, & Borg, 1999; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996; Van Manen, 1990). The use of "interpretive" research assumes that research is an interactive process, one that relies and rests upon how the researcher and participants interpret questions, dialogue, and actions. Gall et al. (1999) address this issue by stating,

Interpretivism is an epistemological position that regards aspects of human environment as constructed by the individuals who participate in that environment, and thus asserts that aspects of social reality have no existence apart from the meanings that individuals construct for them. (p. 529)

"Ethnographic methodologies" were not proposed for this study due to their association with anthropological studies that research and generalize the practices of unfamiliar cultures.

An interpretive perspective was used to encourage the inclusion of intricate details and multiple perspectives by way of feelings, thought processes, and emotions that are difficult to extract or learn about through other research methods (Van Manen, 1990). According to Bogdan and Biklin (1998), this goal of understanding participants from their own perspectives is a common theme among all types of interpretive research.
Strategies to Ensure Research Soundness

A triangulation methodology was used to compare data from multiple sources (i.e., survey, interviews, and literature analysis). The researcher shared a personal disclosure with participants to describe his involvement related to the focus of this research.

To assist with the analysis of each dialogue, the researcher recorded a journal entry about the research process soon after each session. A summary of each interview was provided to each interviewee for review of accuracy (e.g., language, tone, mannerisms) and content. All interview summaries and digital audiotapes are kept confidential.

In interpreting the data gathered through the dialogues a thematic analysis method was used. The method involved a process of collapsing information from the researcher's journal and interview summaries into smaller pieces of data, then categorizing them according to their similarities and differences.

Role as Researcher

According to Bogdan and Biklin (1998), the decision to include an autobiographical personal disclosure is often used "to gain authority with the reader" (p. 191). "The qualitative researcher is always dealing with the lived experience and must be awake to that experience" (Janesick, 1998, p. 57). This study was centered on the participants during the implementation year of a newly launched college shared governance system. The researcher had an interest in this area based upon
organizational governance experience. As an "insider," the researcher shared a detailed experience with the participants in the study and therefore had a unique bond with them. Since an "insider" perspective can potentially lead to research biases, this possibility was acknowledged by the researcher, as "there is no value-free or bias-free research design" (Janesick, 2000, p. 385). A qualitative researcher needs to identify internal bias while conducting and analyzing data. An "insider" can benefit, as the study participants will speak in the organizational culture without stopping to define terms to the researcher. The researcher's acute awareness of the college (due to his 13 years as a faculty member, middle manager, and administrative team member) provided an opportunity for in-depth insight rarely available to most studies.

Furthermore, leaders involved in this study could relate to the researcher, since they knew that he shared some of the same experiences. On the other hand, data from the interviews were burdened by the fact that most participants knew the researcher. The researcher strived to remain objective and refrained from sharing or giving advice to participants. The researcher shared experiences and perspectives in an attempt to (a) be more self-conscious in inquiry and analysis, (b) inform the reader of subjectivity, (c) create a better awareness of that subjectivity, and (d) demonstrate how it related to understanding the writings and research of others. The purpose of qualitative inquiries, therefore, was to enter into an investigation honestly, with assumptions clearly articulated, so that others could realize, yet never entirely know or truly understand, the lenses through which the researcher viewed the world (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994).
Ethical Considerations

"Qualitative researchers are guests in the private spaces of the world. Their manners should be good and their code of ethics strict" (Stake, 2000, p. 447). In this study, the researcher was a colleague of the participants. The researcher had a continuing relationship with the research participants. Therefore, it was important to be very much aware of the need for ethical conduct in the study. Data-collection methods of interviewing and observation could present ethical issues for qualitative researchers. "Interviewing carries with it both risks and benefits to the informants. Respondents may feel their privacy has been invaded, they may be embarrassed by certain questions, and they may tell things they never intended to reveal" (Merriam, 1998, p. 214). In order to respect the intent of the participants, interview transcripts were made available to the participants for their review and final approval. During the interviews, interviewees were assured that the interviews were confidential. If requested, the recorder was turned off whenever interviewees considered their responses too sensitive for recording.

"Observation has its own ethical pitfalls. The act of observation may bring about changes in activity, rendering it somewhat atypical" (Merriam, 2001, p. 215). In this study, all of the observations were made at public meetings where an audience could be present. Merriam (1998) stated that public documents do not usually present an ethical problem because they are open for review by the average citizen. In this study, only public documents were reviewed.
Strategies for Protection of Human Subjects

The researcher used the *Oregon State University Human Subjects Handbook* and abided by the highest ethical standards of research involving human participants. The survey results were coded to remove names, and confidentiality was discussed with and provided to each participant. In interviews, human subjects were provided a written consent form that outlined the elements of the research project. Subjects were given the opportunity to discontinue their participation at any time.

This chapter described the methodology used in this study. The qualitative case study methodology focused on describing the lived experiences of campus leaders in a community college shared governance environment. The participants in the research provided insight into strengths and weaknesses of the shared governance system under study. In addition, recommendations for further study resulted from the research.
CHAPTER IV: PRESENTATION OF DATA

This dissertation focuses on perspectives of representative community college leaders regarding shared governance. The study attempts to answer the following questions:

1. What elements help or hinder community college representative leaders (i.e., board, faculty, president, student leaders, and support staff) in applying shared governance?

2. What variables influence their perspectives?

3. What must be done to improve the effectiveness of shared governance?

This chapter begins with profiles of the college, the college governance system, and the participants in the study. The profile of the college and governance system is presented first. Next, the profiles of the representatives and their perspectives are presented through the use of direct quotations drawn from the interviews. This format is repeated for each of the 12 participants. Pseudonyms are used to protect the identities of the participants and college.

Following the representative profiles and perspectives, the themes that emerge from the data are presented. The themes that emerge from the data are derived from the elements in governance that constitute the perspective of the participants regarding the college governance system. Therefore, themes represent a recurring, unifying pattern that "covers" a set of elements. The themes begin with a discussion by leaders and participants on relevant issues of shared governance. Themes emerged on perceived
barriers and reasons for success of the existing shared governance system. Themes are further defined to offer a clearer understanding of their use for this study. The themes that emerge from the participant interviews are triangulated with college documents or researcher observations. A summary of the themes is presented and displayed in table form.

Twelve community college representatives from one institution were selected to participate in this study. The representatives were either in leadership positions (i.e., president of college, union, student body) or they were recommended by their employee group representative leaders as involved in the college's newly implemented college governance system. Participants were further selected based upon their accessibility and stated willingness to share viewpoints. The researcher individually interviewed group leaders and a selected representative from each group to develop rich descriptive information and to clarify the selected representatives' multiple perspectives on the governance system. Data were assembled through interviews, field notes, observations of governance meetings, the researcher's reflective journal, college documents, and published governance minutes.

The College Governance System

Valley Community College (VCC) was founded in 1964; its main campus was opened in 1968. The college grew out of a technical-vocational school that was founded in 1938. The college is frequently rated as one of the top 2-year colleges in the United States. The college is a member of the League for Innovation in the Community
College and was recently selected by the League as one of 12 Vanguard Learning Colleges. The college has had seven presidents in its 40-year history.

The college's main campus is located just outside of two adjoining cities with a total combined population of 194,000. The college district serves nine communities and a number of unincorporated areas. The socioeconomics of the district include a low-end immigrant population, a rapidly disappearing timber resource, and a small, but wealthy population of business owners. The educational attainment for the county is nearly double the state average: 46.3% in 2000, for a population 18 to 24 years old enrolled in college or graduate school (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). In the last decade, a number of technology-based companies have moved to the area. In the past 3 years, one of the two largest technology manufacturing campuses closed down. Within the next year a large travel agency will open with over 500 jobs.

The college serves a 4,554-square-mile district (State Blue Book, 2004). The total district population is estimated at 330,527. The in-district enrollment was 27,181 at Valley Community College in 2003-04. The college has three branches, including a large downtown center in the largest city in the district. Campus outreach centers are at the next two largest communities in the district, each with a population of roughly 8,000. A Flight Technology Center is at the largest airport in the district; community learning centers are at seven area high schools and at various other outreach sites across the district.

The college is governed by seven elected, nonpaid board members who have primary authority for establishing policies governing the operation of the college and for
adopting the college's annual budget. Their charge is to oversee the development of programs and services that will best serve the needs of the people of VCC. The Classified Union (VCCEF) is affiliated with the American Federation of Teachers and was chartered on May 1, 1973. The VCCEF represented both classified and faculty for one year before the faculty voted to form an affiliation with the National Education Association (i.e., VCCEA).

In 2004-05, Valley Community College had approximately 1,000 contracted (headcount/nonhourly) employees. The number for each employee group included a 10-member administrative executive team, 49 additional managers, 246 contracted faculty, 387 part-time faculty, 453 classified employees (Employee Demographics: Report to Board, 2005).

The college has separate unions representing the faculty and classified employees. The American Federation of Teachers (AFT) represents classified employees working .5 FTE on an annual basis. The local AFT group, Employee Federation, was established at the college in 1975. The Oregon Education Association, affiliated with the National Educational Association, has represented the yearly contracted and part-time faculty working on an annual basis at or above .20 FTE since 1972.

**The College Governance System Development**

The Board of Education held a retreat on June 6-7, 2003, focused on establishing a new college governance system. The board looked at two governance areas: global
governance at the board level and college governance focused on the internal governance system. With respect to their own governance process, the board decided to "govern by policy" and accepted a revision to Board Policy B020 on September 10, 2003:

The Board will govern by policy. It will establish appropriate ends policies and executive direction policies and ensure that accountability measures are clearly identified and reported on a frequency and method chosen by the board. The board therefore agreed to focus on setting policy, establishing executive directions and delegating the general supervision and control of the college to the president, subject to board review and evaluation of the president's performance.

The board directed the president to develop a new college governance system in collaboration with stakeholders in the college. They stated their intention to hold the president accountable for the system and the decisions made through the system.

The president requested the unions, student leadership, and the management representative group to appoint individuals to serve on a task force to develop a framework that clearly defined the college-wide governance system, including structure, scope, roles, and processes (Valley Community College [VCC], 2005). A Governance Task Force charter was approved on February 12, 2004, with representation from administration, classified staff, faculty, managers, and students.

The following areas were deemed by the president, board, and unions to be outside the scope of work for the 2003 Governance Task Force Charter:


2. College compliance with statutory requirements (e.g., ORS Chapter 341, public contacting, employment and labor relations) and board policies already in effect.
3. Administrative policies not related to governance—e.g., operations and personnel.

4. Internal department decision-making.

From September 2003 through February 2004, the Task Force conducted a series of meetings with all the representatives of the various stakeholder groups to address key governance issues and receive feedback from their constituent groups. The Governance Task Force submitted a draft report to the college community, in early 2004, for discussion by constituent groups and college-wide feedback at an established governance E-mail account. The feedback was reviewed by the Task Force and a follow-up memo sent by the president to the college community. The Governance Task Force moved the college closer to achieving board Policy B.025, College Governance, passed on March 10, 2004.

In 2003-04, a governance task force had identified the concepts necessary for the new college governance system. The new governance system was implemented in the 2004-05 academic year. On April 10, 2004, the College Board authorized the president to proceed to implement the concepts. The system was based on Board Policy B.025, which recognized that the college governance system should recognize that the best decisions are made through the inclusion of many and diverse voices. Explicit goals made clear that authority, responsibility, accountability, and relationships among the board, managers, faculty, staff, and students would be clearly described and communicated.
The system of governance would be evaluated by the board of education on the following parameters: (a) clarity, (b) wide and explicit communication, (c) effectiveness, (d) efficiency and timeliness, (e) evidence of processes that encourage employee and student participation in problem solving and decision-making, (f) processes that ensure decisions are made at the appropriate level and by the appropriate group with employees having the necessary expertise, and (g) recognition of support needed for employees and students to participate and contribute meaningfully.

The governance system was charged with planning and policy development for the college and therefore established seven councils. Six councils were charted with responsibility for specific college functions. The College Council was charged with overall oversight responsibility for the operation and effectiveness of the governance system.

The governance system recognizes specific stakeholder groups and administration members by giving them specific representational roles and by basing their participation on appointment by a stakeholder group or by the college president.

The stakeholders groups include the Valley Community College Employees Federation, Valley Community College Education Association, Associated Students of Valley Community College, Management Senate, and Faculty Council. All have rights to appoint representatives to councils. The president appoints Executive Team members.

Each council's charge is recorded in a documented charter and scope-of-work statement, and each acts in accordance with a decision matrix. Within the governance
system, the role of the executive committee is defined as implementation decision-makers. The entire governance system is responsible to the College Board through the college president.

Built into the process are avenues for clear communication, a commitment to the time involved with committee work, and clearly defined roles as to who has power to make decisions. Most important, these components were designed to allow for an effective level of trust and respect between faculty and administration on the various committees.

**Governance Councils**

The new governance system consists of a College Council responsible for the major planning and assessment of the college. Membership includes representatives of the college stakeholder groups (i.e., classified staff, faculty and students), two vice-presidents, the director of Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning and the president.

Six governance councils are organized around the major work of the college (Figure 1). Each council includes representatives of college stakeholders, an administrator with authority and responsibility for the area, and additional members appointed by virtue of expertise. For each council, a charter was developed that outlines the scope of work and a decision matrix that assigns decision-making authority. Councils are allowed to charter standing committees and task forces to accomplish their responsibilities.
The stated goal for the councils (Valley governance training session notes, October 2004) is to operate at a high level of planning and policy development. Councils are responsible for publicly defining processes by which they obtain key stakeholder input at critical decision points (problem definition, solution elements, and final recommendation/decision).

As the Governance Task Force reviewed the current governance system, it became clear that a system organized around the work of the college instead of exclusively around employee groups would better serve the college. These are the reasons for this design:

1. To help keep the focus on the work and its outcomes.

2. To bring the constituents of the college together to deliberate on issues, share perspectives and reach conclusions.

3. To improve coherence by connecting associated issues in one council with standing committees (VCC, 2005).
During the implementation year, the College Council was to serve as the major planning and policy body of the college and was responsible for strategic planning, policy development, institutional effectiveness and for coordinating the governance system and the councils that are part of the governance system.

The need for an organizational development council to focus on college climate and individual and organizational development was considered as a possible addition, but it has not been implemented. (Valley hired a professional development director in July 2005).

The Faculty Association represents the faculty on "all matters bargainable under State law" and provides a common voice for VCCEA members in matters pertinent to their general welfare (VCCEA Constitution). Faculty Council is made up of department/discipline representatives and serves as a faculty forum and referendum holder for all subjects, particularly academic matters (Article 39.1.1, VCCEA Contract). It also has responsibilities, such as grading policy and student evaluations (Valley Community College Education Association [VCCEA], 2005).

The proposed governance system provides greater involvement in the governance of the college for both the Faculty Association and the Faculty Council. The Faculty Association continues to represent the faculty in subjects of bargaining, and appoints seats on the College Council, governance councils, and appropriate standing committees and task forces. The Faculty Council also appoints representatives to appropriate councils, committees, and task forces. The Faculty Council also has responsibility for (a) appointing the faculty members of the Degree Requirements
Review Committee and the Curriculum Approval Committee, (b) approving and referring a college-wide "learning plan" to the college on behalf of the faculty, and (c) functioning in general as a formal recommending body for the faculty on matters of instructional policy and the learning environment (Barber & Davis, 2004).

The Governance Task Force has developed charters for each of the councils to define the purpose, scope of work, and membership of each council. Charters contain a decision matrix to define the roles of each group and individuals for the various tasks and decisions within the scope of each council.

**Governance System Orientation**

The college president and a consultant (a retired faculty member/manager at the college) gave a 2-hour orientation to governance council members in October 2004. During the orientation session, stakeholders were instructed that the college governance system work must be at a planning and policy level, and not at an operational or implementation level (Valley governance training notes, 2004).

In an inservice speech on September 28, 2004, the Valley Community College president stated that the councils have responsibility for planning, policy, and evaluating effectiveness within their scope of responsibility. The councils are charged to function at a strategic level.

Each council is charged with developing appropriate methods for listening, dialogue, and communication with the college community prior to, during, and
following its deliberative process. Each council is responsible for coordinating with the other governance councils and the College Council.

The implementation year for Governance Councils provided the opportunity to evaluate and incorporate existing college committees into the new system. During the year, Councils were instructed by College Council to charter standing committees for their specific area of responsibility. The chartering process has provisions for councils and/or management to charter a task force (VCC, 2005).

The Council members were given the following responsibilities during the governance system orientation (Valley governance orientation, 2004):

1. Consulting with and reporting to their appointing bodies.
2. Communicating with, representing and bringing issues from their stakeholder group.
3. Working collaboratively with other council members, and other councils as appropriate.
4. Fully participating in council work.
5. Ensuring the council charter is followed.

**Governance System Roles**

The governance system established a goal to clarify the roles of faculty, classified staff, students, managers, administrators, the executive team and the board of education in (a) implementing a structure that maximizes participation and the best
thinking of all and (b) placing authority at the appropriate level. The goal is to produce timely decisions that are transparent to the rest of the college community.

Role of the College Board

The governance system recognized the role and authority of the board as responsible to the public and legally vested with final decision-making in all matters of college policies, programs, facilities, budget and personnel (VCC, 2005). This was in accord with board governance decisions in 2002, when the board agreed to a modified Carver model of board governance, which gave the board responsibility to monitor the effectiveness of the college. These policies help guide the president of the college, who is responsible for establishing effective operations to carry out such policies. The board delegates to the president the responsibility and authority to operate the college in compliance with policies and executive directions that are established to guide the work of the president and college.

Role of the President

In the adopted college governance system, the role and authority of the president of the college is to be directly accountable and responsible to the board of education for the educational leadership and effective management of the college's human, physical and fiscal resources. The president's role includes, but is not limited to, the following board directives:
1. Articulation of the vision, mission, core values, and learning principles for the college within which its educational objectives are developed and implemented.

2. Formulation of strategic long- and short-range plans for the college.

3. Provision of leadership, direction and guidance to the administration of the college, including holding administration accountable for completed work.

4. Responsibility for recommending a balanced budget and strategies that lead to fiscal stability to the board of education.

5. Representation of, and acting as primary spokesperson for, the college to various external organizations.

6. Development and maintenance of a climate in the college conducive to productive learning and effective teaching (Valley Governance History, 2004).

Role of the Executive Team

The Executive Team (ET) includes the two vice-presidents; five associate vice-presidents; two executive directors; director of Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning; and the executive assistant to the president and the president. Executive Team members have accountability and responsibility for and to their assigned areas and are collectively accountable and responsible for viewing the college as a whole and making or recommending decisions that align the best interests of their units with college goals.

The role of the executive team is largely in the executive and administrative realm. Members are accountable for particular branches of the college and as such are
active participants in the governance system. It is further recognized that the realms of
governance and administration and the roles of administrators as individuals and as
members of the executive team may overlap. When this occurs it is necessary to clarify
roles and identify the realm in which issues belong.

The board and the president rely on the executive team as a body to provide
expert advice that views the college as an entire system rather than disparate parts.

In the administrative realm, the executive team is accountable and responsible
for the following areas:

1. Collaborating with governance councils to assure that information is shared
to inform decisions/recommendations.

2. Forwarding issues to governance councils according to their charters.

3. Sharing perspectives and implications with councils prior to
decisions/recommendations.

4. Initiating major college-wide issues in conjunction with the governance
system.

5. Executing major initiatives of the college.

6. Implementing plans and policies.

7. Advising the president on matters relevant to their areas of responsibility.

8. Assisting the president in formulating final recommendations to the board of
education.

9. Implementing operational systems and management.
10. Providing triage on day-to-day management.

11. Coordinating implementation of plans, projects and operations.

Job descriptions of individuals largely did not change under this governance system. The primary responsibility of faculty continues to be teaching and creating the learning environment; classified staff support learning, and managers support learning by organizing and implementing strategies to use the resources of the college effectively.

Each of these groups, plus students, are recognized stakeholders, and they are given opportunities to participate in governance. Processes are developed to allow for and encourage such participation.

Role of Students

Students are in a unique position to speak to diversity by virtue of their varied constituency. As recipients of college services, they provide insight about the college's institutional effectiveness and quality. Incorporating them into the college's decision-making processes promotes greater involvement of students in the life of the college and prepares them for community stewardship. Recognizing these factors, the college governance system provides for active participation of student representatives.

Role of Classified Staff

The primary responsibility of classified staff is to support students, faculty, managers, and administrators in carrying out the vision, learning principles, mission,
and core values of the college. Classified staff have extensive knowledge of student needs, college processes and procedures, as well as professional standards and practices. Classified staff members provide the college community with a unique perspective, and offer insight and sound judgment that help guide the decisions made in the governance process.

Role of Faculty

College faculty have primary authority over several areas of the college, including strategies and methods of instruction and assessment; curriculum design; course and program requirements; faculty research; roles, expectations, and interactions among teachers and students; and academic elements of student life. The methods and processes for faculty and instructional department decision-making at the level of the individual course and program are well established—and not the subject of college-wide governance, except as regulated by college policy and external constraints such as state law and accreditation. These principles are elaborated in formal documents of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP, 2006) and the National Education Association (cited in Florida A & M Chapter of the United Faculty of Florida [FAMUFF], 2006).

The faculty, individually and collectively, also participates as an active partner in decisions in other areas of the college. Faculty participation occurs both through collective bargaining processes and in discipline, department, division, and college-wide governance structures. A specific review of the decision-making responsibilities
encompassing all levels of faculty involvement is provided by Faculty Council and VCCEA.

Role of Managers

Managers have accountability, authority and responsibility to work with faculty, classified staff and students to achieve the vision, mission, learning principles, strategic plan and goals of the college. Managers are active partners in college decisions and are charged with executing and implementing timely strategies that move the college forward.

Scope of Council Operations

By state statute, authority to govern Valley Community College is vested in the board of education.

Decision-Making Mode

The 2003-04 governance task force recommended that councils strive to reach consensus. In the event that consensus cannot be achieved within timelines identified for council decisions, councils present majority and minority positions to the College Council or a designated administrator as identified in the council's decision matrix. Recipients of majority and minority positions consider them, and either return the deliberations to the council with advice on resolving the issues, or, as called for in the
governance system charters and decision matrices, resolve the issue and provide the rationale to the council.

The 2003-04 governance task force further stated, "Administrators with override authority designated by decision matrices should do so rarely" (Valley Governance History, 2004). Whenever feasible, overridden decisions should be returned to councils for further work with full explanation of the rationale for the veto. When not feasible (e.g., due to time constraints), the overriding administrator makes the decision and provides the rationale to the council.

Reasonable timelines for council decisions are established early in the decision-making processes, in concert with other councils, the College Council, and administration. Deadlines are established such that failure to reach a consensus decision or majority and minority reports results in moving the decision to the College Council or the administrator with authority and accountability for that area of the college. If an administrator is responsible, he or she may return the proposal to the council or make the decision. The decision and rationale are communicated to the council. If all else fails, the administrator with authority and responsibility may make a final decision/recommendation and communicate it to the college community.

**Council Structure**

The governance council has three defined member roles: a chair, a vice-chair, and a liaison to the College Council. One of the officers or a designated council member serves as a liaison to the College Council. The chair and vice-chair are full
members of the council. The chair is elected by the council members for a one-year term. The role of chair includes the following responsibilities:

1. Facilitates meetings.
2. Drafts agenda with vice-chair and other council members.
3. Reviews notes and documents.
4. Calls meetings.
5. Assures that the council works within its charter.
6. Facilitates appointment of members.
7. Assures effective communication to college community.

The vice-chair of the council is an administrator with authority and responsibility for that area (typically a member of ET). The role of vice-chair includes the following responsibilities:

1. Drafts agenda with chair and other council members.
2. Facilitates the effectiveness of the council by assembling and preparing informational materials.
3. Produces and distributes minutes, notes, and other documents.

Because experience in council process and business is a necessary element of leadership, the chair of each council has at least one year's prior service on that council. It is recognized that this experience requirement, in conjunction with the participation issues noted above, makes it difficult for members of some stakeholder groups to chair councils. Success of the governance system requires that these obstacles to full participation sometimes be compromised (Valley Governance History, 2004).
Participants

Twelve members of the Valley Community College Governance system agreed to in-depth interviews for this study. The president of the college, classified and faculty unions, student body, and chair of the management senate, along with a selected participant from each constituent group, were chosen for interviews. The interviews were performed over a 3-month period from June to August 2005.

Administration Participants

The president of Valley Community College is identified herein as Erika. Erika participated in an interview that provided the following information on topics related to her perspective on the college governance system (Erika, personal communication, June 10, 2005). Erika has over 25 years of service at two community colleges in the state and at all levels (i.e., faculty, chair, dean, vice-president, and president). Erika earned a bachelor's degree in business and social systems and a law degree from the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. She completed a master's degree in adult education and a doctorate in postsecondary education at Oregon State University. Erika is confident and forthcoming regarding her perspectives on college governance and her assessment of the recently implemented college governance system.

Erika has been president at the college for the past 5 years. She was the vice-president of the college for six years prior to her selection as president. Previous to her leadership roles at Valley Community College, Erika served as an instructional dean at a community college located 45 miles away. In addition to college leadership, Erika
serves on a number of national and state boards/councils. She is a frequent speaker and trainer on the topic of women's leadership. Erika, as president, is accountable for implementing a comprehensive college governance system at Valley Community College.

By the nature of her position as college president, Erika is the sole employee of the board, leads the college's executive team, and co-chairs the college council, which is the coordinating group of the governance system.

President Erika sees college governance as a natural evolution in organizations. "Each command and control person is going to have to come to the realization that the days of command and control are over" (Erika, personal communication, June 10, 2005). The concept of a college governance system that engages all stakeholders, from Erika's perspective, is partly due to the culture in the organization: "I see this decision to have collective intelligence involved in the decision-making as imbedded in culture here" (Erika, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

During the interview on elements that help or hinder community college representative leaders in applying shared governance, Erika focused on capitalizing on the collective intelligence at the college and the good intentions of the employees: "one thing that helps is the board and its view and insistence on having some form of governance that includes stakeholders." Erika believes that employees have good intentions in making sure the college is successful: "I think there is a genuine commitment to do good work for the college. I don't think anyone is trying to take the college in a way that isn't helpful."
As the president and co-chair of College Council, Erika has had the responsibility for overseeing the implementation of the college governance system. Her focus on the governance system and implementation has been a top priority. She believes the governance work has helped the college in important aspects of clarity. Erika stated, "Clarity that we've achieved with the board and president having authority was a big step forward, and to have it in writing was helpful. That recognition has helped and taken a lot of the risk out of the governance system." From her perspective, it was important to foster clarity regarding responsibilities: "I know that ultimately if we are going south, I have an opportunity to weigh in and bring things back. . . ."

The governance structure also seemed helpful to the president. Erika stated, "we had policy, planning, and evaluation language and this gives us a way to ask questions (e.g., should we be doing this?), and provides a framework. . . ." The implementation around structure, however, pointed out some of the hindrances faced by representative leaders in applying shared governance.

The issue of stakeholders trusting the system was evident. Erika pointed out, "we build trust by doing it in a way that is inclusive. We shouldn't have to fight at the table building that trust. . . ." Erika believed stakeholders' perceived need for administrators was also a factor:

A small number of employees—I think it is pretty small—that doesn't see a role for administration tugs on the system and creates trouble. There will always be people on the extremes trying to moderate what happens. Nonadministrative members may test a little more as to what is the role of the administrators.
In addition to the challenges of trust and role, Erika expressed concern that stakeholders need to think broadly for the system to be successful: "Different levels of knowledge from the groups is a hindrance." This was further evident in her following statement: "Clearly, if you are an administrator or manager, you're going to have a wider view because you're looking across the institution and seeing it as a system. A manager tends to have fairly deep knowledge of how elements interrelate." Erika saw these identified hindrances as room for the governance system to benefit the college and participants.

Erika spoke about the reason for the new governance system and the desired benefits:

Back to the principles, it gives us a structured opportunity to make sure all of the stakeholders are involved in policy and planning of the college, and that is a big advantage. Tap into where people are coming from and get a sense of why people are thinking what they are thinking, and why.

According to Erika, this benefit was a focus when dealing with budget challenges and their effects on the college: "It is healthy for people to understand how difficult it is to make budget reductions. It was a good education process to have more people involved with developing a list of where we could save money." The focus on the structure of the governance system was a key to its success, according to Erika. She said the college spent "Years and years of talking about shared governance without clear structure. We can now point to a system and decision-making protocols, and we have a real structure in place."
Having said that, Erika believed the development of the structure and clarity of the governance system were seen as some of the disadvantages in the current system. "Uncertainty around the gray area between policy, planning, and implementation is a disadvantage in the short run but an advantage in the long run if it brings clarity [to decision-making]." The decision-making time for the governance system was also one of the disadvantages that Erika's perceived, at least in the implementation year: "Things just go slower. If you or I as president made decisions, it might be a more efficient use of time, but I don't know if it would be more effective."

Erika identified variables such as the role and scope of authority in policy, planning, and implementation as an area needing further development. Time was also an important factor to consider. "Some people might fear that they can't get work done because they have to wait for the governance system to make a decision. This might be the case for some managers." From Erika's perspective, this issue will be resolved as the governance system matures:

Plans truly provide a framework as to what we do, not the how but the what, so people can see the loop back and the value and meaning of spending time at the governance table. It is something that is going to happen. . . .

The work to continue and improve the governance system was an important focus for the president. Erika identified a number of areas needing improvement. They include having a cycle for planning, checking the outcome of those plans, and then acting to make sure improvements would be a welcomed. She stated,

Get through the start-up work and get plans in place. Getting plans in place will guide our work, and then councils will have a regular system
for review of policy and consulting with the administrators on the implementation. The college will get into a routine of a plan-do-check-act cycle.

Erika also pointed out that communicating more effectively with the broader college community is vital: "Having a strong communication loop and communicating that to the broader campus community needs improvement." In addition to communication, Erika said,

another thing to improve effectiveness and build trust for the system is to quit thinking as employee groups. We are here to do the work of the college rather than our own special interests, what makes most sense for the community and college.

The elements that constitute Erika's reported perspective on governance derive from her interview responses (Erika, personal communication, June 10, 2005) and are based on her 25 years of personal experience as a leader in community colleges, as well as her personal beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Erika's perspective included the following: authority, commitment, the common good, culture, engagement, knowledge, leadership philosophy, relationship/trust, scope, structure, systems thinking, time, workload and training (Erika, personal communication, June 10, 2005).

The second administrator to be interviewed is called Molly. Molly is the senior executive team member and has been at the college for over 25 years. Molly started her career at the college as a classified employee. She worked at the college for many years, rising through the ranks to become vice-president for college operations, a role she has served in for the past 13 years. She comes from a family of educators and started her
career in education as a college volleyball coach at a university in a neighboring state.

Molly has a doctoral degree in computer science. Molly was honest and open in her discussion of college governance.

Molly believes that the role of a college governance system is the desire by all of these groups in having a governance system that includes broad representation, broad consulting, and inclusion. I think that is a big help; we have the predisposition and values here. We had high-skill level and an understanding of what types of decisions need to be made and share in a desire to have broad-based discussions before decisions are made.

While the desire for inclusion was important to Molly, she also valued clarity of role:

I would quibble with the term "shared governance," just because I don't think you can share it in the sense everyone can share in the responsibility and accountability. We've stayed away from the term for that reason. Only the president and administration serves in the roles having the accountability for that level of decision-making.

Molly considers accountability an important issue:

For example, I can delegate a decision totally, and say I'll go with a decision no matter if I like it or agree with it. However, if something goes wrong, I will still have the responsibility and be held accountable for the decision. Maybe the issue of accountability is harder to swallow than understand.

Molly pointed out that a lack of shared values could be a hindrance:

It is really critical for this type of a governance system to work at its best. It is critical to have some shared core values that everyone can say, "Yes, I share that value and I make my own participation and consensus vote, yes or no, based on those values." I think we are still struggling with that issue.

Molly further stated,

Another thing that can be a hindrance is people, because they lack experience/background, want to go into the details, which is something
they understand instead of keeping the governance council discussions at a high level. It is human nature to go to something you understand.

Molly viewed the involvement of the unions as a possible hindrance: "Union politics makes it difficult too. Some of the union representatives have self-imposed constraints that don't help the consensus-building process."

While noted hindrances exist, Molly viewed inclusion in the decision-making process as an important variable: "You'll have better ownership and it is better for where we are going as a college." In addition, according to Molly, the time may be well spent: "I think the governance system helps build relationships and that is important to the effectiveness of the college." Furthermore, Molly pointed out, "You get a lot of voices and hear a lot of different perspectives that are critical for decision-making, especially in college-wide planning and strategic decision-making. You miss things if you have voices that aren't there."

Regarding improvement of the governance system, Molly stated it was important to focus on the system:

I think we need to stay on the plan-do-check-act cycle to make sure we are being effective, but other than that we need to make sure the system is operating at the right level. I don't know that there is much more that must be done.

Molly also pointed out the relationship factor:

We need to keep after the relationships, keep after values that keep us learning-centered and respectful and all of those things. To the extent that that doesn't exist we need to snuff (i.e., end) it out now. Doesn't mean we need to be buddy-buddy, but everybody better be listening in a respectful manner, and everyone's voice needs to be heard and incorporated into the work.
Molly saw a need for clarity on policy, planning, and implementation as a final area for improvement. She stated, "[the college] need[s] representatives to stay out of the details and stay at a framework/high level." Having said that, Molly said,

Without high-level plans and policies, without those operations, we are at risk for being adrift. If the plans are clear and relevant, then those plans and policies drive implementation and operations . . . being very, very aware of keeping things in tune and the plans up-to-date is critical to the college and effectiveness of the shared governance system.

Elements that constitute Molly's perspective on governance derive from her interview responses (Molly, personal communication, June 24, 2005), and are based on her personal experiences working in higher education for over 30 years, as well as her personal beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Molly's perspective include the following: authority, the common good, engagement, expertise, historical/cultural factors, leadership philosophy, relationship/trust, scope, self-interest, structure, systems thinking, time, training, and unions (Molly, personal communication, June 24, 2005).

Board Participants

The board chair of Valley Community College is identified as Stuart. Stuart is a physician who has served on the board for 11 years and chaired the board 3 of those years. Stuart is married, and his wife is a recently retired VCC faculty member. During the interview, Stuart appeared relaxed in giving his responses to the questions. He gave the impression of being highly educated about the college, a deeply committed board member with a solid understanding of the college and his role as a board member.
Stuart sees the role of the governance system as supporting a "shared governance" model given organizational constraints:

First of all the concept of shared governance in our college is a hybrid type of governance system, not a pure shared governance system. Shared governance is an impossibility for elected boards in Oregon. I think pure shared governance can only happen where the board doesn't need to approve statutory administrative decisions.

Stuart sees the administration and board as having a key role in the success of the governance system. As a long-time board member, Stuart has seen the impact a president has on the success of a college governance system:

We've had that experience trying to instill a shared governance system with a weaker administration. The more you stay away from micromanaging at the board level the better chance that shared governance-hybrid system can be successful. . . . [A] major component that helps in applying shared governance is a strong administration."

Stuart calls the system of governance currently functioning, more of a "Policy shared governance system that allows for a hybrid-shared governance system."

Stuart finds the tension between the board operating at policy level and needing to help manage the college as an factor that impacts college governance:

From the board perspective the board has to be satisfied that there is some governing process occurring below the board level that actually works. If the board isn't satisfied it is in place, that is an invitation to micromange the college governance system.

As board chair, Stuart sees the ability for an organization to be creative as impacted by the college governance system:

If the board gets involved, management is looking to satisfy the board member. From that point forward the more the administration is trying to meet the needs of a board member, the more it restricts the thinking on the solution. The more parameters the board puts on governance or
management, the more limited the creativity and thinking that will go into the solutions.

According to Stuart, the college governance system must be clear to all employees:

"Confusion at all levels—faculty, management, and classified—will hinder the system."

The board chair elaborated why clarity in governance is essential:

Administrative policies that aren't clear in some fashion get back to the board. This can get back via complaints done sub-rosa, not on the record. Over time, a faulty shared governance system is like a stew that has gone sour.

Clarity on the issue of authority was an important point for Stuart to iterate:

The only employee of the board is the chief. The only person the board hires and fires directly. If that responsibility isn't taken seriously, the board and college will pay for it. It may take years for it to become apparent.

Stuart shared a number of examples, especially with the former president, where unclear policy led to the board needing to getting involved.

Stuart shared the variables he sees that impact the college governance system. According to the board chair, the biggest limiting factor to shared governance at Valley Community College is state statutes: "The worst part in this state, [is the situation] where you have statutory administrative requirements. By statute you're required to be an administrator to approve certain decisions." Another variable is the ability of the board to think at a policy governance level and focus on planning and strategic policy: 

"[The] major benefit for shared governance is it frees the board and allows more time for deliberation and discussion to develop or [for] chang[ing] policy on future concerns
or issues facing the college." Stuart sees governance as a way to improve the function of board work during board meetings.

Going back to an earlier point, frequently, presentations to the board are for the benefit of the presenter and not the board. People, of course, want to tell the board how great their program is and who they are serving. This is of interest but a great waste of board time. If the board asks for a presentation, that is one thing. The focus needs to be on how the presentation influences the board decision around setting or applying policies.

Stuart pointed out that the board is still working on its own governance process: "[The] problem with the current board agenda is it hasn't been modified enough to allow for true policy governance system to work."

In addition to the board-level governance issues, Stuart identified a number of areas where modification could improve the effectiveness of the college governance system. The clarity of the governance system is important to Stuart: "[The] first and most important thing the Board members need to understand: the terms and system of governance." Clarity requires training for those involved, including new board members: "[These members] need education. Three new board members have no experience at all. One has had experience in the past, but not with this shared governance model." Stuart points out that shared governance requires more than an understanding:

Some of us think we understand but don't. Shared governance is more complex than it sounds. At the board level when you start defining ends and means you get real confused real fast. [You] need to have all board members agree to use it and support it. You need to have all Board members understand and agree to use it.
The elements that constitute Stuart's perspective on governance derive from his interview responses (Stuart, personal communication, August 29, 2005) and are based on his personal experiences as a long-term board member, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Stuart's perspective include the following: authority, communication, historical factors, leadership philosophy, process, relationship/trust, scope, structure, time and training (Stuart, personal communication, August 29, 2005).

A second board member interviewed is identified as B. Michael. B. Michael shared the following demographic information (B. Michael, personal communication, August 24, 2005). B. Michael has been on the board for six years, and previously served as board chair and vice-chair. He is a retired English instructor and worked at the college for nearly 30 years. B. Michael was instrumental in helping to form the unions at the college. He received his master's degree from the nearby state university, where he attended on a football scholarship. B. Michael is married and his wife is a retired teacher from a local high school. During the interview, B. Michael was relaxed and freely shared his experiences and beliefs on the shared governance system at the college. B. Michael has a long history with governance at the college from multiple perspectives.

B. Michael sees the role of the governance system to get the best outcome for the college: "People have good ideas who wouldn't necessarily be in leadership positions. In a shared governance system, ideas come to the front that wouldn't necessarily come out with a traditional bureaucratic structure." In the 30+ years B. Michael has been
associated with the college, he has seen the challenge of implementing a shared governance system:

This college has put off implementing shared governance for years because we didn't have an agreement by all groups to pursue it. The application of shared governance requires the consent of all the parties involved. If any group within the group decides they don't want to participate, or want to fight the process, it is a hindrance to the system as a whole.

In addition to all groups agreeing on the need for a shared governance system, B. Michael sees time as a major challenge for the system to fully function: "I expect that one form of assistance for staff would be released time. This is most important for people who are deeply involved in the process to commit." B. Michael goes on to point out other hindrances to the governance system.

One hindrance he sees is a fear of loss of power for administrators: "I think the biggest hindrance is fear that some group is going to give up authority and the resistance to giving up that authority." B. Michael agrees with the board chair that state statutes play a significant role: "It is clear that state mandates and statutes have interfered with the board's perspective and ability to implement shared governance." He further elaborates, "State mandates . . . the board and president have certain responsibilities to do certain things, and the accountability can't be delegated." Despite the challenges, both externally and within the organization, B. Michael sees a number of benefits to the current college governance system.

B. Michael sees the staff and the college benefiting from a shared governance system: "If you have a staff that believes that they are being heard, their morale
increases and their commitment to the college deepens." Having said that, B. Michael understands the challenge of balancing staff input in a decision: "When you need a quick decision people expect processes to be followed, and those processes take time. There are times when decisions come up that need to be made quickly, otherwise the college is paralyzed." He also sees how time can be used as a tool: "I can see how people can drag out processes simply to get their own way, and that would be a real barrier." B. Michael has had experience as a faculty member struggling to implement a shared governance system, and now as a board member who not only helped craft the current governance system, but also participated in the implementation for improving the system.

The elements that constitute B. Michael's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (B. Michael, personal communication, August 24, 2005) and are based on his experiences as a faculty member, union member, and board member, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute B. Michael's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, engagement, history, leadership philosophy, relationships/trust, self-interest, structure, and time (B. Michael, personal communication, August 24, 2005).

Classified Participants

The Classified Union president is referred to as Mike. Mike shared the following information (Mike, personal communication, June 29, 2005) about himself. Mike has been the Employee Federation president for the past two years. Mike is active
in local and state labor movements. He served on the committee charged with
developing and recommending a governance system to the board, and currently serves
as the Finance Council Chair. Mike has worked at the college for 10 years. His first
association with the college was as a student, including being elected as student body
president at the college a little over 20 years ago. After graduating, he worked in the
local community before returning to the college as a purchasing agent. Mike comes
from a family of migrant workers and is passionate about equality issues and the role of
community colleges in impacting social justice issues.

Mike said the unions play a vital role in the success of the governance system:
"Unions by their nature create a process for employees to participate in governance." A
main benefit for Mike is bringing the views of staff that might not otherwise be heard:
"Unions create a process where you are more likely to get dissenting views." The value
of employee involvement was evident in Mike's comment: "Without unions you'd have
a much more top-down system, with administrators appointing people who they want to
councils." Mike reiterated, "[You] can't simply impose a process and expect people to
be fully supporting its implementation." Mike framed the role of governance members
as advisory: "As long as unions understand the governance system is advisory,
everything will work better."

The balance between union participants in the governance system and
management was important to Mike as he addressed possible hindrances to the
governance system. Mike said the union has to maintain a focus on the needs of the
institution. He stated,
If you have people who think their personal stake has priority over the institution, then the governance system will fall apart. Union members who are attempting to block decisions or the process for their own benefit will be detrimental to the system as a whole.

Mike sees issues of management and union authority in governance as vital to the system's success.

Mike believes you need a certain type of manager for a shared governance system to be successful: "This governance system does require some loss of authority; it requires managers to be more a facilitator and less a director." Mike pointed out that just as union leadership could impact the success of the governance system, so could management: "[The] management side can hinder the process if they approach the system with fear of losing authority." According to Mike, one of the greatest challenges for a shared governance system is the potential for one side to derail the system. The level of trust between constituency groups is an essential foundation of the governance system and impacts the ability of the system to function successfully. According to the classified president,

[There is] potential for a train wreck when someone can use the system for their own benefit. There has to be a way to expel the virus (can't cripple the institution) of self-benefit and this system has that built in with the administration to announce they are making a decision if things aren't moving forward in a timely fashion.

Currently, Mike doesn't see a major problem arising from any representative group focusing on their own needs: "Everything I've seen, people are genuinely invested in the good of the college."
He did have some ideas on moving the system forward. Mike pointed out his own style is to "go through and develop the system as you go along." He sees the need to give the system time to mature and avoid the current tendency to "be overly focused on process development."

The elements that constitute Mike's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (Mike, personal communication, August 29, 2005) and are based on his experiences as a student leader, classified employee, union leader, and council chair, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Mike's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, the common good, engagement, ideology, process, relationships/trust, self-interest, and time (Mike, personal communication, August 29, 2005).

A second classified employee interviewed is identified as Ross. Ross participated in an interview that provided the following information on topics related to his perspective on college governance (Ross, personal communication, August 4, 2005). Ross is married and has a daughter. Ross attended the college as a student over 25 years ago on a wrestling scholarship. He eventually worked his way up from a work-study position to become a lead officer in the college's public safety department. Ross has been involved in the classified union (i.e., Employee Federation) for a number of years and currently serves as the grievance chair. He was appointed by the EF to the Facilities Council in the college governance system.
Ross sees the governance system as a chance to "get a lot of good ideas . . . get a more holistic approach" to decision-making. Ross's view regarding the need for governance participants to focus on the institution ahead of their own needs is slightly differently from Mike's: "Focusing on an individual versus what is best for the whole. We need to work for doing the right thing even if it isn't convenient or the easiest option. Sometimes people don't want to do the right thing, to work together." The issue of working together was a key focus for Ross when he transitioned to issues that hinder participants in applying shared governance.

A big hindrance for Ross in applying shared governance was focused on the issues of trust. Ross pointed out that participants need to be "upfront and honest. Personal biases or self-serving [attitudes are] a great hindrance to governance." Ross also sees the need for clarity in the role of the managers:

Labor wants management to manage. Labor wants to go in and do their jobs and don't want the headaches that management has to deal with. I don't want those headaches when I go home. I don't want to worry about the budget 3 or 4 years down the road. I don't need to worry about people's personal lives and their children if they are laid off. [Management has the responsibility for] some of the hardest things anyone has to do.

Ross shared that his opinion on the proper role for management may not be universally held by other employee groups, especially the faculty.

In addition to the need for clarity in some areas, Ross had additional suggestions to offer. Communication was an area of major importance to him: "More information needs to be sent out to the masses." This suggestion was tied to improving decision-making: "Having input from more of the stakeholders and a better way of funneling
into the representatives of their groups." Improving communication wasn't seen in isolation by Ross: "Make quicker decisions and have meaningful work that is short- and long-range." Ross wanted to stress that the concept of making the work meaningful is essential. Ross notes, "it is hard to see how my work will affect things 10 years down the road. I'll be gone and I may not even be here to see it. Our gratification in this system is sometimes so far down the road it can be discouraging." Ross gave some examples to make his point about his engagement in decisions that will impact the college down the road, "I'd like to see a wind farm at the coast to produce electricity, and more hybrid vehicles."

The elements that constitute Ross's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (Ross, personal communication, August 4, 2005) and are based on his experiences as a student, classified employee, union leader, and council member, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Ross's perspective on college governance include the following: collaboration, communication, engagement, ideology, leadership, process, relationships/trust, representation, roles, scope, time, values, and vision (Ross, personal communication, August 4, 2005).

Faculty Participants

The faculty union president and co-chair of college council is identified as Larry. Larry has been a faculty member in the Social Science division for the past 8 years. Prior to coming to the college, Larry was a faculty member at two universities. Larry
was elected faculty union (i.e., Education Association) president 3 years ago and served on the chartered team to develop recommendations for the new governance system. Larry comes from a family involved in local politics on the East Coast. The town in which he grew up had an election process for local issues similar to the townhall format utilized in New England. His mother was active in the group as a vote counter, and Larry recalls attending the debates/votes in his youth. Larry first became involved in organizing activities as a graduate teaching fellow. Larry is single and his girlfriend is from Ghana. Larry has traveled extensively and is active in regional union activities. Soon after coming to Valley Community College, Larry started to engage in union activities.

Larry views the role of unions as essential to the success of the current governance system: "Leaders of the Faculty Association, Classified Federation, and the college administration were instrumental in making this happen. I don't want to leave the managers or students out, but it took those three groups in particular to come together and make this happen." His view on governance involves having the right people at the table:

[the] key factor is the seeming good-faith efforts on many people's parts. I remember the college president saying at the first meeting of the governance task force—while she was acknowledging the difficulty of the work—she thought the right people were in the room at the right time. I agree we are working together and developing the right level of trust, but I don't think that [view] is universally held.

From Larry's perspective the unions have a key role to play in the development and continuation of the governance system.
Larry sees a governance system as more than just benefiting the decision-making process. He stated,

A lot of times people will say you need shared governance or democracy because you want people to bring in their different knowledge, but it is more than that. It is bringing together the different authorities. I talked earlier about the authority of the faculty and administration, but there is the authority of the students to consider. I don't want to leave out the managers, but I have a hard time seeing the difference between the managers and administration.

Larry sees the governance system facing some challenges: "[Regarding the] difficulty of [the] governance system figuring out what the governance system should do, the term I always use is that the big decisions of the college are made in the governance system." Larry went deeper into what he thinks the governance system should do.

According to Larry, the governance system should have significant scope and authority. He stated,

Governance system should be governing. When I looked up the word in *Webster's Dictionary* (I like the etymology of words) you find it means to regulate, direct, and control. Goal for me is to have a governance system where the big decisions are being made. [That includes making decisions on] the budget, or to determine new directions for the college. These decisions should be made by the key stakeholders and administration together.

Larry acknowledges that having a governance system that regulates, directs and controls will take time: "[You] still need to build trust and build a system where the big decisions are made and where everyone is comfortable with that." He sees some of the biggest challenges to the system coming from the managers: "I don't think it has been overly hindering, but the issue of role of the administration and those who don't believe
Larry identified other variables hindering the success of the new governance system. The governance councils' role to develop work plans was an area of concern for Larry. He stated,

"One of the key issues is specificity in the plans. In policy those who want to protect administration authority seem to want to distinguish between policy and procedures. The policy is maintained at a high abstract level, and the plan is kept at a very high level and only provides guidance, not direction, at the administrative level. The VP has suggested the plans should direct the board, and I agree with that. But she has said it shouldn't be directing anyone below the vice-presidents. I don't see the governance system as a glorified work plan for the VPs. I think that is insane.

Other big concerns, for Larry, included structure and communication:

"Developing a system that isn't overly bureaucratic, that is fully communicating and still getting things done." He further pointed out that the intentions of the parties involved are also vital: "[The] biggest challenge is having the good faith commitment of the parties."

To improve the effectiveness of shared governance, Larry would focus on building trust. Larry stated, "We still need to build trust and build a system where the big decisions are made and where everyone is comfortable with that." Trust requires clarity of relationships; he felt that shared governance should involve "Clarifying
relationships between councils and how they get the work done." Clarity would come by defining plans. According to Larry, "[there is a] need to define plans and what they are and what their function is." Finally, Larry sees keeping students and the employees interested and involved as an area for improvement:

the ability to keep the two groups, classified and students, fully interested and able to participate in the governance system is needed. The classified haven't had the support (time-off and management support) to be able to participate fully in the process. It's harder to do backfill for those groups, but with enough resources it may be easy to do."

The elements that constitute Larry's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (Larry, personal communication, August 19, 2005) and are based on his experiences as a faculty member, union president, and council co-chair, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Larry's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, commitment, communication, ideology, leadership, process, relationships/trust, roles, scope, time, and unions (Larry, personal communication, August 19, 2005).

A second faculty member interviewed is identified as Michele. Michele has been a faculty member at the downtown campus center for over 10 years. Prior to coming to the college, Michele served as a part-time faculty member at another college. A year ago, Michele was appointed by the Faculty Council to serve on the diversity council. She has not been involved in the union. Her interest in serving on the diversity council led her to submit her name for consideration. She also hopes that serving on the governance council—meetings are held on the college's main campus—will bring more awareness to the downtown campus and the issues impacting those working at a campus
location away from the main campus. Michele appeared worried that she didn't have a
good deal to offer, given her limited experience in college governance, but she relaxed
and gave her views as the interview progressed.

Michele sees the governance system as helpful to the college and participants:
"It should increase people's willingness to go the extra mile, because they are a part of
the decision-making process. By getting people at the table, through the process, and
reaching consensus in the end, there shouldn't be any disgruntled groups." Michele sees
the governance system helping align employee efforts with the mission of the college:
"It helps foster ownership of the college mission." She has seen support for the system
by the participants: "Respect for the concept of shared governance is present."

The system is not without some hindrances. A big challenge for the system is
communication at all levels. Michele sees keeping up as a challenge: "Communication
needs improvement for the college community to keep abreast of what is going on in the
councils." In addition, understanding the council roles are a challenge, "We need to
know what the exact roles are for the councils." The need for clarity in developing
council plans is important: "At the end of the year, councils were developing their work
plans and they ended up being quite different in nature, based upon the different
perceptions of what we were doing." She sees communication on work plans as playing
a role in the confusion:

Some work plans were general and some more detailed with
implementation written into them. In Diversity Council, we had assumed
the 80-page diversity plan was already done, but we found out at the very
last meeting that it was submitted to the board but wasn't approved.
The challenge with communication wasn't just a college issue. Michele reported her own challenges and frustration with communication to her constituencies: "I felt I reported back to and represented Faculty Council well, but I never felt like I got feedback from the faculty as a whole. I didn't even know how to do that."

Michele was quick to point out, "Communication between councils would improve the effectiveness of shared governance." She identified communication within employee groups as an area of improvement and felt faculty needed the most help: "I think that faculty is the hardest group to get feedback from. Classified employees have more communication through their union. The Faculty seems widespread and rarely in one place at a time." Michele offered a solution to improve communication: "Training to help representatives understand how we can get more direct feedback from the people we represent." Michele thought there was need for improved communication across the system, and she also pointed out areas in the system that could use improvement.

The councils themselves, according to Michele, would benefit from understanding the principle of consensus decision-making. She described the decision-making process on the Diversity Council: "In a consensus process you could look at how many people approved; we could use the thumb sideways for neutral, or down for disapproval." According to Michele, the concept of consensus presents some intrinsic challenges:

It doesn't usually work in the long run to have majority rule. . . . But consensus has its challenges too. In the consensus process, you can't always have consensus from everyone. You will need to get a majority opinion from a group and then reach consensus within the councils.
The ability to reach consensus, according to Michele, was also connected to other challenges, such as attendance, faced by participants. She stated,

[The] problem on the diversity council is that some people didn't attend on a regular basis and then someone would show up after a number of conversations and say, "I can't agree with that decision." People coming over from the diversity team without release time did make it harder for them to attend.

The ability to attend, from Michele's perspective, was often an issue of time:

"Allowing some reassignment time has really helped, especially because I don't work on the Main campus." To Michele, release time would be a solution to making sure everyone was present at the meetings: "If you have release time, then you should be required to attend." Despite areas for improvement Michele, thought the governance system was off to a good start. Pressed to offer her assessment, she replied,

"Communication and understanding would help make it a little better."

The elements that constitute Michele's perspective on governance derive from her interview responses (Michele, personal communication, September 1, 2005) and are based on her experiences as a faculty member and council member, as well as her beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Michele's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, commitment, communication, motivation, process, relationships/trust, representation, roles, scope, time, and training (Michele, personal communication, September 1, 2005).
Manager Participants

The first manager interviewed is identified as Alexa. Alexa has been at the college as a division chair for over 10 years. Prior to coming to the college, she was the vice-principal at a K-12 school in a local community. Alexa has worked in education for the past 26 years. Her involvement in college governance includes serving as the management senate co-chair, election by the management group to serve on the college council, and as a member of the team originally charted to develop recommendations for the new college governance system. Alexa is married and has two children. Her youngest daughter is a freshman at the local university. Alexa was relaxed and open during the interviews, and said she is more than willing to share her perspectives and experiences on the college governance system.

Alexa believes that the governance system starts with the leaders of the organization: "Having the open-mindedness of the board and president to have all stakeholders involved, and being open to having a [shared] governance system is important." She thinks the values of staff participation aren't unique to education in general: "Educational institutions are more open in general to ideas from all staff as opposed to private business, where the board and president are making the decisions and you just live with them. It helps to be in this environment." Alexa believes everyone involved in the governance system should be "making sure the governance system really focuses on what is best for students." While these aspects help governance, Alexa sees a number of areas that can and hinder the system.
The clarity of the system needs to be improved, according to Alexa: "Having a lack of clear guidelines and roles, and not knowing what your role is, really hinders." This includes clarity at the policy and procedure levels: "Our policies and procedures are kind of messy. Knowing what is a policy and what is procedure is problematic. Often things are done a certain way because that is the way it has always been done."

She believes clarity would bring some consistency to the processes at the college: "We aren't always consistent across the college on how things get done, and that makes for some uninformed decision-making."

The unions, from Alexa's perspective, create some challenges too. She stated her concerns:

Participants have loyalty to their unions or representative groups. A lot of time it does feel like posturing is evident and different agendas or strategies [are] being developed to get the most benefits out of the decisions being made. I was really opposed to the unions appointing people to the councils. My understanding from at least one of the unions is the unions didn't have any formal election process; the union officers just went around and picked who they wanted. I don't think that way of appointing people necessarily gets the people with the skills. Often people aren't there to work for the common good. Often it becomes a venue for bargaining rather than what can we do that is best for the college.

She further stated that the union issues could be magnified due to the current lack of financial resources at the college: "Economics is an issue in community colleges right now and contribute to the lack of trust—e.g., jobs are at risk." Having stated her concerns regarding the union, she countered her previous concern when she pointed out that the governance system may actually help with union relations by "Formalizing the fact that all stakeholders have a vested interest and expectation that they will be
involved in the system. It recognizes that everyone will have a voice in the decisions."
In addition to participants that serve primarily to support union goals, she thinks some employees are possibly participating for self-serving reasons: "Some people are picked because they are willing to do governance work because they aren't happy with their current job." Alexa shifted from concerns to ideas for improving the system.

Her first idea was to help everyone focus on why the system exists: "If everyone was pushing what was best for students and had that as the driving goal without the self-serving interest, the system would work better." Alexa felt that would be more likely if everyone had the necessary time to invest in the best outcomes for students:

Time is a common issue, with everyone already having full-time jobs and then trying to do this on top of it. The time issue needs to be dealt with. The time that it takes you away from other things you can do to improve student learning.

She also felt elections for participants would be better than appointments: "I do think a lot of times people will elect good representatives." In general, Alexa felt the system was improving and meeting the expectations of the originally charted governance system.

The elements that constitute Alexa's perspective on governance derive from her interview responses (Alexa, personal communication, August 17, 2005) and are based on her experiences as a K-12 administrator, Division Chair, Management Senate co-chair, and College Council member, as well as her beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Alexa's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, the common good, communication, engagement,
historical factors, leadership, power, process, relationships/trust, representation, resources, roles, scope, self-interest, structure, time, unions, and values (Alexa, personal communication, August 17, 2005).

The second manager chosen for an interview is identified as Don. Don was a faculty member in psychology for over 25 years prior to becoming chair of the Social Science division. Don serves on the administration bargaining committee, has been a member of management senate, and is currently on the learning council. Don is married to a nurse and has two grown children. His oldest son works part-time at the college as a tutor. Don has had a number of colleagues involved in the faculty union, but for the most part has not chosen to get very involved. While eligible for retirement with over 30 years of service, Don continues to enjoy his role as chair. He doesn't plan to retire until his wife does. Don was relaxed during the interview and forthcoming with his beliefs and experiences regarding college governance.

Don has a long history with the college and thinks the past culture will help in applying a shared model of governance: "[The] collaborative culture of the college probably helps to some degree." Echoing Alexa's point, he is quick to point out that the focus needs to remain on what is best for students: "We should be asking what is best for students, college, faculty, classified, not questions about how we could benefit one group or another." The tension between what is best for students or an individual/group was a common theme for Don.

The tension around funding and budget issues was Don's next point: "You want governance to be representative, but you don't want the representatives tied
[economically] to any given group." He has seen this concern: "I see the way in which the unions are functioning in the general college, as advocates for the economic benefit of one group, as a hindrance to truly applying the governance system." He believes this impediment comes from union leadership: "Unions choose representatives at the table who have other agendas rather than focusing on the college. Until we find [a] process or way to develop a representative body other than unions, you will always have the problem." Don thinks challenges with union-appointed representatives will probably continue to exist in the current governance system.

Don believes improvements to the system should be built into the system itself. The system calls for some review and assessment:

Assessment is necessary both within the groups and across the groups. The governance structure was laid out and we need to be careful to go back and see how effective we've been (e.g., group skills). We need to figure out how to spend less time with more output, figure out how to take very large groups and make decisions.

The assessment, according to Don, shouldn't focus only on the processes but on the individual and council levels. Don has seen some challenges in individual governance skills on the council on which he serves. There is an "Inability to be collaborative, or people are not up on their skills for working in groups. It can make for a very slow process and bog decision-making down."

Don believes council review and communication can improve the governance system. He said that we "Need to look at the council structure and see if they are really doing what they are supposed to do. Do we really need all the councils or committees, or can some of them be eliminated or absorbed?" He thinks that improved
communication between councils will only help: "Is the communication consistent and what do we need to do to build more communication between councils?" While Don sees significant room for improvements, he does believe the governance system is meeting its intended goals.

The elements that constitute Don's perspective on governance derive from his interview responses (Don, personal communication, August 3, 2005) and are based on his experiences as long-time faculty member, division chair, management senate member, and learning council member, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Don's perspective on college governance include the following: assessment, collaboration, the common good, communication, engagement, process, representation, structure, time, training, unions, and vision (Don, personal communication, August 3, 2005).

Student Participants

The student body president and chair of the Student Affairs Council is identified as Carson. Carson has been a student for the past 3 years. He needed to complete his general education degree (GED) prior to enrolling at the college. Carson didn't feel like he fit in as a high school student and dropped out during his junior year. Carson was elected Valley student body president the previous year. Carson recalls getting involved in student government because he wanted to have a stronger connection to the college and help make a difference by giving back to the institution and his fellow students.
Carson is married and recently had his first child. His wife was also a student at the college prior to having their child. Carson plans to transfer to the local university when he finishes his year as student body president. Carson hopes to enter local and state politics after he completes his degrees. He is thinking about running for student body president at the local university to which he is transferring next year.

Carson sees things that help and hinder the governance system:

[The] biggest benefit is less back-end uproar. If you have more people making decisions, you have a lot less chance of angering faculty or students, and when that happens that negatively affects the implementation of a decision. Negative media from one group, even if it is just the students, is still negative media.

He also believes the governance system helps with communication: "It offers strong avenues of communication for students and staff." For students, communication and participation is helped by the governance system: "Governance is not the most exciting process, but if students learn how to use it, then we can run with it and make it work for us. All year it reinforces that we as students have so much say." He thinks that shared governance helps provide a good place for student input: "Without a place to go before the implementation of the shared governance system, it only leaves the public board meeting for an avenue to get to anybody."

Carson shifted his thoughts to hindrances. In his role as student body president, the first and foremost concern on Carson's mind was the need for recruiting students to participate: "[We] need more support for student leaders for recruiting and retaining students in this process." In some ways, Carson thought the governance system made it easier for him as SBP:
[It's a] lot easier for student government to be involved with two students on each council. Students are fast paced and Technology Council is important to students. We are in a technological age and need to remind students what governance offers.

Carson also identified areas within the council decision-making structure that could be a hindering factor. Although he is supportive of a consensus decision-making model, he sees that consensus has its challenges. As chair of the Student Affairs Council, he witnessed some of these challenges firsthand. He stated,

The consensus model can really, really hold things up. One person can be a stickler and someone can take something personal and they could vote no and hold up everything. I think some people are scared of one group trying to hold things up. This means some groups are less trusting; I don't know the whole history of the groups.

For Carson the hindrances often focused on the dynamics of the groups involved. He thinks the unions "have a bigger stake" in the governance system than students. The increased stake wasn't the only point made by Carson. He pointed out that the history between groups can be a hindrance: "Some stakeholder groups are less trusting of other groups. They think it is historical; maybe they are looking way too far in the past." Carson pointed out that looking to the past wasn't only attributed to staff: "Some groups bring up something said 10 years ago at the bargaining table, or students bring up an example of what one teacher did." Unfortunately, Carson witnessed very few council members that were willing to point out that an example was only one person or one situation. He stated,

The need to mend the historical issues, such as trust, is essential and only hinders the success of the governance system. [It is] hard to build trust and mend bridges that haven't been open for a long time. We need to be open and honest for the governance system to really work. Being safe in
governance is necessary or it stops things, so there needs to be trust built from the beginning.

Carson reiterated the issue of trust and viewed it as the biggest hindrance to the system.

In Carson's view, improving the system requires that the college and participants be open to change: "Things are changing in the governance system; we need to realize it is a living, breathing thing that is changing every minute, and we need to just roll with the punches." Carson noted that those responsible for the development of the governance system often didn't want the structure to change. Being open to change is needed but isn't always apparent:

I've run into people who worked on the task force and heard we've voted and changed things to make it work better. They were upset it was changed or that the language was changed. Everyone needs to understand it is O.K. to make changes if things aren't working. We need to move forward, and the system would be useless if we didn't have the flexibility to move forward from past decisions.

To elaborate, he said that making changes requires the efforts of everyone involved: "No one group has a way to make changes to the whole system without the support of other groups." Carson reduced his ideas for improvement to three words: "Communication, communication, communication."

The elements that constitute Carson's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (Carson, personal communication, June 2, 2005) and are based on his experiences as student body president and student affairs chair, as well as his beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Carson's perspective on college governance include the following: authority, the common good, communication, engagement, historical factors, openness, process,
relationships/trust, representation, and systems thinking (Carson, personal communication, June 2, 2005).

A second student selected for an interview is a student senator and is identified as Dianne. Dianne is in her mid-20s and enrolled at the college without clear educational goals. Having taken a number of classes, she became involved in student government to develop a stronger connection to the school. Her mother has a master's degree and strongly values higher education for her children. Her mother encourages her to get a college degree and to be involved as a student. Dianne admits she didn't really know what she was getting into when the student body president recruited and appointed her to be a member of the learning council. In addition to this appointment, she was elected to serve as a student senator. Dianne plans to continue her education at Valley and run for student body vice-president.

Dianne's view of the foundation of the college governance system follows:

"Seems like a personality thing for the president, how much involvement the president would want." From her perspective a shared governance system is great for the following reason:

In applying shared governance, you are making a commitment to listen to and value other opinions. Without shared governance, you wouldn't have to listen. People would need to turn in their complaints and you could choose to listen or not.

In order for the system to be successful, she stated, "Having a shared vision for the college is something that would help community college representative leaders (i.e., board, faculty, president, student leaders, and support staff) in applying shared
governance." She acknowledges that it can be a challenge for students to reach the goal of having a shared vision:

Students are up to their neck with responsibilities; most have jobs outside of school, and serving on a council is really pushing it with regard to available time. It is not easy for students to get involved in governance because of the time requirements. I can see why they wouldn't feel the need to be involved.

I haven't experienced but I've heard on other committees that there's high turn-over for students. I've heard that some faculty and staff have the attitude of what is the benefit of getting students up-to-speed because they are just going to leave. The attitude is a challenge, but that is the personality and personal view of certain people on the councils. It is my experience that the learning council staff is excited and thinks it is great that I participate. They have no problem stopping and educating me on a point that I don't understand.

Dianne pointed out that the cycle of student participation will always be a challenge:

Students coming into these committees are really there for a couple of months and then there is a new student, and it becomes hard to represent student views because they are always playing catch up and it takes time for students to feel grounded and comfortable speaking up.

The need to integrate into a committee, she believes, can be a challenge for some students: "You need to check people out a little bit and make sure it really is O.K. for you to talk. Takes time to get a feel for the group you are in." In addition to students' integration and orienting themselves, Dianne sees a number of other challenges.

A key factor for successful student participation, according to Dianne, is commitment and available time: "As far as students go, you have to have people who are interested and have the time to do it and make a commitment to the process."
Dianne believes she made the necessary commitment and time; she also believes she has learned a few things to improve the governance system.

Dianne suggested how to improve student participation: "The student government needs to do a campaign to raise awareness (class rap sessions, events, spiel to the crowd, get people talking to other people) and let people know we have this college governance system in place." She thinks that getting students involved is the biggest hurdle:

Once students are involved in the governance system, they will see the benefits; the system tells us we (students) are as important as they say we are. Basically it is like walking the talk of the College Core Values and Guiding Principles, and the college looks to us for guidance too. You are a student in the learning environment which benefits you directly.

Her final suggestion is to let students know up front what they are getting themselves into: "In student government, we are now trying to figure out who would be best on what council, but a better idea might be to come up with a thorough description of each committee and council, and what is expected of them." Dianne was excited about continuing with student government and serving on a council the next year. She believes her actions speak louder than any words she could say about her view of the system.

The elements identified from Dianne's perspective on governance come from the interview and follow-up questions (Dianne, personal communication, June 7, 2005) and are based on her experiences as student senator and learning council member, as well as her beliefs regarding organizational governance. The elements that constitute Dianne's perspective on college governance include the following: commitment, the common
good, communication, engagement, inclusion, leadership, orientation, relationships/trust, representation, time, training, values and vision (Dianne, personal communication, June 7, 2005).

Valley Community College has a long history of engaging students in the governance process. Dale Parnell, Valley's first president, had the student body president sit at the Board of Education table during meetings, with the right to speak, though not to vote. Students were invited to serve on college committees, and the president's door was always open to them (Romine, 1998). The involvement of students and staff, from the beginning of Valley Community College, extended beyond a role in college governance. Romine wrote in The Parnell Years that students, along with staff, also were invited from the beginning to be part of state and national community college groups. Leon Lindsey, Associated Student Body president in 1967-68, may have been the first student officer to attend the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) national convention.

Presentation of the Elements and Themes Identified in the Data

The elements that constitute the perspective of the community college leaders are an essential part or quality of college governance. Elements are "the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself" (Merriam, 2001). The themes that emerge from the data are derived from the elements in governance that constitute the perspective of the participants regarding the college governance system. Therefore, themes represent a recurring, unifying pattern that "encompasses" a set of elements.
This section provides a summary of the data elements that constitute the perspectives of the 12 participants. The most frequently identified elements and variables that influence the participants' perspective on the governance system are summarized for each of the six participating groups. A concluding summary identifies the emerging themes.

Elements

In describing the college governance system, the 12 participants provided in-depth responses during initial and follow-up interviews. A total of 30 elements were identified during the analysis of responses. To provide a visual overview, Table 2 offers a list of those elements, by group, ranked according to frequency of response. The most frequently referred to elements by participants include authority, relationship/trust, structure, time, and scope. A more detailed list of elements, by group, is provided in Appendix G. A number of elements appear at the top of a participant group's list but are not necessarily at the top of the aggregate list. Quantifying the elements is used purely for organizational purposes and does not necessarily reflect qualitative importance in developing the emerging themes. Following the review of the elements most frequently discussed by participants during interviews, the themes that emerge from the elements are reviewed.

Authority

All groups, except for students, ranked authority as a key element in the governance system. The discussion on authority keyed on final responsibility and
accountability for decisions. Erika, college president, stated, "Clarity was achieved [in the development of the governance system] with the board and president having the authority, and it was a big step forward to have it in writing."

To a statement from the faculty union that management needs to move away from autocratic authority, the faculty union president responded, "If the big decisions are being made in the governance system, then you don't have a top-down, autocratic, bureaucratic decision-making system."

The literature concurs. In *Governing the Twenty-First Century University*, James Dunderstadt, a former faculty member, dean and university president, states, "responsibility and accountability should always accompany authority. Deans and presidents can be fired." He further states, "The contemporary university has many activities, responsibilities, constituencies, and overlapping lines of authority that are well addressed by the tradition of public oversight and trusteeship, shared collegial internal governance of academic matters, and experienced administrative leadership."

This view that authority should follow accountability is supported by a community college president as well. Carol Lucey (2002), a president in Nevada, gave an address to the AAUP's 2001 conference on shared governance and later published the speech as an article in *Academe*. In her article, "Civic Engagement, Shared Governance and Community Colleges," she notes that in resource arguments and similar decisions between faculty and administrators, it is she who has the accountability: "In the end, the president has to win those arguments or find another job, because the governing board
cannot hold the collective accountable for fiduciary matters” (p. 29). The issue of aligning authority with accountability is important for a governance system to function.

In *Improving Academic Governance*, William Tierney (2004) highlights a quote from an academic he interviewed who said,

> To say that we just need to speak with one another more is hogwash. . . . I support democracy. Democracy means that people are accountable, that different groups voice their opinions, and they are in some way counted and administrators are held accountable.

Molly, Valley vice-president, pointed out,

> We need to keep governance councils at the higher level and not be making up the rules as we go along. Let us on the operational side take care of the implementation of the policies and planning. I would quibble with the term "shared governance," just because I don't think you can share it in the sense everyone can share in the responsibility and accountability. We've stayed away from the term for that reason.

However, Larry, faculty union president, sees the issue of policy/implementation issue in a different light:

> Faculty know that we have a new governance system, and know we have members involved. They don't know to trust the governance system yet or if it is merely a co-optation with no real devolution of power out from the administration.

The classified and managers addressed the issue of authority by focusing on the role of management.

> Mike, classified union president, sees more of a change in management style in the governance system than a shift in authority: "This governance system does require some loss of authority; it requires a manager to be more a facilitator and less a director."

Alexa, management senate co-chair, already sees this management concept of
"facilitator" naturally in place in higher education: "Educational institutions are more open in general to ideas from all staff as opposed to private business, where the board and president are making the decisions and you just live with them." While authority was the greatest interest of participants, it should be noted that authority and the element of relationship/trust were virtually tied in frequency of focus. Authority emerges as a key component in the "role" theme.

**Relationship/Trust**

Participants ranked relationship/trust as the second most important element in the governance system, whereas the students referred to relationship/trust more than any other element. Among all groups except managers, relationship/trust ranked in the top five elements receiving the most attention; among managers, it ranked seventh. All groups responded that relationship/trust was cited as essential for the governance system to be successful.

Carson, student body president, saw relationship/trust as important and as having room for growth: "Trust issues are huge. We need to be fully able to trust one another. Some stakeholder groups are less trusting of other groups. [I] think it is historical, maybe looking way too far in the past." President Erika had a similar perspective on the issue: "Having pretty good relationships with the constituents helps. We don't necessarily agree on everything, but generally the relationships are pretty good, open and honest." Ross, classified union appointee to the facility council, saw the relationship/trust issue emerging from good practice. He argued for "no hidden
agendas, but rather openness and honesty” to facilitate the system's success. Larry, faculty participant, stated,

One of the great benefits of the governance system . . . is the significantly higher level of mutual trust and respect across the college and various units, specifically faculty, classified and administration, and groups—particularly I see it happening and growing at the council levels. I'm not suggesting we need to be one big happy family without differences. I don't see it happening more broadly yet, but the governance system will be the test for that.

Participants shared a collective vision that relationship/trust is a fundamental necessity for the governance system to succeed. Relationship/trust is therefore identified as a core factor in the Social/Cultural theme.

Structure

The issue of structure was the most referred-to element for the administration, board, and manager groups, but wasn't stated directly by the students, faculty or classified staff. This is not surprising as the responsibility and accountability for the implementation of college decision-making structures traditionally lie with the board, administration, and management. The foundation of the governance system was developed in the structure of councils and decision-making. The classified, faculty and student groups were aware of the structure in their comments but focused more on the element of process than the structure of the governance system. Structure, along with a number of related elements, emerges as a theme and will be discussed at length.
Time

Every participant group except students commented on time frequently enough for it to be in the top five list of cited elements. The participants referred to additional time needed for decision-making and to actively participate in the system. The administration, board, classified staff and managers all commented that the added time needed for decision-making was a disadvantage and a place for improvement in the governance system. All groups were unanimous in their concern that the additional time would impact participants' workloads. Time emerges as a theme and therefore is analyzed in the next section on themes.

Scope

The scope of the Valley governance system is connected to the issues of authority and responsibility of the various constituency groups. In the governance system it is still being debated as to what the scope should be. Perceptions of each group tend to vary because the governance charter doesn't clarify the definitions of policy, planning and implementation. In addressing issues that are academic in nature, the literature tends to suggest a role consistent with the VCC governance system, but one less "shared" regarding the issues of budget and facilities. Such is also true in the recommendations of national labor organizations of the employee groups.

Valley people differ in perceptions regarding the appropriate scope of the governance system. The management senate co-chair got right to the point in the beginning of her interview: "What would really help is having things clearly spelled out
about who does what." Those in administration wanted clear lines regarding policy, planning and implementation, while the employee groups wanted a shared role in all the decisions.

The faculty union president was clear in his position:

[The] difficulty of a governance system is figuring out what the governance system should do; the term I always use is that the big decisions of the college are made in the governance system. I don't think that everyone would always agree with me on this one.

It is clear that the issue of scope needs clarity, as the management senate co-chair said: "Maybe there are some unrealistic expectations by some of the groups as to how much responsibility they should have. They want to get into the operational pieces of the college, but how many college presidents can you really have?" The college vice-president agreed, but in a more encompassing way: "[For the] board, faculty, and even sometimes for the president, the easiest thing is to dive into the details, and that isn't effective for the governance system." Scope becomes a real issue in the development of governance plans.

The faculty union president stated,

One of the key issues is specificity in the plans. In policy, those who want to protect administration authority seem to want to distinguish between policy and procedures. The policy is maintained at a high abstract level and the plan is kept at a very high level. The VP has suggested the plans should direct the board, and I agree with that. But she has said it shouldn't be directing anyone below the vice-presidents. I don't see the governance system as a glorified work plan for the VPs. I think that is insane. If the plans are vaguely guiding, then it isn't a governance system. There are those who don't want the plans to have impact.
Valley Faculty Council (Barber & Davis, 2004) reviewed a report by the co-chairs that stated,

A number of other decision categories have the potential for joint decision making between faculty and the administration. These include setting the college budget, the "unit planning" process, procedures and policies that affect students directly, implementation of the college diversity plan, the allocation of funds for physical resources (e.g., facilities/space), long-range technology planning, and others…. Some decisions are made primarily by the administration, where faculty may be consulted, or at least advised before a final decision is made. One example of this is the setting of the academic calendar…. In the proposed new college governance system, it is hoped that the system of governance councils and their accompanying decision grids will clarify these processes. (p. 3)

The vice-president for operations thinks the separation of scope between policy and implementation will work: "If the plans are clear and relevant, then those plans and policies can drive implementation and operations." Regarding issues that are not purely academic, scope of the governance system issues is an area that needs clarification. The decision grids (Appendix H) provide an overview of the system's scope.

The literature in this area is consistent with the findings. The ability to change the scope of responsibility to fit a shared governance system is a challenge. From a legal perspective, writes Dunderstadt (2004), "Shared governance is a misnomer. By law or by charter, essentially all of the legal powers of a university are held by its governing board" (p. 211). Keohane (1998) points out that "Shared governance is, in reality, an ever-changing balance of forces involving faculty, board, and administration" (p. 11). David Collis (2004), in "Paradox of Scope," writes,

If the art of governance is to balance competing constituencies through delicate trade-offs, careful compromises, and judicious offers of quid pro
quos, the complexity of such deals is complicated by an increase in the number of constituencies. The number of linkages between \( n \) entities \( [n(n-1)/2] \) increases exponentially with the number of entities. With four parties' interests to balance, there are six trade-offs to manage. With six parties (a 50 percent increase), there are fifteen trade-offs to manage (a 250 percent increase)…. As constituencies expand, it becomes increasingly difficult to govern the sheer complexity of the institution, let alone build consensus. . . . (pp. 186-187)

In a 1999 statement, the California Classified Senate supported a strengthened role for faculty, classified, and students in community college governance, including opportunities to participate in the formulation and development of district and college policies and procedures, and in processes for jointly developing recommendations for action by the governing board. (California Community Colleges Classified Senate [4CS], 1999)

Obviously, the complexity of adding more constituency groups to a governance system creates an increased need for clarity and understanding of the themes. That emerged forcefully in remarks by participants during the interviews in this study.

Participants used many terms and examples to describe their governance experiences. The terms and examples in this data analysis are described as conceptual elements. The elements reflect the purpose of this study: to describe and explain the shared governance system during its implementation year at Valley Community College. The elements form patterns and regularities that emerge as themes. The analysis of the themes emerging from the data follows.

Analysis of Themes Presented in the Data

The six final themes are analyzed and a definition is provided for each theme. The conceptual elements provide patterns and regularities and are organized into
themes. Themes are named to provide a sense to their nature, and provide congruency at a conceptual level. The names for the themes come from the researcher, but reflect the participants and literature. Five themes emerge in the study: role, communication, structure, process, and social/cultural. The emerging themes will be described and then triangulated, when relevant, with data from interviews, campus documents, literature findings, and the researcher's notes and journals from the interviews.

Role

Role emerged as a key theme from the primary elements: accountability, board/president authority, manager role, administration role, board role, employee/student role, policy/implementation, union authority, and representation. Role is a major theme identified in this study and represents an area of conflicting viewpoints from the participants and in the governance system (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Board Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board/President Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All groups provided elements that emerged as the theme "role." The administration, board and management focused on the desire to have clarity and delineation of roles for responsibility and accountability in decision-making. For classified and faculty participants the focus is on the desire for a larger role in shared decision-making. This overlap in views highlights the tension that exists in who has the role to assign representatives to the governance councils. This area of contention is consistent with governance literature, and documented practice at Valley College.

The board's role is based on state statute. The board chair pointed this out during his interview: "The state mandates that the board and president have certain responsibilities to do certain things, and the accountability can't be delegated." This comment is in alignment with documents provided the board regarding budget. In response to criticisms raised by the faculty union president, the Valley VP (2003) wrote to the board during the budget development process:

In a shared governance environment, however, continuing confrontations resulting from role polarities can be extremely counter-productive in the budget development process. In a public institution, the budget development process has pre-determined deadlines which legally must be met. Prolonged confrontations shorten the time available to reach realistic shared solutions that meet the interests of all parties. It is for this reason that many colleges choose not to share budget development decisions.

Solutions for budget development in a shared governance context are usually framed in terms of sharing power and authority. Usually [budget] cutters are those who have the formal authority in the college, e.g., the president and vice-presidents. Sharing power and authority in the budget development process would seem to be a matter of negotiation and consensus building or finding the right "balance" between interests of the cutters and the spenders.

The one fundamental reality that is often ignored in the pressure to move to shared institutional budget development is accountability.
The formal and informal structures of accountability associated with hierarchical bureaucracy still predominate. The resistance on the part of cutters to shared budget development comes from this mismatch between a new governance model and an old accountability structure. It does not matter who in the institution makes budget decisions; if the result is a serious financial problem the CFO will be held accountable. This accountability is not "blame" for creating the problem but the responsibility for developing and implementing strategies to fix the problem and keep it from happening again, and the responsibility to provide answers to higher authorities such as the board or the legislature.

This issue of role in regards to authority is a perceived conflict for the faculty union president. He stated, "If the big decisions are being made in the governance system, then you don't have a top-down autocratic, bureaucratic decision-making system. It is much more than just bringing in people who know about issues." To bring clarity on issues like role, the governance system developed an operational manual that was printed in fall 2005.

The Valley Governance System Manual (VCC, 2005), provides a description of the roles and responsibilities within the governance system for administrators, board, classified staff, faculty, managers, students, and the executive team. The section on role in the manual states,

Implementing a structure that maximizes participation and the best thinking of all and placing authority at the appropriate level. It must be recognized that ultimately the board holds the president and the administration accountable and responsible for decisions made. Within this framework, the goal is to produce a process in which timely decisions and the reasons for them are guided by involvement and action from, and are transparent to, the rest of the community. (VCC, 2005)

Even with this clarification, the tension regarding where authority rests continues to exist. The following diagram provides two areas that need clarity for the
theme role: responsibility and authority (Figure 2). Clarity of role for the groups and councils within the governance system is needed.

Another community college looks at the issue of role in a similar fashion. The collegial governance described by Tidewater Community College states,

the internal constituencies of the institution—administration, faculty, classified employees, and students—are to be genuinely represented and have a meaningful voice in the decisions affecting the operation, policy development, and strategic planning of the college. The purpose . . . is to define the roles that board members, administrators, faculty, classified staff and students should play in shared responsibility and cooperative action. The design of the governance system adheres to two basic operating principles—that people's time is a precious commodity which should not be wasted, and that people do their best work when there is a high expectation that their work will matter. (Tidewater Community College [TCC], 2006)

The literature supports the importance in having clarity of role. John Carver (1997), often described as a leading authority on the role of nonprofit boards, writes,

The board has total authority over the organization and total accountability for the organization. But the board is almost always forced to rely on others to carry out the work, that is, to exercise most of the authority and to fulfill most of the accountability. This dependence on others requires the board to give careful attention to the principles of sound delegation.

Since the board is accountable that the organization works, and since the actual running of the organization is substantially in the hands
of management, then it is important to the board that management be successful. The board must therefore increase the likelihood that management will be successful, while making it possible to recognize whether or not it really is successful. This calls upon the board to be very clear about its expectations, to personalize the assignment of those expectations, and then to check whether the expectations have been met. Only in this way is everyone concerned clear about what constitutes success and who has what role in achieving it. (p. 141)

The literature further points out that the perceived role of faculty authority, in particular, is often different from the perspective of the faculty and administration. Kaplan (2004) states,

Faculty representatives and administrators tend to provide similar estimates for the percentage of faculty involved in appointments of department heads, setting of degree requirements, establishing faculty authority in governance and curriculum decisions. The sharpest disparities between the responses of faculty members and administrators appear to be in the area of appointments, campus construction projects, appointments of academic dean, and the setting of teaching loads. (pp. 182-183)

While the literature in this area is limited for community colleges, significant research has been done at the universities on authority. One of the largest studies focusing on faculty authority agreed clarity exists at least in some specific areas. In a study of 3,500 faculty and academic administrators at 750 institutions, the top five areas in which faculty have a natural voice and authority in decision-making were curriculum, general education, admissions, academic standards, and promotion and tenure (Tierney & Minor, 2003).

Defining clearly the role for each group involved in the governance process and who ultimately has authority for "making the decision" is vital to the success of a college governance system. Dunderstadt (2004) writes, "Hence a key to effective
governance is to provide faculty bodies with executive rather than merely advisory authority" (p. 149).

The California Community Colleges Classified Senate (4CS, 1999), stated,

There are also those districts that have struggled to understand and accept the participatory governance ideal or are struggling among their faculty, students, and staff to establish their roles. Shared governance has had its time to evolve—now it is time to revisit its successes and failures and to redefine and improve it. (p. 2)

Using the term "participatory" rather than "shared" is a beginning step to clarify this difficult concept. While the themes in this study are developed based upon their congruencies, themes are not mutually exclusive. The need to clarify definitions specific to role in policy/planning and implementation is connected to the element of relationship/trust.

Communication

Communication was a theme consistently identified by participants as a key area in improving the governance system. Communication, both between committees and across the college, is seen by participants as a current hindrance to a governance system. Communication is cited as essential to the success of the governance system. Two elements emerge to form the theme communication. These two elements include "engagement" and "communication" by participants, and the college community, in the governance system (Table 4).
The previous Valley board chair believes communication within a governance system is important to making good decisions: "People have good ideas who wouldn't necessarily be in leadership positions. In a shared governance system, ideas come to the front that wouldn't necessarily come out of a traditional bureaucratic structure." The faculty union president shared his view on the importance of good communication, and emphasized a specific qualifier: the administrative structure. "Developing a system that isn't overly bureaucratic and is fully communicating and still getting things done . . . is important to success." The Valley college president agreed regarding the importance of communication, but was quick to point out the need to improve the system: "Having that loop and communicating that to the broader campus community needs improvement." The Faculty Council appointee working at one of the satellite campuses emphasized how important it is to communicate to the entire campus. She pointed out, "[The campus needs] communication to keep abreast of what is going on in the councils." The manager elected by his peers to serve on the learning council shared a similar concern: "formal processes to provide campus-wide communication, that is consistent and clear, needs to be done in addition to building more communication between councils." The participant selected by the Faculty Council pointed out that her main frustration is communication: "I felt I reported back to and represented Faculty
Council well, but I never felt like I got feedback from the faculty as a whole. I didn't even know how to do that." If college-wide communication is a goal, then it clearly isn't happening from the perspective of at least some participants.

The issues raised by participants in the study are consistent with the documents and communications on campus during the past year. Communication was directly addressed by VCC president in a memo to all staff dated November 2005: "We are developing a communication system to assure that the work of the councils will be open and visible." While some communication issues are being addressed, others still need improvement. Meeting minutes for councils are generally posted to the college governance website within a few weeks (Erika, personal communication, December 8, 2005). Unfortunately, the college governance website wasn't available until April 2005. This left the campus without a consistent communication system for almost the entire implementation year. Council agendas have not yet been published to the college community prior to meetings, and frequently don't get handed out until the meeting, or are E-mailed late the prior day (Erika, personal communication, December 8, 2005).

In her communication to all staff in June 2005, Valley president emphasized her commitment to communication:

> We plan for our communication system to be robust, but I ask that you stay connected to your representatives as well as following the updates so that you know what is going on and may participate as you see fit. I have attached the list of council membership for your information.

It is clear from her memo to staff that there is the need to address an increase in communication.
The communication challenges faced by Valley Community College are consistent with those discussed at other institutions of higher education. Loyola University, Chicago, published a white paper on shared governance that stated, "For this purpose, there must be channels of reliable input from relevant constituencies. Communication, on the other hand, conveys decisions already reached and identifies the reasons for which these decisions have been made" (Loyola University Committee on Shared Governance [LUCSG], 2002). Kay Bull (2002) [NIB] provided the following description on communication to the Oklahoma State University faculty: "Effective planning demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion and should be the rule for communication" (p. 20). What is lacking from these examples is a clear plan and system for achieving the end goal: open, clear and reliable communication to all constituents.

The importance of communication and engagement by all parties is supported in the literature. Tierney (2004) writes,

Shared governance is when there is some degree of shared understanding . . . [it] needs to make people see how we're all in this together . . . [and] provide organizational meaning and identity such the organizational sum is greater than the individual parts. (p. 233)

Structure

Structure is a theme that includes both "who" is involved in the governance system (e.g., membership, constituency groups) and "how" they are trained and how the
system as a whole functions (e.g., orientation, training, development, and decision-making; see Table 5).

**TABLE 5. Structure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• System Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stuart, board chair, saw the need for a clear structure in the governance system:

"Confusion at all levels, faculty, management, and classified will hinder the system."

The college president seems to agree with the board chair. Erika called for charters with a clear scope of work to do. Management identified structure as an area to look holistically at how the governance system can function most efficiently and effectively.

Don, division chair serving on the learning council, asked this question during the interview: "Do we really need all the councils or committees, or can some of them be eliminated or absorbed?"

The structural assessment of the 70 committees operating on Valley's campus was completed during the implementation year of the college governance system (President's Governance Report to Board, 2005). The review and assessment of the existing committees led to the integration of some committees into the governance system. The most obvious was the integration of the Diversity Committee into the
Diversity Council. While some committee members moved to the council, a majority did not, as the configuration of the council membership was more representative of the constituency groups than the more volunteer/interest-based membership criteria of the former Diversity Committee.

Not directly referring to the structure for the governance system, but in a related comment, the student body president said,

I've run into people who worked on the task force and heard we've voted and changed things to make it work better. They were upset it was changed or that the language was changed. Everyone needs to understand it is O.K. to make changes if things aren't working. We need to move forward and the system would be useless if we didn't have the flexibility to move forward from past decisions.

The literature dealing specifically with the structure of governance describes a number of conditions necessary to develop a system that is based upon collaboration. In Academe, Philip Glotzbach (2001), former chair of the American Council of Academic Deans executive board, wrote an article adapted from his keynote address during an AAUP/ACAD conference, "Collaboration Toward the Common Good: Faculty and Administrators Working Together," held October 2000. His article enumerated five organizational principals that systematically encourage structural conditions for collaboration:

Clarify the roles of the players, keep the process as simple and straightforward as possible, assign (elect or appoint) people to participate in the work based on what they can contribute, not on who they are or which group they "represent," prefer a "matrix" model of decision-making wherever possible, and create systems and procedures (both formal and informal) that maximize consultation and minimize surprises. (Glotzbach, 2001, p. 21)
The structure of a governance system is only specific to the institution it reflects, and a one-size-fits-all model isn't feasible. With regards to structure, Tierney (1999) writes, "Those involved in the governance of higher education recognize that colleges are organizational cultures composed of structures and processes that continually change and adapt" (p. 244). He argues that governance structures are cultural configurations, and "participants need to realize that the manner in which they construct and participate in the processes and structures of governance will be different for the faculty [classified and students] than for other constituencies such as boards and administrators" (Tierney, 2005).

David Collis (2004) identifies the need to "address strategy and structure." He states, "It will be the governance structure of universities that ultimately impedes their ability to make those hard choices. Therefore, it is the governance that requires the most careful analysis, evaluation, and improvement" (p. 34). He concludes that governance structure follows strategy, though he acknowledges a catch-22 situation: "The current governance structure [in higher education] prevents us choosing the clear strategy that would enable us to improve the governance structure that would in turn make choosing the strategy easy" p. 69).

Kater and Levin (2005) identify a shift in the structure of community college governance:

By viewing shared governance not only as an academic tradition but also as an exchange of goods and services, the research suggests a perspective indicative of the commodification of cooperation. In conjunction with globalizing pressures for economy and efficiency, management may be
increasingly willing to share operational decision-making with faculty in return for faculty productivity. (p. 32)

Their findings also suggest that a role in decision-making signals recognition of the professional status of community college faculty, similar to the historical and traditional status of faculty in 4-year colleges and universities.

The structural framework for the governance system at Valley Community College is based significantly on faculty and classified union participation. The concept and pressure for a "joint or shared" decision structure came from the faculty union leadership. The union leadership over the past 12 years at VCC came from direct university experience in a more traditional model of shared decision-making. The union president from 1994-2002 holds a Ph.D. in physics and came from the local university with a strong faculty senate. The current faculty union president stated, during interviews, that he was involved in governance in the three universities he worked at prior to coming to VCC. During the development of the governance structure, his union successfully argued that they were the legal representatives for their respective groups regarding governance, and thus should be awarded the role of assigning representatives to the governance councils. This is recorded in a published report by the Faculty Council co-chairs to the Faculty Council in March 2004:

Faculty have elected the VCCEA to represent them in bargaining, and according to [state] law this gives the VCCEA the status of faculty representative in governance as well. At the same time, the faculty have also established the faculty council to serve as a forum on matters related to the academic program and the learning environment. (Barber & Davis, 2004, p. 10)
While the faculty association represents the faculty on "all matters bargainable under [state] law" and provides a common voice for VCCEA members in matters pertinent to their general welfare (VCCEA constitution), the faculty council serves as a faculty forum and referendum holder for all subjects, but particularly academic matters, of the college. (VCCEA, 2005, Art. 39.1.1)

Both Valley managers pointed out during their interviews that they perceived union appointments as a structural problem in the governance system. The following comments demonstrate their view on the unions' role in appointing participants. As one manager contended, "Unions choose representatives at the table who have other agendas rather than the focusing on the college." The other manager stated,

I was really opposed to the unions appointing people to the councils. My understanding from at least one of the unions is that the unions didn't have any formal election process; the union officers just went around and picked who they wanted. I don't think that way of appointing people necessarily gets the people with the [needed] skills.

The decision on how to ultimately decide who selects governance participants fell on the shoulders of the president to recommend to the board. In only her 3rd year as president, she was faced with a challenging decision. According to interviews with board, faculty, management administration, and classified staff, the current president, an internal candidate for the position, had strong support of both unions and staff during the selection process because of her active support for unions in governance. Ultimately, her recommendation was that unions should be responsible for selecting governance participants. The board unanimously supported this recommendation during a board meeting (Erika, personal communication, January 12, 2005).
Positions on this issue can range from the view that the union and shared
governance are incompatible, to requiring higher education faculty to either choose an
internal shared governance system (e.g., faculty senate) or a union, but not both (O'Neil,
2004). The parent organizations of both Valley Unions, AFT and NEA, joined in
supporting both a union and a shared governance system. In *The Truth About Unions
and Shared Governance*, the NEA/AFT wrote,

> AFT and NEA believe that unions and other representative governing
> bodies complement, rather than compete with, each other. The truth is
> unions can provide a framework for other shared governance bodies to
> operate successfully and without administrative interference.
> There is no set structure for cooperative relationships between
> unions and other shared governance bodies. Structural differences at
> various institutions are based upon federal, state and local legal
> mandates, as well as institutional traditions and applicable labor laws.
> It is important, however, that the roles of the union and other
> shared governance bodies be clearly defined and understood by everyone
> involved. (American Federation of Teachers, Higher Education [AFT],
> n.d., p. 1)

The faculty union president pointed out,

> Frankly, there isn't much possibility of being co-opted by either the
> association or federation stance. If you don't have a system that is
> governing in an honest and fully fair way, you have the possibility of
> participating in a system that isn't living up to the standards set.

**Process**

Process is a theme that includes two overlapping vignettes (Table 6). The first
vignette includes the activities in the governance system described as "policy and
planning." The other vignette is the process of "implementation" of agreed-to policy
TABLE 6. Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy/Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Board</td>
<td>• Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning</td>
<td>• Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development</td>
<td>• Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policy</td>
<td>• Expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Philosophy</td>
<td>• Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and plans. It was agreed by all groups that the board has legal authority for policy approval and college planning.

Figure 3 offers a visual overview of the overlapping area described by participants within and between policy and planning in the governance system and the implementation structure of the college. Process is focused on the ability to make these important aspects of governance work together in a coherent fashion.

![Figure 3. Governance Implementation Overlap](image-url)
The Valley college president thinks clarity in process is only a matter of time, but doesn't necessarily think it will happen quickly:

[We need to] develop a track record, and that track record gets developed by having policies and plans developed at the table with overrides and [mechanisms to] get them implemented. We need to guide the work through at least another 2- to 3-year process to full implementation so that people will see tangible results.

The board chair sees clarity in process helping the board be more effective: "More focused board meetings will be a result of an effective shared governance system. Confusion at all levels—faculty, management, and classified—will hinder the system."
The classified union president agrees it will take time, but also states, "I think we might be overly focused on process development."

The faculty union president said the best place to start is by developing policy and plans: "[We] need to get on with the review of policies and integrating that with the governance system." The faculty member participating from the Faculty Council thinks doing so has challenges: "It can be difficult to reach consensus. . . . In a consensus process, you could look at how many people approved. We could use the thumb sideways for neutral, or down for disapproval." A management participant finds that the consensus process is designed for collaboration and thinks it is just a matter of time before things run more smoothly: "While it isn't always acknowledged, each of those entities has a commitment to collaboration. We tend to go for consensus and should be able to get there."

The Valley college operations manual provides an outline for the meeting process and consensus decision-making:
• Robert's Rules will regulate council meetings (to be developed by the governance subcommittee to emphasize efficiency, participation, and clarity).
• Chair may fully participate in meeting discussions. Facilitation will pass to vice-chair or another member if the discussion is undermined by the chair's engagement in the issue.
• The consensus decision-making model underpins the governance system structure. Members blocking consensus are expected to explain their opposition and may offer an alternative proposal.

The process for policy approval is spelled out in the decision-making protocol of the governance system manual:

Consensus is a goal of the governance councils and should be the primary decision style. Consensus may be expressed through unanimous agreement; it may be a modified consensus where members can live with a decision even though they may not be in full support. Majority and minority reports may be provided to the responsible administrator if consensus is not achieved. (VCC, 2005)

The manual provides a number of steps that can be taken if consensus is not reached.

The final statement gives the administrator with final authority and responsibility the ability to make a final decision/recommendation and communicate it to the college community.

Title 5 in California directs district boards to delegate authority and responsibility to district faculty, through their academic senates, in the shared governance process as it relates to academic and professional matters such as curriculum, degree/certificate requirements, and grading policies. What it doesn't do is define a shared governance process.
Other colleges have similar consensus decision-making processes, but go further to offer training. Chabot College (2004) in California defines its shared governance process in a handbook:

Consensus decision-making is a process that does not involve Robert's Rules of Order or other such rules for committee work. Because of this, consensus decision-making may be unfamiliar to committee representatives. Therefore each committee should begin their year's work with a discussion of the decision-making principles and processes using consensus. Governance bodies must realize that consensus decision-making takes time and requires a commitment to open discussions. (p. 3)

Chabot College (2004) describes some of the essential characteristics of successful consensus decision-making—"speaking up; consensus does not mean unanimity; silence is not consensus; hold[ing] out; and solidarity [in decision-making]" (p. 2)—and provides guidelines for generating consensus. Chabot also provides a description of the how governance and administrative roles are a combination of tradition and an open "participation model." Chabot's report on shared governance and collegial consultation process states,

There are two classic schools of administration and management:

1. Traditional organization is a hierarchical order with subordinates. This model is often described as a pyramid and has the advantages of maintaining a central focus on goals and making decisions rapidly.
2. An open model encourages broad participation and ownership. At times, participants in this model can lose focus, and decision-making can be slow.

Chabot College merges these models, resulting in a structure somewhat like an hourglass. The top of the hourglass represents the governance structure, forming a funnel for ideas and recommendations. The ideas and recommendations, gathered at the top, filter to the middle of the hourglass.
The middle, or "waist" of the hourglass, consists of the college council, the college president, and the board of trustees.

The base of the hourglass consists of the traditional administrative structure of the college. It is used to carry out the decisions reached. On occasion, the administrative structure may wholly develop and carry out a decision due to the need to respond quickly. When this occurs, the college council will be informed and given the rationale for the action. (p. 2)

At decisions near the center of the hourglass, the process shifts to "mutually agreed" between Chabot College (2004) governance groups and the president:

This shared governance process, "mutually agreed" to by the college president and the academic senate, honors the state and board of trustee requirements while providing an open and inclusive process by which the future of the college, and implementing strategies, can be mutually agreed upon and developed. This shared governance process, and process for reaching mutual agreement, has Chabot academic senate, classified senate, associated students, college president, and board of trustees approval. (p. 1)

Tierney (2004) quotes a college president: "I wish we could do away with the whole phrase shared governance." Another concluded, "It implies processes. I'm not concerned about process; I'm worried about getting results, in getting the job done."

The faculty union parent organization, National Education Association (1987), adopted and published a "Statement on Faculty Governance" in higher education. The statement supported a clear process for faculty: "Effective governance requires processes which are open and encourage faculty participation by their ability to effectuate change when necessary" (p. 1).
Time

Time is a key factor in regard to both the amount of time it takes to make a decision and the additional workload for participants (Table 7). All groups indicated time was a significant issue for the system and all participants. The Valley governance system attempts to address this issue through released time for faculty and classified staff. While the concern for time is universal, how to appropriately address the issue still needs work.

**TABLE 7. Time**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Decision-Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Workload</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequent comments were made in regard to additional time needed. An administrative participant pointed out, "It has potential to slow down decisions, and take a lot of time from a few people adding to their loads." A board member stated, "When you need a quick decision, people expect processes to be followed, and those processes take time. There are times when decisions come up that need to be made quickly; otherwise, the college is paralyzed." Classified participants had similar comments: "Assuring that everything goes right will be more time consuming . . . and, it could take too damn long." A manager said, "Implementing this [governance system] makes it something different and it takes a lot of time." This led to responses on the issue of workload.
The board chair was supportive of providing released time to address added workload: "I expect that one form of assistance for staff would be released time. This is most important for people who are deeply involved in the process." The faculty union president looked outside of his own group and stated,

Ability must be there to keep the two other groups, classified and students, fully interested and able to participate in the governance system. The classified haven't had the support to be able to participate. Harder to do backfill; with enough resources it may be easy to do.

A management participant saw the workload issue from a different perspective: "The time issue needs to be dealt with. The needed time can take you away from other things you can do to improve student learning.” The student body president added his perspective:

Students are up to their neck with responsibilities; most have jobs outside of school, and serving on a council is really pushing it with regard to available time. It is easier for students not to get involved because of the time requirements. I can see why some wouldn't feel the need to be involved.

Valley Community College addresses the time issue in the founding principles of the governance system. Principals 7-9 specifically state,

7. The governance system should be efficient and effective, balancing the need for timely, informed decisions with the need to provide adequate time for participation in decision-making processes.
8. The governance system should encourage and promote a wide range of opportunities for many people to provide leadership regardless of their formal positions at the college.
9. The governance system should provide for clear, frequent, consistent, and timely communication within governance groups and between groups and the wider college community. (VCC, 2005)
The Valley governance system was delayed in implementation because not all participants had opportunity for released time or were paid for an overload. The ability to implement released time for staff is also challenged by financial constraints. The board passed a resolution (March 2004) that the system would be cost neutral. According to Valley's human resource director, this issue is not resolved (Chuck, personal communication, October 10, 2005).

The element of time is a key issue for the governance system, involving all constituent groups, yet the literature in this area is very limited. Linda Collins (2002) wrote in *Academe* that a major obstacle for progress in shared governance following approval of AB1725 in California was the lack of increased investment in reassignment time for faculty and managers at community colleges. Alfred (1998) echoed such concerns in his paper on *Shared Governance in Community Colleges*. He wrote that the negative aspects of shared governance included slowed decision-making, hampered effective management and limited efficiency. Looking at time as a single factor should be approached with caution.

Meg Wheatley (2005) points out the need to combine the issue of effectiveness with the issue of time. "In this speed culture, we now equate productivity with speed. . . . No one measures the productivity of these meetings by asking whether people have developed wiser solutions, better ideas, or more trusting relationships." Participants and the literature agree that the goal of engaging more stakeholders during the process may seem like it takes more time, but in reality can save time due to the increased buy-in during implementation.
Social/Cultural

Social/Cultural is a theme emerging from (a) the overlapping vignettes of "relationships/trust" between the constituency groups and (b) the evolution of the governance system within a "history/culture" of the organization (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social/Cultural</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships/Trust</td>
<td>History/Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Common Good</td>
<td>• Leadership Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Commitment</td>
<td>• Ideology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-Interest</td>
<td>• Systems Thinking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engagement</td>
<td>• Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Inclusion</td>
<td>• Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Motivation</td>
<td>• Leadership Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Openness</td>
<td>• Philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Values</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Valley college president presented governance as a major focus during the all-staff inservice meeting, fall 2003. In her speech, she addressed many elements found in the social/cultural theme:

Another major focus for this year is governance. The board has made a decision to govern by policy. They have directed me to develop a system for college governance that is effective and they plan to hold me, as president, accountable for the system and the decisions that we make. As you might imagine I have a bit of investment in assuring that we do this work well! I think one thing we can all agree on is that our current system is not working well. I had the unenviable task of charting our current governance system. It took up four large pieces of chart pack paper end-to-end. With lots of circles floating in the ether, disconnected to most everything else in the system. As I looked at it I thought no wonder we have a hard time understanding how things get done.
I have convened a group that includes students, classified staff, faculty, union leaders, and managers to develop a new system of governance. Again, there will be structured opportunities for college-wide feedback before a new system is finalized. Our hope is that we can streamline councils and committees and that we are clear and explicit about the roles of all parties—students, faculty, classified staff, managers, the president, unions and the board—and that it is clear where issues go for deliberation. Our governance system has been tripping us up for a long time because we have not had a shared understanding of what it means. This was on my work plan two years ago but was sidetracked by the budget issues. We need to address this and I am confident that we can. The committee has had two meetings so far and we are having rich discussions. They are not easy but they must be had if we are to develop a system that will work for the college. Obviously we need to design a system that taps into the collective wisdom of everyone and facilitates participation. We are working on setting up a website so that our work will be available to all as we go along (Valley President, Fall Inservice Speech, 2003).

In her assessment to the board in the following year, she wrote, "We are about to do an assessment on the college governance system. Based on my own experience and after meeting with the chairs and co-chairs of the councils I am relatively pleased with the progress to date. Of course, the system is still in its infancy but I think you will see that much work has been accomplished" (Erika, personal communication, May 11, 2005).

The literature holds similar findings on the cultural relationship between the faculty and administration. Kaplan (2004) states,

Fifty-three percent of respondents described the governance environment between faculty and administration as cooperative and another 41 percent characterized the relations as having some conflict but still collegial. Only 6.5 percent of respondents expressed concern that the governing environment could be best categorized as suspicious and adversarial. These numbers were consistent across several different types of institutions. (p. 175)
Other colleges have cited the importance of trust/relationships in their governance work. In its white paper on shared governance, Loyola University, Chicago, states,

Trust entails a number of factors. Truth-telling. Candid communication. Genuine listening. Accountability. Consistency. Mutuality. Trust is earned gradually, over time. Trust is not to be confused with absolute loyalty or willful ignorance. In a climate of trust, we can depend on one another to work for the mission and goals of the university. In a climate of trust, we can strive to bring wisdom to bear on institutional problems. In a climate of trust, we have the right to expect the best from one another and to hold one another to the highest standards of performance. To sustain such trust, we must learn to communicate and, if we disagree, to do so in a manner that is at once reasoned, fair-minded, passionate and respectful. (LUCSG, 2002)

The literature related to relationship/trust is consistent with findings in this study. William Tierney (2004) notes that "Trust trumps structure every time." He further states,

A culture of trust is founded on three premises. First is a belief that individuals are able to meet one another in dialogues in which they believe that all are involved for the common good. Second, those who are involved in making a decision outline how the decision will be made, and they stick to that plan. Third, individuals are precise with their words. (p. 211)

Margaret Wheatley (2005) supports this need for trust:

Employees earn trust, but leaders create the circumstances in which such trust can be earned.... Not only do leaders have to let go and watch as employees figure out their own solutions, but they have to shore up their self-confidence and encourage them to do more. . . . But people need a great deal from their leaders. They need information, access to one another, resources, trust, and follow-through. . . . Leaders are necessary to . . . [h]elp create connections across the organization, to feed the system with information from multiple sources—all while helping everyone stay clear on what we agreed we wanted to accomplish and who we wanted to be. (p. 70)
Wheatley also states that knowledge is something created inside oneself through relationships: "Knowledge never exists independently of this process of being in relationship with an event, an idea or another person. This process is true for all of us. Knowledge is created in relationship, inside thinking, reflecting human beings" (p. 149).

The current Valley governance system does not directly address the issue of relationship/trust. The president's role of "development and maintenance of a climate in the college conducive to productive learning and effective teaching" could arguably mean an environment of good relationships/trust.

History/Culture is more specific to Valley College. The history of governance at the college has been an evolutionary process. The college president described "years and years of talking about shared governance without clear structure. We can now point to a system and decision-making protocols and we have a real structure in place." The vice-president echoed her sentiments: "We already had the predisposition and some skills, in addition to having the values, for shared governance." The management representative who has worked at the college for over 30 years agreed: "Collaborative culture of the college probably helps to some degree."

The board chair explained his understanding of the history:

We tried to implement a shared governance system a few years ago. Then a more management-focused board was elected that redid the work on governance that we'd been doing. Now we have a board that has been very interested in implementing a hybrid-shared governance system.

The former board chair had an even longer history: "I've had 20 years of experience in pursing shared governance at this institution, first as a faculty member."
The faculty union president has seen significant change in the governance system. He noted,

You come here, you have a college council that wasn't representative, you had faculty on it that were self-appointed or picked by administration, and a Faculty Council that has very little sense of its authority. There wasn't a governance system here. I've never seen anything like it, and this was the most confusing thing to everybody on how decisions got made. You have administration members who consider themselves very democratic and participatory but you didn't have a system in place to make it happen.

While the history of the college may help in implementing the governance system, it may also cause challenges. The student body president shared examples where experience doesn't necessarily help:

Some groups bring up something said 10 years ago at the bargaining table, or students bring up one teacher did this, but it is all internal and very few people are willing to say this was one person or one situation.

Burton Clark (1998), In Creating Entrepreneurial Universities: Organizational Pathways of Transformation, provides four key ideas to increase performance in organizational culture. The first is demonstrating trust by listening to others with respect. This requires a shared focus on the common good, sticking to clear decision-making plans, and valuing clear language. Second, a common language must be developed. This requires defining the meaning of frequently used words. The author points out that "governance is a process, not an end." Third, keep one's words in sync with one's actions. This requires that meetings and interactions are infused with meaning. Finally, developing a core identity is listed as a key. This requires
participants to understand and share the core values of the institution. Clark writes,

"Strong cultures are rooted in strong practices" (p. 7). Tierney (2004) agrees:

Because governance structures are cultural configurations, the way to improve governance is through an interpretation of the organization as a dynamic culture. The interaction of individuals and structures can be orientated toward improvement and high performance when an institution's leaders utilize cultural strategies aimed at organizational redesign rather than structural arguments over one or another decision-making apparatus. (p. 203)

The test at Valley community college will be the ability to implement a shared governance structure that fits the culture, effectively develops policy and plans, successfully implements the plans and policies, and garners support from all groups.

Summary

The above analysis presents the governance system at Valley Community College and represents the opinions of 12 participants. The representative opinions are those of the board chair, college president, faculty union president, classified union president, management senate chair, student body president, and an additional representative selected from each representative group.
CHAPTER V: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

The literature on community college administration characterizes shared governance as an ideal model of governance for colleges, and some faculty unions, board members, and administrators have concurred. Various meanings and terminology have been used to describe shared governance, because employee groups and college leaders tend to define it according to their own goals. The governance model studied seeks to engage the campus community in the decision-making process through the development of six new governance councils. The new governance councils report to the existing representative council, the college council, and focus on policy development, planning, and evaluation. Research participants used various terms to describe their expectations and experiences for the implementation of the governance system: "shared governance," "participatory decision-making," "college governance," or "hybrid-shared governance." Definitions often focus on who participates in making the decisions and/or how decisions are made.

The literature on "shared governance" tends to define the term as a process involving anyone affected by the outcome of the decision (Nussbaum, 1995; Schuetz, 1999). The governance system studied defines those affected by the decision as the board, administration, classified staff, faculty, managers, and students. In this definition the people are identified by their positions or association with the college. The
representatives focus on the following aspects of the college: diversity, facilities, finance, learning, student affairs, and technology.

This study describes the perspectives of representative community college leaders at one institution regarding the implementation of that institution's shared governance system. The implementation year of the shared governance system is the period reviewed in the study. The study gives an interpretation of the findings collected from the perspectives of six college constituent groups. The study identifies elements and themes that exemplify the dynamic tensions created by a shared governance system. These dynamic tensions identify continuums that can help or hinder community college leaders in implementing a shared governance system. The study also identifies variables that influence the participants' perspectives and gives recommendations for improving the implementation process of shared governance. The researcher collected data from interviews with board members, faculty, administrators, managers, student leaders, and classified staff. That body of data was combined with (a) the author's field notes from trainings and governance meetings, (b) documents from the college at which the study took place, and (c) the researcher's journal.

The study compares those perspectives and suggests their possible impact on current governance theory. From this base, the researcher identifies the successes, pitfalls, cautions, and recommendations that leaders and governance participants need to know to successfully navigate the most difficult part of shared governance: the implementation year. The recommendations and conclusions reflect themes that
Six dynamic tension continuums emerged from the data elements. The dynamic tension continuums constitute the participants' perspectives on the college governance system: social/cultural, communication, structure, process, role, and time. The dynamic tension continuums collectively address issues of trust, collegiality, and the historical context of the organization. These dynamic tension continuums are significant areas in the implementation of a college governance system.

The Faculty Union president viewed the new governance system as a step forward from the old system. He stated,

You come here, you have a college council that wasn't representative, you had faculty on it that were self-appointed or picked by administration, and a faculty council that has very little sense of its authority. There wasn't a governance system here, I've never seen anything like it, and this was the most confusing thing to everybody on how decisions got made.

The college president identified a different aspect of governance as important when she stated,

The clarity that we've achieved between the Board and president gave us the authority, and it was a big step forward to have it in writing. That recognition has helped and taken a lot of the risk out of the governance system.

The Board chair noted that the foundation for an effective shared governance system is the leadership provided by the president. He stated,
We've had the experience of trying to instill a shared governance system with a weaker administration. The more you stay away from micromanaging at the Board level, the better chance that a shared governance-hybrid system can be successful at the college level.

The identified dynamic tension continuums provide similarities and contradictions from the study participants. While there wasn't full agreement that the new council governance system, with six new councils, was functioning better than the old system of only one governance council, study participants did see the ability to engage more staff and students in the process as a positive step forward.

Social/Cultural

The major dynamic tension continuum identified in the interview and observation data was social/cultural. Social/cultural refers to the contextual features of an organization. These include shared values and beliefs, the nature of external influences on the college, and activities that impact the college via political, technical, social and economic arenas, unique overall priorities and desired goals of the organization, and the number of people and resources and their span of control in the organization. All participants spoke of the core importance of having trust and collegial relationships among constituent groups; they considered this foundation essential to a shared/participatory governance system.

One clear example that trust was a continuing challenge for participants in the governance system was the need for the learning council to take four governance meetings to reach an agreement on the definition of a quorum. The fear that one group
might use a meeting where one group was absent to push decisions through made it mandatory for representation from each group to be present before a decision could be made. This, of course, created a situation where one group's absence or late arrival at a meeting would effectively shut down the ability of the council to move forward during critical stages of developing the college's learning plan.

The participants further stated that, in hindsight, it would have been better to address the issues of trust and collegiality before the implementation of the governance system. All of the study participants commented on how historical influences within the institution act positively or negatively upon the implementation of the governance system. Each participant acknowledged the need of all participants to focus on the common good as an essential principal to guide decisions and the governance system. Furthermore, study participants noted the importance that participants develop an ability to function as representatives to their constituency. The tension between the desires of one's constituency group versus the common good was also identified as a point of contention. A college vice president stated, "To improve effectiveness and build trust for the system, we need to quit thinking as employee groups. We are here to do the work of the college rather than serve our own special interests."

Community colleges are socially constructed organizations, and a governance system that is viewed as organic in nature, evolving, and maturing has the ability to adapt to a change in demands, both internally and externally. With this view in mind, leaders must respect the appropriate role for unions. The impact unions have on the governance system primarily derives from a legislative perspective. For the governance
system to function without conflict and strife, participants need to maintain a focus on
the big picture and avoid the temptation to focus on the needs of only one representative
group. A governance system that aligns its work to the mission and vision of the
college, and which is committed to open and honest participation, will have the ability
to adapt to change. A shared governance system must provide an environment that fully
engages participants in meaningful work to effectively gain college-wide support.

Communication

One key to an effective shared governance system is sound communication to
assure that the shared governance system leads to a shared understanding, and that
everyone sees him or herself as equal in the governance process. Every interviewee
identified communication as an essential construct in an efficient and effective
governance system. Communication is not simply the formal process used to gather and
share information within the governance system; it includes informal dialogue as well.
If a president is faced with the choice of getting more work done in the governance
system or spending more time communicating, he or she would be further ahead to
choose the path of communication. The president stated, "Things go slower. If you or I
as president made decisions it might be a more efficient use of time, but I don't know if
it would be more effective." The student body president agreed:

Biggest benefit is less back-end uproar. If you have more people making
decisions, you have a lot less chance of angering faculty or students and
that negatively effects the implementation of a decision. Negative media
from one group is negative media.
In order for a governance system to develop a structure and culture conducive to effective organizational decision-making, a foundation for clear and effective communication must be present. Communication is necessary at all levels in the governance system. This includes communication between the board and the community, between the board and college, and among the governance councils, administration, and campus community. Communication is central in relaying information so that representatives in the governance system, employees, and members of the board have a complete understanding of issues and processes for decision-making. Horizontal as well as vertical communication, within the system, was identified as directly tied to the level of employee participation.

The governance communication systems struggled during the implementation year. The governance website didn't come online until April, 6 months after initiating the governance system, essentially leaving the campus community without a direct way to access the council agendas and minutes. A faculty study participant noted efforts to increase communication: "One council put up a survey on a website to let people, for example, give their top five opinions and feelings [on the learning plan]. Something like this can help get feedback from the group that you are representing." The student group provided a survey for students during on-line registration. Students could choose to follow a link directly from the registration webpage.

Open and clear communication channels are necessary to address the issues of mistrust between the faculty ranks and the administration that have historically plagued Valley Community College. Open forums would provide opportunity for staff to have
more direct interaction with governance representatives and councils. The use of E-mail chatrooms would create more engagement than simple surveys. In addition, a portal system could allow direct linking to student and staff custom homepages. The president did a good job of providing staff with periodic E-mail updates on the governance system progress in planning and policy development. Creating access to or providing student E-mail accounts would address a current communication gap. Utilizing the student newspaper would be another option for communicating with students and staff.

Structure

The data indicate that the structure establishes the mechanics of the governance system. Organization of the system, how representatives are selected, how the union engages with the governance system, the framework in which decisions are made, and who does the training/orientation of representatives were all identified as essential elements to the structure. In addition, the organizational philosophy of the college president and board, and the organization's present and historical culture were identified as helpful and supportive factors in the establishment of a shared governance system. The ability for a college, selected as a vanguard institution, to place learning at the heart of the organization was present from the perspective of a student study participant:

"Tells us we (as students) that we are as important as they say we are. Basically it is like walking the talk of the College Core Values and Guiding Principles, and the College looks to us for guidance too. You are a student in the learning environment which would benefit you directly."
A structural design decision to utilize consensus in decision-making for the intracollege governance system was consistent with the leadership philosophy of the college president. A student study participant noted,

Consensus model can really, really hold things up. One person can be a stickler and someone can take something personal and they could vote no and hold up everything. I think some people are scared of one group trying to hold things up. This means some groups are less trusting, I don't know the whole history of the groups.

To try to address the issue, councils developed a consensus voting process. The faculty council study participant stated, "In a consensus process you could look at how many people approved (we could use the thumb sideways for neutral, or down for disapproval)." The dynamic tension that exists in a consensus structure was stated further by the faculty council study participant: "By getting people at the table, through the process, and reaching consensus in the end, there shouldn't be any disgruntled groups."

The decision that the unions were responsible for selecting governance representatives from their employee groups was identified by management, as well as some administrators and students, as a structural tension point. The managers seemed specifically concerned about the perceived agendas of the unions. The management senate chair talked about participants who have loyalty to their unions or representative groups. A lot of time it does feel like posturing is evident and different agendas or strategies are being developed to get the most benefits [for one employee group] out of the decisions being made.
The concerns ranged from the perceived negative influence of union agendas on the common good of the college to the need to avoid a system that brought bargaining and national labor agendas to the college governance system.

Process

Process was seen as an overlap of two important aspects in governance: policy development and implementation. In policy development, the board, president, and governance councils must clearly understand and agree to the definitions and terminology used and to the processes used in both the development and implementation stage. To achieve this end, employees and the board need a clear understanding of how governance can effectively move from policy development to implementation and evaluation. A key indicator in achieving this is clear agreement on where the authority for implementation and evaluation lies.

Employee groups view authority and implementation from different perspectives. The board chair noted,

First of all, the concept of shared governance in our college is a hybrid type of governance system, not a pure shared governance system. Shared governance is an impossibility for elected boards in this state. I think pure shared governance can only happen where the board doesn't need to approve statutory administrative decisions.

The board chair further stated, "The only employee of the board is the president—the only person the board hires and fires directly. If that responsibility isn't taken seriously, the board and college will pay for it." The classified union president agreed the governance system is an important step forward. He stated, "This governance system
does require some loss of authority; it requires managers to be more a facilitator and less a director."

The data reveal that the level of participatory development in policy setting and planning has been historically based upon social/cultural influences of the stakeholder leaders, board and unions, and the leadership styles of former college presidents. Past presidents held a more autocratic leadership style that allowed little or no participation by constituent groups in policy development and organizational planning. Yet, most community college boards place an emphasis on collaboration skills; for the president's ability to engage staff in participatory planning is an essential function in job postings for community college presidents. The faculty union president stated,

Faculty know that we have a new governance system, and know we have members involved. They don't know to trust the governance system yet or if it is merely a co-optation with no real devolution of power out from the administration.

The dynamic tension between decision authority and implementation accountability is a key factor in developing governance systems.

Role

Understanding the roles that governance representatives and various constituent groups have is a key challenge in establishing an effective governance system. Clarity as to where the authority lies for establishing, approving, and implementing policy is essential. The authority of the board, management, representatives, unions, administration, and college president must be clearly defined. The data suggest that the
roles of the various groups and participants engaged in the governance system are constantly shaping and being shaped by the organizational leadership and culture of the college.

The board and president play a pivotal role in engaging the various employee groups. At the college studied, the president was selected internally with strong support of the board and unions in large part because of her support of shared governance when she was college vice president. The level of trust between the unions and president continues to be reported as high by interviewees from all employee groups. The president sees the governance system as a way to further the level of trust that exists within the college. She also sees roles and authority taking shape over time. She noted, "Uncertainty around the gray area between policy, planning, and implementation is a disadvantage in the short run but an advantage in the long run if it brings clarity." The unions articulated a slightly different perspective on the authority with a more involved role for the unions.

The faculty union president sees clarity from his perspective. He stated, "A lot of times people will say you need shared governance or democracy because you want people to bring in their different knowledge, but it is more than that. It is bringing together the different authorities." This should not be surprising, as the unions have historically literally had a seat at the table during board meetings. Although the union seats are nonvoting, union members are often referred to by board members for input, in addition to the monthly reports that are a part of the regular agenda.
Time

All study participants referred to the additional time needed for decision-making in the new governance system, and the additional time required to actively participate in the new system as disadvantages of the shared governance system. The administration, board, classified staff and management representatives were unanimous in their concern that the additional time impacted participants' workloads and, to this point, has not led to better decisions. The negative perception regarding the amount of time needed for implementation of the governance system may change as governance committees move from the policy review and planning stage to the less time-consuming stage of policy evaluation and plan review.

Governance Perspective of the Participants as Compared to Governance Theory

Some form of shared governance has a long history as a preferred governance model at many 4-year institutions. The concept of a diffused, democratic decision-making process is frequently referenced by union, faculty and employee groups as necessary to model the foundation of a democratic society. The influence of faculty hired with experience and values learned in the university system will continue to increase the impact and desire for a shared governance model at community colleges. The college studied is impacted by the proximity of a large public university and the relationships among union leaders at other colleges. VCC union leaders are active
throughout the state, and recently assisted another regional community college faculty in the organization and implementation of the first faculty union at that institution.

The two VCC unions differ in their approach to the governance process. The classified union president stated, "As long as unions understand the governance system is advisory, everything will work better." The faculty union president noted, "Governance system should be governing . . . where the big decisions are being made—e.g., budget—or new directions the college is going. These decisions should be made by the key stakeholders, the unions and administration together."

The management senate chair expressed her concern for the unions' approach: Participants who have loyalty to their unions or representative groups [create challenges]. A lot of times it does feel like posturing is evident and different agendas or strategies [are] being developed to get the most benefits out of the decisions being made.

The other management representative interviewed shared a similar perspective: "I feel in general both unions are positioning themselves for more authority, but one might be more active than the other; regardless, the attitude is still there." The concern about union involvement was noted by the management senate chair:

I was really opposed to the unions appointing people to the councils. My understanding is the unions didn't have any formal election process; the union officers just went around and picked who they wanted. I don't think that way of appointing people necessarily gets the people with the skills [needed].

The issue of appointment to councils was viewed from a different perspective by the classified union president: "Without unions you'd have a much more top-down system with administrators appointing people who they want to councils." A college
vice-president noted during an interview, "To some extent, detaching the union and having representation from some folks that aren't dominated by the union might help the effectiveness, but it might grind things to a halt trying to get there." The dynamic tension between the unions' involvement in the governance system continued throughout the implementation year. Addressing the appropriate level and scope of union involvement, prior to implementation, could benefit everyone involved.

Successes/Pitfalls, Cautions and Recommendations

The research uncovered a number of successes/pitfalls, cautions and recommendations during the implementation year of the college shared governance system. The success and pitfalls are focused on the structure of VCC’s governance system, role of participants, issues of authority, representation, and composition. Cautions include the need for clarity of stakeholder groups' roles and authority. Recommendations include council functions and key indicators/benchmarks for successful implementation of a shared governance system. The successes/pitfalls, cautions and recommendations are focused solely upon information gathered in the implementation year regarding a shared governance system at one institution.

Governance Structure

Community college boards have the legal responsibility for governing the college. The board also supervises the president of the college. Many community college boards have clear policy in place that gives the college president responsibility
and accountability to the board for the college's organizational effectiveness and efficiency. Therefore, college governance is ultimately a joint responsibility of the board and president. VCC and community colleges in general would profit from a structure that seeks to organize governance councils in a democratic hierarchy that places the responsible administrator in the leadership role. This includes a college council that (a) oversees the governance system and additional councils and (b) reviews policy recommendations and functional plans that are recommended to the president. The president then has the authority (and accountability) to provide the board with policy and plan recommendations from the staff. The recommended structure is functionally similar to what is in place at Valley College, with a primary focus on policy development and planning.

The major difference between the new VCC system and the recommended structure is how the governance councils are chaired. In the VCC structure the chair is always selected from a constituent group rather than from administrators accountable for the function. The recommended governance system aligns the functional councils with the organizational structure of the college and taps into the knowledge, skills, and abilities of the administrators hired by the college to fill a leadership role. This change allows the necessary alignment of the establishment of governance policy and plans with the implementation of those plans. The recommended structure is creating a learning council focused on credit programs (i.e., transfer and 2-year professional programs); a student services council (focused on student recruitment, retention, and placement); a facilities and operations council (focused on campus maintenance and
facility development); and a community education and workforce development council (focused on credit-free continuing education programs and workforce training). This structure furthermore aligns the responsible administrator with the responsibility and accountability to provide leadership at the council level. Furthermore, administrators can more readily structure interactions with multiple constituent perspectives of the college, create a forum for dialogue on key issues, and connect with relevant external stakeholders. A shared governance structure would benefit from the inclusion of external stakeholders. VCC has a pool of over 400 community advisory members serving on professional technical advisory committees. Adding community advisory committee members to the governance structure would broaden the conversation to include an external perspective.

Authority

The governance system needs to clearly define those areas in which special competence exists in the constituency groups (e.g., classified, faculty, managers and students). Faculty and management consent should be required in academic policies and programs. Employee group and student advice should be sought but not considered authoritative in funding priorities. Employee input should also be gathered when policy issues (e.g., time campus buildings are locked, parking charges, etc.) impact employee job functionality and satisfaction. Some governance participants will ultimately want the governance system to have the authority to make decisions. The board chair and
college president agree that responsibility and authority both lie with the president as the board's only employee.

Union Representation

Unions are generally established with a charter that defines their representational role. In most cases the union's role is focused on wages, salary, benefits and working conditions. Community colleges are often faced with two representing bodies for faculty: union and faculty senate. Defining clarity and distinction between these two groups is essential. The union's focus on labor issues (e.g., salary, wages, working conditions, etc.) can create a conflict between advocacy for a constituency group versus the common good of the organization. Therefore, a truly representative process would seek to establish a true democratic process and allow for the election and removal of representatives by a vote of the full constituency body.

Council Composition

Ideally, councils should represent the voice for all college stakeholders. The board ultimately has the oversight accountability for the college, and its members must remain in that role. Therefore, stakeholder groups include the employee groups (e.g., administration, classified staff, faculty, managers) and end-users (students, community members, business, foundation board members). The responsible administrator should assure that each employee stakeholder group has an elected member.
Council Functions

The function of each council includes ends planning, policy development, and plan coordination, integration, and evaluation. The council is responsible for planning and policy development for the defined area. Each council is responsible for assuring that its plan does not affect another functional areas' plans. The overarching college council has final review of all plans to verify that one plan doesn't impact another. The policy development establishes rules and regulations but not decisions. For example, the concept that all faculty must hold a doctorate is a policy, but the selection of faculty is a decision and not open to the council. The coordination, integration and evaluation of plans provides for a framework to infuse the council plans horizontally in the college. The evaluation process will occur annually when the plan is reviewed and the responsible administrator provides a report of achievements. The council annually provides the administrator with a documented evaluation of each plan's success and areas for improvement.

Role of Shared Governance Participants

All stakeholders have a role in the governance structure, beginning at the department/program level and extending to the college level. A shared governance model has its own challenges and often creates a tension between decision-making efficiency and effectiveness. The need to make sure the college is doing the right thing, versus doing something faster, should be a guiding value that supports implementing a
shared governance model. This study identified both positive and negative attributes for a shared governance system. The advantages identified by study participants include:

- Shared understanding of stakeholder leaders on the key issues facing the college.
- Ability for stakeholders to have a form of input into decisions.
- Support for carrying out the decisions made in the governance system.
- Increased responsibility for stakeholder implementation of decisions.
- Improved and more effective learning environment for students.
- Improved and more effective work life for employees.
- Improved communication opportunities for stakeholder leaders.
- Opportunity to provide divergent points of view in a structured process.
- Increased understanding as to how college will move forward on critical issues.

Negative aspects identified by study participants include:

- Increased time needed to make decisions and develop plans.
- Time administrators and stakeholders are engaged in governance meetings.
- Lack of clarity on process steps for approving plans.
- Lack of clarity or common understanding on definition of key governance terms (e.g., authority, plan, etc).
- System's propensity for masking competing perspectives and priorities.
- Opportunity for power struggles, polarization and adversarial relations.
- Role and authority confusion among councils and stakeholder leaders.
- Tendency to attract stakeholders with political views and agendas.

In summary, this study supports the greatest challenge and threat to institutions, identified by Duderstadt (2004): success and failure arises from the manner in which the institutions are governed, both from within and from without. Different constituent groups identified differing levels of perceived effectiveness for the shared governance system under study. The new governance system can be perceived completely differently depending upon the position the individual held in the institution. Interviewees felt that implementing the governance system slowed decision-making and polarized rather than united campus constituencies in the learning and facilities council;
yet the student affairs and diversity council had a less contentious environment during the implementation year. In contrast, the shared governance system was generally viewed by participants as having improved campus communication, increased the breadth of understanding related to issues facing the college, and helped promote buy-in into decisions.

**Impact of This Study on the Researcher**

My interest in college governance, and its impact on institutional effectiveness, is based on my experiences as a student, classified staff member, faculty member, and coach in community college and university systems, and as a division chair and administrator at a community college. A current résumé is provided in Appendix I. My interest also reflects my experience as a publicly elected board member for a large public utility and as an appointed member to the executive committee and board for the council of governments serving the community college district in which I live. My experience as a board member and administrator at public institutions supports the notion that command and control is generally less effective in the long-term than widespread employee involvement in organizational decision-making (i.e., governance). Governance starts at the program and department level and needs a way to actively engage employees in an organization-wide governance system.

This study reinforced my view that leaders and organizational systems, formal and informal, shape the effectiveness of the organization. Skills in organizing and
implementing a governance system depend on an awareness of the historical/cultural, structural, and process needs of the institution and stakeholders.

As a governance system evolves, it is impacted by various factors. The most influential factor is the impact of stakeholders and leaders accountable for the governance process. Governance stakeholders engage over time in the development process at various levels (i.e., board, administration, classified, faculty, managers, students, and community), and the system gradually reaches a stage of maturity in both effectiveness and efficiency. The ongoing evaluation of the governance system is necessary to maintain a viable and effective process that can meet the needs of the organization.

My preconceived bias that students would not have the necessary desire, skills, knowledge, and/or time to fully contribute to the governance system was misinformed. Students come into the system without a strong historical/cultural bias that might impact their role in the decision-making process. Students were in an ideal position to focus on the common good of the whole (i.e., students, college, community, staff, etc.) and not get caught up in the debate of historical wrongs. Furthermore, students are engaged in a valuable learning experience that increases the leadership development of the student body.

Personal benefits as a result of research on governance come directly from colleagues who acknowledge my expertise and experience on governance issues. I am frequently asked to provide input and leadership on governance topics at the college and department levels. I have assisted the two organizations where I serve as a public
official in the development of new governance systems. At the public utility, I helped
draft portions of a new governance handbook and was board chair during the
implementation of policy governance process. At the council of governments, based
upon my recommendation, we moved to an executive committee structure that meets
monthly. This change reduced the full 26-member meetings from monthly to bimonthly
and increased a stronger policy governance process for the board.

Last year, I gave a joint presentation with the college president at a national
conference focused on college governance. My research and development on
organizational governance has continued to open up opportunities that wouldn't have
been available to me otherwise. These opportunities continue to shape my development
as a leader. This college president has allowed me an opportunity to speak truth and be
judgmental without fear of retribution. The ability to reflect on current practice and be
fully honest is not always present in organizations. For these opportunities, I am
eternally grateful.

Strengths and Limitations of This Study

This study's strengths include the identification of themes that community
college boards and presidents can utilize to enhance their ability to implement an
efficient and effective shared governance system. The themes should allow a college
board, administration, support staff, faculty and students to focus on the most important
issues at hand and engage in an effective planning process to move the college in the
desired direction.
There isn't a simple cookie-cutter approach to implementing an effective community college governance system. No two colleges have the same social/cultural context or face the same exact economic factors. The governance system must be adapted to the cultural history in which it is implemented. The challenge is to focus on the culturally held beliefs of the organization's constituents about structures rather than constant structural changes. In short, each college must invent and develop its own system.

Limitations include the small number of governance representatives that were included, and the focus on one college. The choice to focus on one college was based upon the conclusion that situations and conditions of a governance system are unique to a particular college and individuals involved. Though the situation and conditions are unique, the findings of this study may be used to assist other community college stakeholders in developing an effective system.

The study did consider gender and ethnic backgrounds in the research design. Gender of the stakeholder representative group participants was 50% female and 50% male, except for the administration group, which was all female, and the board, which was all male. Race did not emerge as an issue. However, there was limited minority participation. Only 2 of the 12 participants in the interviews disclosed that they belonged to a minority group. The low minority participation rate reflects the fact that minority populations of the board, employees and students are under 10%, the same as the college district.
The data do not support a gender preference in a governance model. Women and men were aligned in perspective based more upon the position they occupied in the organization. Women and men in administration and management tended to view the role of faculty, staff and students in the governance system as more advisory in nature. Faculty, in particular, focused on a desire to mold the governance system into a truly "shared" decision-making system—i.e., one where the big decisions impacting the college are shared. Both genders in the classified staff and student representative groups preferred a shared governance system, but noted that the administration is ultimately accountable and responsible for decisions made in the governance system.

**Recommendations on a Shared Governance Implementation**

A number of recommendations emerged from the study. Identifying a clear role and function for each governance council is essential to governance system success. Oversight on a micro (individual/council) and macro (system/organizational) level is necessary to identify and address issues as they arise in a timely manner before problems become too significant to handle. The trading of value in effectiveness (i.e., buy-in, better decisions) over efficiency (i.e., quicker decisions, less hassle debating issues) presents a dynamic tension for college presidents as well as other faculty and staff.

A successful community college governance system balances the rights of individual employees to create the most effective learning environment for students and
meets the needs of the community with the common good of the college. Charles Handy (1997) provided a conceptual organizational framework when he wrote,

A public corporation should now be regarded not as a piece of property but as a community—although a community created by a common purpose rather than a common place. No one owns a community. Communities, as democracies know them, have constitutions that recognize the rights of their different constituencies and that lay down the methods of governance. The core members of communities are more properly regarded as citizens rather than employees or "human resources"—citizens with responsibilities as well as rights. (pp. 27-28)

Such a framework allows each community college to develop its own variation. However, each college must intentionally structure a council system for guiding policy and planning. A council system requires that representatives are selected; not every employee can participate. The various representative stakeholders develop policy and plans for each functional area that ultimately lead to decisions. This policy and planning process allows stakeholders from all employee groups—e.g., faculty, classified employees and students—to pursue self-chosen objectives and ideals to increase the effectiveness of the organization.

Recommendation 1: Stakeholder Groups

The governance system must address the issue of authority. A decision matrix should outline the responsibilities and decision accountability for each level of college governance. Clarity in the governance system between policy development by governance stakeholders and implementation by the administration is essential. Stakeholder groups of a community college include the faculty, classified staff, students,
managers, administrators, the executive team, board of education, and the external advisory committee members in the implementation of a structure that maximizes participation, incorporates the best thinking of all, and places authority at the appropriate level. The governance system includes a symbiotic relationship between the board/college, and department- and program-level governance systems.

Recommendation 2: Council Composition

In the college governance system, council memberships should include an administrator who has responsibility and accountability for the functional area (e.g., vice-president or dean of instruction for Learning Council, dean of student affairs for Student Affairs Council). Councils should be structured around the responsible administrator. The full council constitutes the representative managers who report to that administrator, and the faculty, staff and students who are a part of the organization impacted by the decisions made by said council. This composition thus creates a structure that can accommodate the various perspectives comprising the community college.

Recommendation 3: Council Representation

The councils should be chaired by the administrator with functional responsibility, who is accountable for the implementation of policy and work process outcomes. The subordinates of the managers, whose council it is, should constitute a plurality of membership. Those added to the council should have defined voting
privileges—i.e., full, limited or none. Community members serving on advisory committees are college constituents and should participate on councils. Membership should change based upon the functional focus of the council (Figure 4). The Learning Council should include the dean or vice president for instruction, instructional dean representatives, faculty chair representatives, faculty lead representatives, faculty representation, classified coordinator representatives, classified representation, student leadership representation, and general student representation.

![Diagram of Council Representation]

**FIGURE 4.** Council Representation

The involvement of community members in the governance system could help to focus the governance system on the common good of the college. Community representation could include a member (or members) of the existing professional
technical advisory councils to the college and an at-large community member who has engagement or an interest in transfer education. Concerns about time commitments or whether a community member's voice would be respected by college faculty and staff have already been demonstrated at VCC by the professional technical advisory committees. To create a culture of trust among faculty and community members serving on transfer focused councils it would be important for community members to have relevant experience and expertise in transfer education. VCC is located near a major university providing ample opportunity to engage retired university faculty on governance councils.

Recommendation 4: Council Authority

The College Council should have the oversight responsibility and authority for reviewing all policy and plan recommendations developed in the governance system by the functional governance councils. Councils are recommending bodies, as the accountability does not lie with a council, but instead resides with the individual responsible for the outcomes. In most cases, decision authority ultimately lies where the responsibility and accountability rests: with the board, president, administrator or manager.

Recommendation 5: Decision-Making

Consensus was identified as the preferred method to reach a decision by study participants. The support for a consensus model appears to be an ethical-moral
judgment. The focus on the decision-making process instead of on the outcome or product is an important point to consider in developing a governance structure. The VCC board and president felt strongly that decisions should be made by the consensus of all those who are directly affected by the decisions. It is important to note that while consensus allows for an agreement it may actually be the least controversial option, not necessarily the best decision for the college.

A consensus decision-making model provides a process for stakeholders to reach a decision. If the board or council cannot reach agreement in the consensus process, additional choices still exist. The board or council can identify the issue or question that needs resolution in order to achieve consensus. If dialogue doesn't move the group to consensus, the final decision rests with the administrators in that area. Building the clear role for administration into the consensus process allows for an intervention by the person responsible and accountable for the outcomes of the organization. Therefore, an administrator or president of the college should have final decision-making authority. To make sure the intervention authority is clear, boards and councils must agree on the process by consensus during the development of the governance system. If the governance system is functioning properly it will be rare, if at all, that administration needs to exercise final decision-making authority.

Recommendation 6: Scope of a Governance Plan

Each governance council should be charged with the development of a plan to guide the work in that functional area. The learning plan should therefore receive
considerable campus engagement. In part this is due to the central nature of learning: it is at the heart of the community college mission. Each council is also responsible for assuring that plans are compatible with the plans being established by other councils and the board. This creates the opportunity for horizontal interactions on issues such as student learning, student services, and campus facilities. If councils cannot agree, the highest council, the college council, should determine if a part of one plan affects another. This process keeps decisions at an appropriate level and avoids the need to debate centralization versus decentralization. The plans should not be allowed to negatively impact an organizational unit that is not brought into the development and implementation of the governance plans.

Recommendation 7: Policy vs. Implementation

The governance councils are policymaking bodies. Governance councils are democratic hierarchies and are not management committees. A policy is a rule or a regulation, not a decision. An example of a governance policy is that all teaching faculty must hold at least a master's degree. The appointment of a teaching faculty member represents a decision and lies outside of the governance process. Managers may ask councils to vote on decisions, but accountability for any decisions will lie with the responsible manager, not the council. Policies, on the other hand, are the responsibility of councils and should not be confused with the implementation responsibility of the management. Implementation is the carrying out of decisions that align with and support an established policy. Management has the responsibility to
implement policy and plans established by the governance councils and board. Administration determines who is to do what, where, and when it is to be completed. Effective implementation requires the utilization of resources. College resources for which the administration are responsible and accountable include people; plant and equipment (capital expenditures); materials, supplies, and energy (consumables); financial capital; and information. Implementation needs a responsible monitoring system. This includes monitoring the assumptions on which the plan is based, the outcomes expected, and how expectations and assumptions are to be detected and corrected.

Recommendation 8: Function of Councils

The councils at VCC would benefit from adding functional planning to the scope of council work. The effectiveness of VCC governance councils would improve with increased governance training for council members, including clarity around the chair's role.

Functional Planning

Councils have responsibility for functional planning within the scope of accountability of the responsible administrator leading the planning effort. This involves an interactive design of the desired present and the invention or selection of means for attaining that design. The objective is to create the future. In order to effectively achieve a preferred future, a number of interactive processes must work
together. The first process is an analysis of the current situation to describe and understand what the organization is and is not capable of. Second, councils need to identify the ideals; objectives and goals are specified through ends planning. This leads to an idealized redesign through means planning. Means planning involves the identification and establishment of policies, programs, projects, and specific courses of action. Finally, resource planning should determine the human resources, equipment, facilities, materials and supplies necessary to implement the preferred course of action.

Training

Training requires the development of the basic form of learning, data and information, but also includes the ability to utilize the data and information of knowledge, understanding and wisdom. The primary focus of training in governance is to understand the role of the council and council members, along with the scope of the council.

Chair Role

The responsible administrator may be able to participate more if she/he does not need to focus on the facilitation of the meeting. A chair should facilitate the work of the council, but does not need to be the meeting facilitator tasked with keeping the discussion focused on the task at hand. Therefore, the meeting facilitator doesn't necessarily need to be the responsible administrator. The responsible administrator will have the responsibility to maintain the agenda, meeting notes and annual planning
which are all necessary features of the governance councils; they empower the structure to move the system along. The meeting facilitator can therefore be any member of a committee certified in modified meeting facilitation (e.g., Roberts Rules of Order). The organic need for councils to be creative and flexible can result in the need for a loosely coupled structure. The responsible administrator can make sure councils communicate and collaborate in a cohesive fashion to successfully address current and identified challenges facing the college.

Recommendation 9: Unions' Role/Authority

Unions have designated authority to represent their employee group on issues such as wages, benefits, and working conditions. Where the line is drawn on working conditions and their impact on the governance system will continue to be a point of discussion at VCC. Unions have a strong and active history at VCC, and played a key role in creating and supporting the president in the implementation of the new governance system. Direct involvement by unions in the college governance system can have positive and negative effects. The more the unions engage in permissive issues of bargaining in the governance system, the greater the possibility political tension will exist. There is a need to define clear roles for the union on issues of policy, implementation, and authority in order for the governance system to be clear to everyone involved.
Recommendations for Further Research

Recommendations for further research related to community college governance include three areas. The first two recommendations involve the role of the community college president. The final recommendation involves governance on a broader level.

The study demonstrates six dynamic tensions that exist in shared governance and involve the college president in his/her areas of responsibility and accountability. While situations and issues may arise that are unique to the individual college, there is a commonality that exists in the literature on governance and among documents at other colleges that have implemented a shared governance system. The findings demonstrate that employees want and need the opportunity to influence the future of the organization in which they work. This includes the desire to impact the future of the organization at the local and college-wide levels.

Further research needs to be conducted to determine if researcher's observations and recommendations on community college shared governance continue longitudinally. The recommendations involve the dynamic tensions of role, communication, structure, process, and social/cultural, which would provide community college presidents, boards, administrators, classified staff, faculty members, managers and students with guidance and a plan of action to deal with the implementation and maintenance of an efficient and effective governance system that values engaging stakeholders in the development and maintenance of the college.

The second recommendation is to study how a president's traits, skills, and abilities impact a college governance system. The study could identify what knowledge,
skills, and abilities are necessary to create an effective and efficient community college governance system. In 2001, the American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) renewed its mission statement to respond to changes taking place in higher education. One major concern for community colleges is the impending shortage of college leaders resulting from an unprecedented number of retirements over the next decade. Community colleges will need to focus on finding and developing qualified leaders to replace those retiring. The new AACC mission statement therefore includes leadership development as a strategic action area and goal, assuring that "diverse, qualified leaders are available at all levels of our nation's community colleges. They understand the community college mission, values, and vision and have the ability to implement them" (p. 2). The AACC defined the governance and organization function as a key skill set for future community college presidents. The AACC suggested that "Presidents master board relations, shared governance and union contracts, and employee welfare negotiations" (p. 3).

The final recommendation is to study how turnover in community college presidencies or boards impacts the governance of the college. The board and college president have a major influence on how shared governance is shaped. The identified impacts could facilitate a better understanding among community college leaders regarding (a) the varieties of knowledge, skills and abilities needed to function when turnover occurs in college presidencies or boards; and (b) the type of orientation and cultural knowledge a president or board member will need to make the successful
transition. The study could measure the pre- and postchanges in employees' levels of trust and perceptions of the college's governance system.

**Summary**

The college studied had a single shared governance council (i.e., college council) prior to the implementation of six additional governance councils that focused on different aspects of college work. An effective college governance system is vital for an organization to address internal and external demands. Colleges will continue to face the competing tensions of stakeholders, economic conditions, politics and societal needs. To prosper, colleges need to effectively develop a college governance system that is the impetus to move the organization in a positive direction. The focus of a college governance system is impacted by the broader governance systems at the local, state and national levels. Many governance systems in colleges don't work because they address content (the knowledge, structure, and data in a college) or process (the activities and behaviors), but fail to address the context in which both of those elements reside. The determinant of people's action isn't what they know but how they perceive the world around them.

In this study it became clear that each representative group was focused on desired outcomes that were often in conflict with one another. On an individual level, each representative shared a context or personal mindset of the organizational culture. It included all of the assumptions and norms brought to the table by that individual. Context can also be called perception, as opposed to facts or data. People don't learn
context from a governance system; they inherit it. The implication for the organization, board, administration, classified staff, faculty, managers, and students is to be mindful of the historical and cultural influences, both internal and external, that impact the development and evolution of the governance system.

Effective governance leadership requires that one take a stand on one's beliefs and philosophies. The ability to effectively engage employees and students in the life and development of the college is a core responsibility of a college president. The board chair addressed the leadership issue: "Shared governance is impossible to enforce unless you have strong administration. In theory, shared governance takes away administrative responsibility from the board, which is not what a board is supposed to be doing." The other board member pointed out the benefits: "If you have a staff that believes that they are being heard, their morale increases and their commitment to the college deepens." A faculty council representative agreed during her interview: "It should increase people's willingness to go the extra mile because they are a part of the decision-making process." It is essential for a president to have functioning relationships with the board, unions and employees. The ability of a president to move the organization is often tied up in the contextual more than the structural challenges of an organization.

The participants in the governance system and the board and college employees must trust one another and believe that each is trustworthy from the beginning of the new structure. Trust is nurtured and earned, and it is in the interest of the board, administration, classified staff, faculty, managers, students and community to take one
another's concerns seriously. Trust is therefore focused upon the common good, a clear decision process that is adhered to, and actions that are in sync with one's words.

The governance system should focus on the development and maintenance of the mission and core values of the institution. The more focused the employees and constituents are on the core values and goals of the college, the better the chance for goal achievement. The interaction of individuals and structures therefore must be focused upon improvement and high performance rather than structural arguments. A shared organizational mission and purpose creates a true purpose for the governance system.

Community college governance and coordination varies from college to college and has changed throughout the years. There is no one system that would work for every college. Community college governance and coordination is not static but changes based on historical and cultural influences. In short, colleges are socially constructed organizations influenced by current stakeholders building upon the foundation laid out by those before them. The social influences are both internal and external. Local and state funding decisions, accreditation requirements, legal decisions, social/cultural trends, economic demands, and leadership philosophies are only a few factors that influence the governance of a community college.
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INFORMATIONAL LETTER FOR INTERESTED PARTICIPANTS

Date: ______________

Dear: _______________________

Again, thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. What follows are some of the primary points of this research project to allow you to have a better understanding of the study and my interest in the topic. We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are a board member or workgroup representative involved in the implementation of the new college governance system. It is anticipated that up to twelve representatives will be interviewed as a part of this study.

PROJECT TITLE:

How College Governance Works at a Vanguard Community College
FOCUS AND SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY:

Focus of Study

This is a research study. The purpose of this research study is to describe and explain the perspectives on shared governance of selected Community College Representative Leaders at a Vanguard community college during the implementation year of a new college governance system. It is expected that the findings of this study will serve to inform community college boards, faculty, presidents, and support staff in the future by providing a clearer understanding of constituency expectations of shared governance in decision making in a college governance system. A conceptual framework for improving the community college shared governance system will be developed based on the themes that emerge from the data collected in this study. This research study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for Doctoral degree requirements at Oregon State University.

We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are actively engaged in the governance system during the implementation year of the college governance system. This study will include representative leaders from the administration, College Board, classified staff, faculty and students (12 total participants). College leaders have assisted the researchers in identifying potential participants and helped to narrow the field of approximately 50 eligible participants to twelve. Establishing a representative group with the regards to years of college service, age, race, and gender balance is also considered in the selection process.

Significance of the Study

College governance is one of the most widely discussed and misunderstood topics in postsecondary education today (Alfred, 1998). The issues of authority, influence and
power are often unclear to administrators, classified staff, and faculty working in today's community colleges. This need for clarity on decision-making processes becomes even more important when tightening resources and the need for accountability becomes more intense. The ability of institutions to respond to state and local needs can mean the difference between a healthy organization and one marred in a quagmire of inflexibility and political strife. In summary, as Duderstadt (2004) states: “the greatest challenge and threat to institutions arises from the manner in which the institutions are governed, both from within and from without.”

Shared governance has many definitions and a long storied history of contentious debate at college and board levels. Institutions with strong governance councils, or unions operating in a political model of governance, have structures that frequently support ongoing faculty, classified, student, and administrative participation in institutional decision-making. The ability for a governance system to mature and improve is challenging. Understanding the barriers and perspectives of stakeholders in the system is imperative to continued governance system development and success.

GUIDING RESEARCH QUESTIONS:

After the signing of the Informed Consent Documents, the remainder of our first face-to-face interaction will be a loose discussion to talk about the research project and your role in the project. The next one to two-hours will include an “interview” that consists of the following guiding research questions as starting points for dialogue:

1. What elements help or hinder community college representative leaders (i.e., board, faculty, president, student leaders, and support staff) in applying shared governance?
2. What are the benefits and disadvantages to implementing the college governance system?
3. What must be done to improve the effectiveness of shared governance?
4. The college governance system was developed based upon a list of guiding principles. How do you relate your experiences to each guiding principle?

Governance Principles:

- Stakeholders have a right to representation on college governance committees.
- Governance system provides full participation for stakeholders at the earliest possible (feasible, practical or reasonable) moment.
- Support for participants is essential and should include skill/knowledge building, reassignment time/backfill, student support, and other resources as necessary.
- Stakeholders determine their representatives within their established processes.
- The governance system shall provide support necessary for staff and students to participate and contribute usefully.
The governance system shall encourage and promote a wide range of opportunities for many people to provide leadership regardless of their formal positions at the college.

The governance system shall provide for clear, frequent, consistent, and timely communication within governance groups and between groups and the wider college community.

The governance system shall provide for consistent and accessible records.

The governance system must balance the need to make decisions in an efficient and timely manner and the need to provide adequate time for participation in the decision making process.

The governance system should rely on the collective wisdom of the board, management, faculty, classified staff and students.

Accountability is linked to authority.

The president is accountable and responsible to the board for decisions made in the governance system.

The governance system should be efficient and effective and result in timely and informed decisions.

The governance system supports the college vision, mission, core values, strategic directions and learning-centered principles.

The governance system embodies Lane’s learning-centered principles and is conducted in a learning framework.

When building the governance structures, types and levels of governance should be understood and addressed.

Types: bureaucratic, political, and collegial.

Levels: board, college, constituents.

System of governance should clearly define and align the authority, responsibilities, and relationships among the board, managers, faculty, classified staff, and students.

The college governance system provides for clear decision processes.

As directed by the board, the president is responsible for developing and publishing a college governance system.

The system of governance should include the ongoing management of college governance councils/teams/committees/task forces including their charter, accountability sponsorships, deliverables, membership, termination, communication systems, and relationship to the college’s mission, vision, core values, and goals. (Retrieved from college website October 11, 2004.)

The listed principles provide a framework to access the college governance system.

The purpose of this study is to describe and explain the perspectives on shared governance of selected community college representative leaders. This research will provide perspectives of participants engaged in a community college shared governance system, grounded in organizational theory, and will describe the development and implementation of that governance system.
The responses to these guiding questions may differ from governance representative to governance representative, depending on their background and experience in the college governance system, and so on. However, in the common context of participation in the implementation of the college governance system, there may be shared patterns or themes within the narratives.

**PROCEDURES**

If you agree to participate, your involvement will take place between June-August 2005. During this three-month period, you will be asked for input on two separate occasions. The first interaction will last for approximately 1.5 hours at which time we will go over the Informed Consent Document. We will spend time in a loose discussion to talk about the research project and your role in the project. We will then engage in a more formal face-to-face discussion using specific guiding questions and follow-up questions where necessary. There will be a final discussion of up to one-hour to check the accuracy of the notes from your interview. This last discussion may occur face-to-face, via telephone, email, or other appropriate modes of communication, depending on your availability and/or preferences.
Appendix B: Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent Document

Project Title: How College Governance Works at a Vanguard Community College
Principal Investigator: Dr. Betty Duvall, Community College Leadership, School of Education
Research Staff: Patrick M. Lanning, Doctoral Candidate, School of Education

Purpose

This is a research study. The purpose of this research study is to describe and explain the perspectives on shared governance of selected Community College Representative Leaders at a Vanguard community college during the implementation year of a new college governance system. It is expected that the findings of this study will serve to inform community college boards, faculty, presidents, and support staff in the future by providing a clearer understanding of constituency expectations of shared governance in decision making in a college governance system. A conceptual framework for improving the implementation of a community college shared governance system will be developed based on the themes that emerge from the data collected in this study. The purpose of this consent form is to give you the information you will need to help you decide whether to be in the study or not. This research study is being conducted in partial fulfillment for the Doctor of Education degree requirements at Oregon State University.

Please read the form carefully. You may ask any questions about the research, what you will be asked to do, the possible risks and benefits, your rights as a volunteer, and anything else about the research or this form that is not clear. When all of your questions have been answered, you can decide if you want to be in this study or not. This process is called “informed consent”. You will be given a copy of this form for your records.
We are inviting you to participate in this research study because you are actively engaged in the governance system during the implementation year of the college governance system. This study will include representative leaders from the administration, College Board, classified staff, faculty and students (12 total participants). College Representative leaders have assisted the researchers in identifying potential participants and helped to narrow the field of approximately 50 eligible participants to twelve. Establishing a representative group with the regards to years of college service, age, race, and gender balance is also considered in the selection process.

**PROCEDURES**

If you agree to participate, your involvement will be less than three hours including interview(s) and review of interview note for accuracy.

The following procedures are involved in this study. Your involvement will take place between April-June 2005. This research project will employ interviewing as a method (“interviewing” used here to mean two-way dialogue). The in-depth interviews will be open-ended with research questions guiding the initial part of the discussion. The interviews will be structured around a set of questions designed to encourage the active engagement of the participant in the study. Basic descriptive questions will elicit general background information. Experience/example questions will elicit information on your role as a governance participant. Structural paradigmatic questions will be used to elicit information and reveal the issues and challenges facing the participants in the governance system. Follow-up and simple clarification questions will be used as needed.

All interviews will be digitally recorded, and a typed summary will be delivered to you with a request for verification of your responses. The researcher will type all notes and check each response for consistency.

Follow-up interviews may be necessary to gain additional information or provide clarity to the initial interview. Participant interviews and follow-up interviews, if necessary, will be conducted in June and July of 2005.

During this Two-month period, you will be asked for input on two separate occasions:

1. The first interaction will last up to two-hours at which time we will go over the Informed Consent Document. Patrick Lanning will provide you with two
Informed Consent Documents to be signed. For record keeping purposes, one Informed Consent Document will be returned to the researcher and you will be provided a copy. At any time, clarification questions will be encouraged. Then a non-structured discussion about the research project will ensue. If you agree, a more formal face-to-face one to two-hour discussion using specific guiding questions and follow-up questions, where necessary, will be done. Only at this face-to-face two-hour discussion will an audio recording device be used. The one to two-hour audio-recorded discussion/interview, will consists of the following guiding research questions as starting points for dialogue:

- What elements help or hinder community college representative leaders (i.e., board, faculty, president, students, and support staff) in applying shared governance?
- What benefits and challenges have resulted from implementing the governance system?
- What can be done to improve the shared governance system?

2. Three to five weeks following the “interview,” researcher Patrick Lanning will contact you either by telephone or email to arrange for a final meeting to check the accuracy of your interview summary. This last discussion may occur face-to-face, via telephone, email, or other appropriate modes of communication, depending on your availability and/or preferences.

**RISKS**

The possible risks associated with participating in this research project are as follows. Risk to you for participating in this study are minimal since your participation will be known only to you and researcher Patrick Lanning, who will keep confidential the source of all information shared by you and other participants in the study in order to avoid jeopardizing your relationships with your colleagues or anyone else. You will be assigned a pseudonym and all information obtained from you will be attributed to that name.

**BENEFITS**

There will be no personal benefit for participating in this study. However, the researchers anticipate that, in the future, society may benefit from this study by providing community college board members, faculty, presidents, support staff, and students a clearer understanding of constituency expectations in shared governance and
decision making, and provide a conceptual framework for implementing and improving community college shared governance system.

COSTS AND COMPENSATION

You will not have any costs for participating in this research project. Nor will you be compensated for participating in this research project.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Records of participation in this research project will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. However, federal government regulatory agencies and the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies involving human subjects) may inspect and copy records pertaining to this research. It is possible that these records could contain information that personally identifies you. A pseudonym will be assigned to you and all information obtained from you or related to you will be associated with that pseudonym. Your identity will be known only to the researcher, Patrick Lanning. All written recorded information, including interview notes, gathered during this study will be kept in a locked storage cabinet accessible only to Patrick Lanning. Researcher Patrick Lanning will personally review all interview tapes, in developing the narrative notes, for accuracy. All gathered data will be destroyed three years beyond the end date of the research project. In the event of any report or publication from this study, your identity will not be disclosed. Results will be reported in a summarized manner in such a way that you cannot be identified.

Audio Recording

By initialing in the space provided below, you verify that you have been told that audio recordings will be generated during the course of this study. Interviews will be recorded so that an accurate account of the interviews will be available to researcher Patrick Lanning during the analysis of the data and the writing of findings. On the recording, you will be referred to by an
assigned pseudonym. Only Patrick Lanning will have access to the recordings and when he is not using them they will be stored in a locked storage cabinet. Patrick Lanning will personally review the tapes when checking accuracy in the interview notes. The tapes will be destroyed three years beyond the end date of the research project.

______________ Participant’s initials

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION

Taking part in this research study is voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you agree to participate in this study, you may stop participating at any time. You are free to skip any question that you would prefer not to answer. If you decide not to take part, or if you stop participating at any time, your decision will not result in any penalty or loss of benefits to which you may otherwise be entitled. Should you withdraw from the study before it is completed, data already obtained from you will be integrated into data obtained from other participants and used in the results of the study. Your information will then be stored and eventually destroyed along with the information obtained from the other participants.

QUESTIONS

Questions are encouraged. If you have any questions about this research project, please contact:

Dr. Betty Duvall   Patrick Lanning
402 Education Hall   3273 Lincoln St.
Oregon State University   Eugene, OR 97405
Corvallis, OR 97331   (541) 334-5098
(503) 292-3745   lanningp@lanecc.edu
duvallb@oregonstate.edu

If you have questions about your rights as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Human Protections Administrator, at (541) 737-3437 or by e-mail at IRB@oregonstate.edu.
Your signature indicates that this research study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's Name (printed):

__________________________________________  ___________________

(Signature of Participant)       (Date)

RESEARCHER STATEMENT

I have discussed the above points with the participant or, where appropriate, with the participant’s legally authorized representative, using a translator when necessary. It is my opinion that the participant understands the risks, benefits, and procedures involved with participation in this research study.

__________________________________________  ___________________

(Signature of Researcher)       (Date)
APPENDIX C: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED IN STUDY

- Governance Orientation Binder
- Governance Chairs Meeting
- Governance Evaluation Report
- VCC Student Newspaper
- Archives
  - Historical recordings (VCC Board meetings)
  - Historical Writings
  - VCC Parnell Years
- Governance Council Minutes
  - College Council
  - Learning Council
  - Facilities Council
  - Technology Council
  - Student Affairs Council
  - Diversity Council
  - Finance Council
- College Website
  - Governance archives
  - Governance documents
### VCC Learning Council

**Meeting Notes from January 21, 2005**

**Observer(s) in attendance.**

1. **Review of Minutes:**
   - **Decision:** Minutes approved without correction.

2. **Report from Finance Council:**
   - Finance Council is in the process of reviewing all financial policy.
   - They are looking at the current budget situation to identify:
     - How increased tuition affected enrollment?
     - How decreased tuition at “off hours” and differential pricing would change revenues?
   - College Council budget subcommittee is dealing with expenditure decisions and finance council looks at the revenue side.
   - Finance Council is looking at methods for communication with other councils and is looking at:
     - Website for notes
     - Representatives for other councils attending their meetings
     - Conversations among the representatives of work groups on councils.

3. **Sustainability & Learning:**
   - A sustainability group was formed in Spring 2004 to explore ways in which we could infuse sustainability across campus. See website: [http://www.lanecc.edu/sustainability/](http://www.lanecc.edu/sustainability/)
   - A subgroup, Sustainability and Learning, has been focused on the issues of sustainability as it relates to learning. The sustainability and learning team, including Bob Baldwin, Stan Taylor, Jennifer Hayward, Margaret Robertson, Joe Russin, Jackie Fern, and Sonya Christian, have organized two campus-wide conversations among faculty.
   - Sustainability is referred to in one of the strategic directions of the college: “Create, enhance, and maintain inviting and welcoming facilities...”
APPENDIX E: A SAMPLE OF TRANSCRIBED FIELD NOTES

The learning council met in room Cen407 from 3-5 PM. The room had natural light and the 9 attending members fit easily around the table that holds 12 comfortably. The administration, classified staff, faculty managers and students all had representatives present. The research participants (manager B & student B) are both present for the meeting. The mood is cordial, and the agenda is primarily focused on development of the learning plan. The faculty members enter and sit together on one side of the table. The manager, classified, student and administrative members are spread out randomly around the rest of the table. The chair, a faculty member starts the meeting and shares a draft of items developed by the faculty members……
APPENDIX F: A SAMPLE OF THE RESEARCHER’S E-JOURNAL

I continued my thoughts on the various themes that are beginning to emerge in the data. I see how researches lose sleep; constantly mulling over the findings. The mechanics of the governance system seems to be taking a back seat to the social/cultural issues, in regards to success, as the system evolves. I need to go back through the manager’s list of themes and compare the interview results with the observations and journal notes. It will be important to review the data for consistency/variance and between participants.
## APPENDIX G: DETAILED LIST OF ELEMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Admin Rank</th>
<th>Board Rank</th>
<th>Classified Rank</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Managers Rank</th>
<th>Situ Rank</th>
<th>Student Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authority</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships/Trust</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scope</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Philosophy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Good</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 41
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Admin Rank</th>
<th>Board</th>
<th>Board Rank</th>
<th>Classified</th>
<th>Classified Rank</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Faculty Rank</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Manager Rank</th>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Student Rank</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Style</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX H: GOVERNANCE DECISION MATRIX
(LEARNING COUNCIL SAMPLE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Council Decision Matrix</th>
<th>Learning Council</th>
<th>Faculty Council</th>
<th>Departments/Divisions</th>
<th>Unions/MC</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>ORS/State Board/OCCWD Accreditation</th>
<th>College Council</th>
<th>OISS/College Operations/Exec Services</th>
<th>Person with legal role</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>Board</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a strategic learning plan for instruction and learning support</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR/N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate effectiveness of the strategic learning plan</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR/N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update strategic learning plan according to the guidelines of the college-wide planning system</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR/N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify new instructional directions that align with the mission, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR/N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formulate policies regarding college-wide instructional and learning support</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>CON</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>AR/N</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ensure college's alignment with accreditation standards 2, 4, and 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY:</th>
<th>A Approve/Override</th>
<th>AR Approve and Refer (goes on to next step)</th>
<th>CA Consult (advise throughout process)</th>
<th>CE Consult (evaluate at end of process)</th>
<th>CON Legal, Contractual, Board, Policy, GAAP…</th>
<th>I Inform (after decision)</th>
<th>IP Inform planning (before decision)</th>
<th>N Initiate, prepare, analyze</th>
<th>R Recommend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Decision-Making Grid Definition

**A Approve/Override**
Approve/override is the final authority to approve a decision or plan. This authority includes the right to override a decision made previously in the process, but such an override triggers the protocol described on page 13 of the report.

**AR Approve and Refer**
Approve and Refer is the authority to approve a decision or plan, in the context of the requirement that the decision moves on to further approval. Approve and Refer is a “gatekeeping” authority – a decision or plan cannot move past this point without approval. However, failure to complete work within specified timelines may move it to the next level.

**CA Consult (advise throughout process)**
Consult/Advise is the right and responsibility to initiate proposals and give input throughout a process, including at the very beginning.

**CE Consult (evaluate at end of process)**
Consult/Evaluate is the right and responsibility to respond to a plan or a decision after it is made.

**Con Legal, Contractual, Board policy, GAAP**
This code indicates where an authority outside the governance councils has decision-making power that controls or constrains what the governance system may do.

**I Inform (after decision)**
Inform/After refers to the right to be informed of a decision or policy after it is made.

**IP Inform planning (before decision)**
Inform/Planning is the right to be informed that a planning process is underway and to contribute input as desired before the decision.

**N Initiate, prepare, analyze**
This code indicates the responsibility to initiate formal proposals and to have access to the information needed to do so effectively.

**R Recommend**
Recommend means the authority to make recommendations but without the authority to approve them.
APPENDIX I: CURRENT RESUMÉ

Patrick M. Lanning
3273 Lincoln Street
Eugene, OR 97405
Home: (541) 334-5098
Office: (541) 463-5547

Resume of Education, Professional, and Community Experience

EDUCATION

Transfer Student, Lane Community College, 1984-1986

B.S. University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, Psychology, 1989

M.S. University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, Interdisciplinary Studies, 1992

Candidate for Education Doctorate, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, Community College Leadership Program, 2000 to Present
• Dissertation focus: Community College Governance

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Associate Vice President for Instructional Services, Lane Community College
September 2004 to Present

The Associate Vice President (AVP) for Instruction provides leadership, coordination and support for the Instructional Services divisions. Instructional Service divisions include: Arts; English, Foreign Language & Speech (Language, Literature & Communication); Health, Physical Education, & Athletics; Mathematics; Science; Social Science; Advanced Technology, Business Technology; Computer Information Technology; and Family/Health Careers. Shared responsibility for credit instructional programs at Lane. Directly responsible for the leadership of instructional programs in lower division credit, and fourteen professional-technical programs. Responsible for student-led programs in Athletics and Performing Arts. Accountable for budget of approximately $14 million and over 200 staff.

Accomplishments:
• Providing leadership, hiring/orientating, coordinating and supporting nine division chairs in the instructional service divisions
• Providing leadership for the development of learning-centered environments that promote student success in both transfer and professional/technical education
• Serving as a member of the Instruction and Student Services Leadership Team
• Serving as a member and approving curriculum recommendations from Curriculum Committee and Degree Requirements Committee
• Providing leadership and coordinating the college enrollment planning process to develop and assess recruitment, retention, and student goal achievement strategies
• Led assessment review of distance learning courses to inform enrollment planning
• Led extra-section funding program in credit and non-credit programs, providing funding for additional course sections, and curriculum development projects
• Met with local and legislative leaders to advocate for community college needs
• Providing leadership, during implementation year, on three college governance councils (i.e., Learning, Technology, and Facilities)
• Initiated and coordinated Unit Planning Review & Re-design Team
• Initiated and developing an orientation and resource electronic guide for instruction and student service chairs
• Serving on Professional Technical Education Advisory Council reviewing professional technical programs and advisory committees
• Accountability for budget of approximately $14 million and over 200 staff

**Division Chair, Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon**

**Health, Physical Education & Athletics, November 1995 to September 2005**

Provide instructional leadership for transfer and professional-technical programs in Health and Physical Education and in Student Services for athletics/recreational sports, and provide facilities and key access for the student run "no-cash clothing stash." A Division enrolling over 700 FTE per year. Provide leadership in institutional and divisional planning. Led curriculum development processes, programs and innovative instructional approaches. Set priorities for and direct a $2.5 million Division budget. Responsible for over 45 contracted and part-time faculty and staff. Responsible for instructional areas and 8 acres of outdoor instructional/athletic facilities.

Accomplishments:
• Led and supported a faculty team in the development of a new professional technical certificate program in Fitness approved by Lane CC and the State.
- Led and supported the work of faculty to secure over $150,000 in grant funding for the Fitness Certificate program
- Led, with faculty and staff, gift-in-kind donations of over $70,000 for instructional equipment
- Provided leadership and support to the athletic director and staff to redesign the student fee funded Recreational Sports Program. In 2001-02, the total number of participants in Family Recreation at Lane was 1,099 participating in 24 activities; in the Open Gym, 4,227 student participants with 15 activities; Club sports: nine teams with 123 participants averaging 14 per team. One of only two colleges in Oregon with Family Recreation opportunities for students.
- Served as Title IX Compliance Officer (interim athletic director)
- Led a college-wide committee in research and proposal of an employee Wellness Program focused on increased employee health and insurance premium reduction. Proposal recommended by College Executive Team and approved by Board of Education for implementation Fall 2003.
- Led an inclusive process to develop a vision and values statement for the Division
- Developed a five-year Division plan for facility and curriculum enhancements
- Led the establishment of two smart-classrooms in the Division, providing technology for lab and lecture courses
- Led three departments in a proactive planning process resulting in positive change
- Proctored courses in collaboration with local businesses and University of Oregon
- Encouraged curriculum revisions in degree programs
- Instituted with faculty an outcomes and assessment project to enhance the teaching/learning process in the Fitness Certificate Program
- Supported inter-disciplinary learning community between Workplace Safety and the Culinary program
- Met with legislators at the State Capital building during community college day
- Led staff to develop paid internships for many of the external co-op experiences required by the Fitness Certificate Program.
- Led with faculty a change in hiring requirements by the Downtown Athletic Club to drop their Bachelor education requirement for personal trainers to allow the Lane Fitness Certificate program to meet minimum requirements
- Supported faculty and staff development through curriculum
- Introduced self-directed work teams including a learning-support team of classified staff
- Decentralized decision-making through the use of Division Council and Faculty Program Coordinators
Developed and taught cultural awareness curriculum to students and staff
Led faculty members to develop programs so they could grow in quality and numbers for greater efficiency and effectiveness
Developed and supervised partnership courses with the University of Oregon
Taught transfer courses
Taught professional technical courses
Worked successfully and timely with facilities and division staff to remove toxic mold from building
Led the division staff through major remodels to locker room, privacy space, and planning stages for lab and classroom remodels
Worked with staff to decentralize budget development
Led the development of a five year budget plan for facilities curriculum and equipment
Met with Business leaders, involving faculty, for fundraising to develop a community fundraising advisor board
Led graduation focused effort for student-athletes, resulting in an over 80% graduation/transfer rate 2002-03 (Highest in 38 member OR/WA Community College Conference)
Addressed staff performance issues in a timely and developmental focused manner

Interim Division Chair, Music, Dance & Theatre Arts, April 2002 to September 2005

Provide instructional leadership for transfer and student production programs in Music, Music Technology, Dance & Theatre Arts; support a student Theatre Club; Division enrolls over 300 FTE per year. Provide leadership in institutional and divisional planning. Lead curriculum development processes, programs and innovative instructional approaches. Set priority for and direct development of a $1.05 million Division budget. Responsible for over 35 contracted and part-time faculty and staff.

Accomplishments:
• Encouraged and supported faculty sabbatical leave request and program coverage plan
• Encouraged the development of a professional-technical program in Music Technology
• Led with faculty the development of a 2+2 Music Major pilot program with Northwest Christian College
• Initiated and encouraged the Dance and Theater faculty to actively participate in the college reading-together project resulting in the play Montana 1948, and a student dance production that will be performed during the April in-service day
• Led staff and faculty in a reintegration of the Art Division bringing Art & Applied Design and Music, Dance and Theatre Arts back under one division
• Actively addressed social, structural, historical and budget issues during reintegration process
• Represented the recording studio grant request for bond equipment funding, successfully securing $120,000 to complete the project
• Worked with faculty and the Grant office to request grant funds from Sony corp. resulting in staff support and project planning assistance
• Implemented, with the help of faculty and staff, the board approved budget reductions
• Supported LCCEA by providing assistance in documentation requests for grievance
• Represented the College in grievance process hearings
• Restructured, with the help of faculty and staff, the technical director position to broaden the position’s support from primarily supporting performances to include the support of daily learning and the division as a whole
• Actively assisted the Foundation office in tours and donation planning
• Supported faculty to develop and implement a contract bringing back the summer musical program and securing a $10,000 private guarantors loan
• Addressed policy and contract violations with staff in a timely and developmental manner

Interim Division Chair, Art & Applied Design, June 2003 to September 2005

Provide instructional leadership for transfer and production programs. Division enrolls over 400 FTE per year. Provide leadership in institutional and divisional planning. Lead curriculum development processes, programs and innovative instructional approaches. Set priority for and direct development of a $1.5 million Division budget. Responsible for over 40 contracted and part-time faculty and staff.

Accomplishments:
• Led staff to develop a better understanding of part-time funding options
• Implemented, with the help of faculty and staff, board approved budget reductions
• Engaged faculty in the development of a long-range plan to address facility issues resulting in the identified need for a new Art building.
• Engaged staff in the research of transitioning art slides to digital format resulting in a long range plan to do so
- Engaged staff in a meaningful reintegration plan resulting in a representative committee focused on structural, budget, facilities, staffing, and organizational needs
- Attended advisory meetings for professional technical programs to personally thank the community for actively participating in the discussion
- Supported Graphic Design program in a review, assessment, and program modification project
- Supported students, faculty, and two master woodcarvers from Japan in the development and installation of a site-specific sculpture titled, "Long Life"

**Acting Vice President for Instructional Services, Lane Community College, June/July, 2000**

Shared responsibility for instructional programs at Lane. Provided leadership of instructional programs in lower division credit, professional-technical programs and developmental education. Provided support for learning support such as Library, Curriculum and Scheduling, and Instructional Computing. Oversaw budget of $12 million and over 200 staff.

**Full-Time Instructor, Health/PE/Athletics, Lane Community College, 1993-1996**

Taught health education and physical education courses. Researched, developed and implemented the fitness education and fitness certificate programs.

**Accomplishments:**
- Developed new, and revised existing curriculum
- Instructed, through the implementation of current theory and methods in lecture, lecture/lab and lab formats
- Implemented new assessment and instructional technology
- Created student handbook
- Provided outside agencies with fitness assessments
- Utilized computer network to access student and college records.
- Effectively communicated with students, staff and community members in both written and oral forms
- Taught students from diverse cultural and racial backgrounds to fulfill a wide variety of academic goals
- Worked with students with disabilities or with other special learning situations
• Worked one-on-one with students through office hours and in other settings
• Demonstrated ability to engage in positive collaboration with peers in curriculum work and other divisional, departmental, campus and community projects
• Demonstrated the ability to work effectively as a team member
• Supervised work-study students, cooperative education students and volunteers
• Demonstrated knowledge of learning theory, current teaching methods and uses of information technology in education
• Designed and used classroom assessment methods to improve learning
• Integrated elements into curricula and teaching that enhanced learner success and encouraged interest toward wellness as a life long pursuit
• Developed lessons that acknowledge student experiences, skills and knowledge and encouraged self-confidence
• Wrote grant proposals for the Professional Fitness Training Program.
• Worked effectively, respectfully, and productively with students and staff from diverse cultural, racial, and ethnic backgrounds, including, but not limited to: people of color, bilingual students/staff, international students, people from various cultures, LGBT students and staff, life long learners, and people with disabilities

Part-Time Instructor, Health/PE/Athletics, Lane Community College, 1992-1993

Taught courses in Health and Physical Education, and supported the Division as needed.
• Taught maximum number of courses allowed as part-timer
• Developed and implemented a study hall for student-athletes
• Supervised special-events for evening and weekend activities
• Provided tutoring and NCAA transfer guidance to student-athletes

College-wide Engagement at Lane Community College

Governance Councils (2004-present)

Learning Council Representative
• Assist in the development, review, and evaluation of and establish policy directions for the instructional and learning support areas of the college in accordance with the vision, mission, core values, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Assist in the development of a strategic
learning plan for instruction and learning support (including library, instructional labs, etc.) and help to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategic learning plan. Identify new instructional directions that align with the mission, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Formulate policies regarding college-wide instructional and learning support. Ensure the college's alignment with accreditation standards 2, 4, and 5.

Technology Council Representative

• Assist in the development, review, and evaluation of technology plans and develop policy directions for the technology areas of the college in accordance with the vision, mission, core values, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Assist in the development of a strategic technology plan for instruction and college services. Evaluate the effectiveness of the strategic technology plan. Identifying new technology directions that align with the mission, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Formulating policies regarding college-wide technology. Ensure the college's alignment with accreditation standard 5- Library and Information Resources.

Facilities Council Representative

• Assist in the development, review, and evaluation of and establish policy directions for campus facilities in accordance with the vision, mission, core values, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Assist in the development of a strategic facilities plan, and help to evaluate the effectiveness of the strategic learning plan. The plan will provide sufficient physical resources, particularly instructional facilities, are designed, maintained, and managed (at both on- and off-campus sites) to achieve the institution's mission and goals. Identify facilities directions that support new instructional needs that align with the mission, learning principles, and strategic plan of the college. Formulate policies regarding college-wide facilities. Ensure the college's alignment with accreditation standard 8- Physical Resources.

College Committees

Curriculum Committee, September 2001 to present

• Read and critically review all curriculum proposals; advise faculty on their proposals; participate in committee decisions, approve or reject curricula,
and serve on subcommittees for special projects, such as the review of courses for duplication.

Professional Technical Education Coordinating Committee (2004 to present)
- Provides guidance and support to professional technical advisory committees, in partnership with the business community, to promote a quality workforce.

Degree Requirements Committee Member, 1999-2001 & September 2005 to present
- Review and evaluate suggested changes to requirements for all degrees and certificates. Hold hearings to gather current faculty, student, and administrative thinking regarding proposed changes. Recommend to VP for Instructional Services prepared changes or rejections.

Banner and Related Systems coordinating group, October 2004 to present
- BARScg is a chartered team to coordinate operation of highly integrated information systems by implementing new Banner features and adding related systems, such as Resource25, Schedule25, eVisions, SCT XtenderSolutions and the SCT Operational Data Store. The SCT Banner modules running core administrative functions for Student, Human Resources, Finance and Financial Aid; additional SCT products integrated with the core modules, such as ExpressLane, ODS and Xtender Solutions; related and integrated third-party products, such as Series25 and eVisions that rely on and extend the core functionality of the college's information systems.

Art Works Committee, October 2003 to September 2005
- Evaluate art works available through donations, loan, or purchase. Make recommendations to the Facilities Management Committee regarding these art works and where to place them on campus. Evaluate and analyze associated issues, recommend acceptance or refusal of art works and facilitate process as outlined in Process for Proposals to Site Major Works at LCC.

Technology Advising and Consulting Team, October 2003 to October 2004
- TACT provides guidance, support and assistance to the Associate Vice President for Information Technology in maintaining Lane's vision, strategic direction and operational objectives. TACT annually identifies major technology issues facing the college and advises the AVP for IT on priorities, goals and issues. TACT Informs the AVP for IT about internal activities,
issues and concerns; encourages and facilitate campus coordination and collaboration, including budget decisions, about technology in the areas of: Services to students, Instructional development and delivery, Professional development, Information systems, and Physical environment. TACT assists in an annual update of college technology plans, advises on management of the revenue from the student general computer technology fee, supports and assists the in conducting internal and external research related to technology.

Safety Committee, October 1997 to 2005

- Serve as administrative appointment on committee mandated by OSHA regulations (OAR 437-40-035) to assist in monitoring, improving, and maintaining job site safety and occupational health. Obtain and review safety-related suggestions, reports of hazards, or other information directly from all persons involved in the operations of the workplace that would help in creating a hazard-free work environment. Help to establish procedures for investigating all safety-related incidents including injury accidents, illnesses and deaths, for the purpose of recommending corrective action necessary to prevent similar events from recurring. Evaluate the College's accountability system and make recommendations to implement supervisor and employee accountability for safety and health. Evaluate the College's safety and health training practices and recommend procedures necessary to ensure that all employees are trained to perform their work in a safe manner. Conduct workplace inspections to locate, identify, and document safety and health hazards on a quarterly basis and make recommendations regarding correction of the hazards. Assisted in the establishment of a procedure to review corrective action taken by the College on safety and health inspection reports and all recommendations made by the committee.

Labor-Management Committee, 2000-2002

- Served on six-member committee to help cultivate an organizational culture in which policies, programs, practices, and personnel support student learning.

Tuesday Chairs Member, 1997-2004

- Founding member of Tuesday Chairs, a weekly meeting of Instructional and Student Service Chairs to address issues of consistency in practice, policy, and contract implementation regarding students and staff.
  - A volunteer group of classified, faculty and managers at Lane focused on
    reading and applying Allan Johnson's book *Privilege, Power and Difference*.
    Formed the year prior to the college-wide reading together project by staff
    interested in addressing personal and community discrimination. Shared
    with the group how I lived into my thirties with an unspoken family rule
    regarding my grandfather's Native American heritage. I was able to share in
    a group setting, for the first time, about his life leaving the reservation as a
    youth to follow his "American Dream" but instead faced a lifetime of
    economic and social discrimination.

Instruction and Student Service Manager Orientation Leader, 2002-present
  - Developed and instituted a new managers orientation to assist with training
    and continued support on college policies and union contracts.

College In-Service Design Team & In-Service Communications Sub-Committee,
2002-03
  - Helped design an inclusive in-service program for faculty, classified, and
    managers. Reviewed and approved presentation proposals as part of sub-
    committee. Facilitated and encouraged staff engagement in power, privilege
    and difference workshop, resulting in Theatre and Dance student projects
    and performances. (Montana 1948).

Faculty Evaluation Handbook, Co-developed with LCCEA Representative, 2000-2003
  - Assigned by President to co-develop an evaluation process guide at Lane
    Community College to help faculty and administrators successfully and
    meaningfully participate in a substantive evaluation process. The FEH
    focuses on professional development and only secondarily on corrective
    evaluation and action. The Developmental Evaluation process provides a
    structure and support opportunity for faculty to periodically take stock of
    accomplishments, reflect on current and future directions, and connect those
    directions with the challenges facing the discipline and department/division.

Accreditation Self Study Team Member, 2002-2004
  - Helped support and complete the work needed on Standard 4- Faculty by
    evaluating how well Lane selects, develops, and retains competent faculty to
    achieve our educational mission and goals.
  - Assisted with Standard 3-Student Services to review Intercollegiate Athletics
    for consistency with our educational philosophy, student programs and
    services to support the achievement of Lane's mission and goals.
Success and Goal Achievement, 2002-present
- Member of SAGA focused on college-wide student success and retention. Helped utilize best practices to set success and retention goals for the College. Share retention and success efforts within the Health, Physical Education, Athletics, Music, Dance, Theatre, Art and Applied Design programs.

Chair, Proficiency Grant Committee (1998-2001)
- Oversaw a six-member committee providing a Student Grant-in-aid program that replaced tuition waivers. Maintained budget for program through Foundation Funding.

Lane Diversity Team Member, 1996-98
- Served as a member of team committed to valuing, promoting, and supporting diversity, including diversity related to age, gender, ethnicity, cultural origin, national origin, source and level of income, familial status, marital status, sexual orientation, religion or disability. Addressed issues related to curriculum, student recruitment, retention and support services, community services and events, staff recruitment, training and retention and partnerships with the community.
- Coordinated Outreach Diversity Committee List for use by local schools and campus community.

LCCEA Faculty Contract Bargaining, Administration Team (1999- present)
- Successfully served on the negotiation of two full-contract openings and two economic re-openers.
- Experience with contract negotiation and mediation processes
- Served on faculty compensation study sub-committee.
- Served on insurance sub-committee.

LCCEF Contract Bargaining, Administration Team (1998-99)
- Successfully negotiated Students First! Contract Bargaining.

Carl Perkins Grant Selection Committee, 1998-Present
- Member of committee that establishes criteria and reviews Perkins Grant Proposals for Professional Technical Programs. Approximately $8,500,000 to Lane Programs annually.
LCCEA Negotiation Research, Faculty Team Member, 1996
- Researched over fifty faculty contracts for Insurance and Wellness programs
- Attended bargaining sessions

Faculty Grievance Committee Member, 1995
- Provided support and advice for faculty members on contractual issues

Selected Research/Projects:

Diversity Assessment at Lane Community College (2001)
- Performed a diversity audit to explore the challenges that students of color face while attending Lane Community College. Specifically, I explored Lane Community College's African-American student population from four different contexts including historical legacy, structural diversity, psychological climate, and behavioral interactions. In addition, I explored ideas to improve the campus climate for students of color with a number of Lane's diversity leaders. Research sources included the 2000 Census, Lane Community College Institutional Research and Planning Data, College Diversity Plan(s), and interviews with identified diversity leaders and students of color.

- Researched community college mission statements, Lower-SES support programs, and financial aid resources to see how well selected community colleges were aligned with a social justice focus.

Systemic & Strategic Cultural Change COG (2003)
- Designed a retreat plan that furthered the development of Lane's administrative team in becoming a learning-centered college.

Creativity Plan for Lane Community College (2002)
- Reviewed the alignment of Lane Community College's Strategic Plan to the work being done at the Division level.

Student Service Campus Audit: Lane Community College (2001)
- Performed a campus audit of the Lane Community College student services areas prior to the opening of the Students First! Building. Looked closely at the physical space issues of the various services. Identified the need to integrate options for online student services.
Grant writing:
- Led faculty teams to develop proposals which have resulted in additional programs and funding for area of responsibility.
  - Over $100,000 for Professional Fitness Training
  - Over $30,000 for Therapeutic and Rehabilitation

COMMUNITY EXPERIENCE

Accreditation Evaluator,
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities (NWCCU)

Accomplishments
- Completed evaluator training in April 2001.
- Functioned as a colleague as well as constructive critic in five (i.e., three full-scale and two regular interim) accreditation visits (2002 to present).
- Evaluated college academic and learning assessment plans.
- Evaluated college practice and policy in accordance with accreditation guidelines.
- Wrote a portion of the committee reports, as input to the decision on the institutions' accreditation status.

Lane Council of Governments
Board Director 2002-Present
Vice Chairman, January 2005 to present
Annual Budget Committee Member 2003-present
Executive Committee Member January 2004 to present

The Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) is a voluntary association of local governments in Lane County, Oregon. Dedicated to solving area-wide problems, LCOG helps area cities, Lane County, educational districts, and special-purpose districts reach their common goals. Since LCOG's creation in 1945, the agency has participated in a wide variety of projects and programs for local governments. Today, LCOG serves Lane County, the 12 cities within the county, and education, public utilities, and other special districts. Over the years, LCOG has dealt with many important issues, programs, and projects that affect local government. LCOG has no taxing or ordinance authority. Rather, it conducts its work under the policy guidance of a Board of Directors made up of local elected officials and in cooperation with agencies at the local, state, and federal levels.
Accomplishments

- Provided policy direction and set policy on issues of education, public services, public utilities, and projects that affect local government
- Engaged in multi-jurisdiction planning and program development to solve regional problems
- Evaluated and approved policy level provisions on a wide variety of direct contract services to local governments and state and federal agencies
- Engaged in regional planning, coordination, program-development, and service-delivery organization
- Reviewed and recommended annual LCOG budget as part of five-member Budget Committee
- Award Presenter: 2004 Inter-Governmental Agency Project Award Fiberoptics to area schools and colleges
- Assisted as a member of the LCOG Executive Committee in the restructuring of the Executive Committee and Board Governance Roles resulting in a greater regional policy focus for the Board of Directors

Eugene Water & Electric Board

Board Commissioner, May 2000 to present
Board President, January 2003 to January 2005

Eugene Water & Electric Board (EWEB), one of the oldest publicly owned electric utilities in the Northwest, was founded in 1911. Today, EWEB is Oregon's largest customer-owned utility. In accordance with the City of Eugene Charter, the citizens of Eugene elect a five-member Board of Commissioners, and this Board retains full control and sets policies for the water, electric and steam utilities. As representatives of the community and with direct responsibility to all EWEB customers, the Board has adopted as its mission "to be an outstanding provider of energy and water products that meet customers' needs and benefit the citizens of Eugene."

Accomplishments

- Chaired over 70 public meetings
- Presented to numerous political, business, and community organizations
- Provided policy direction and set policy
- Led four board governance retreats
- EWEB Representative for Region 2050 Regional Policy Planning
- Met regularly with EWEB General Manager to establish board agendas
- Special District Representative
- Subcommittee on GM evaluation process
- Led the Board in IEBW contract negotiation process

PRESENTATIONS:

Frequent presenter on a variety of topics to chambers of commerce and service clubs; and workshop facilitator.

PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:

American Conference of Academic Deans