Doctoral Dissertations   Theses, Dissertations, Capstones and Projects

2007

Shared governance at Gavilan College : a case study

Matthew Escover

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.usfca.edu/diss

Part of the Education Commons

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

SHARED GOVERNANCE AT GAVILAN COLLEGE: A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation Presented
to
The Faculty of the School of Education
Department of Leadership Studies

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by

Matthew Escover
San Francisco
May 2007

This dissertation, written under the direction of the candidate's dissertation committee and approved by the members of the committee, has been presented to and accepted by the Faculty of the School of Education in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Education. The content and research methodologies presented in this work represent the work of the candidate alone.

Matthew M. Grover _May 22, 2007_

Candidate   Date

Dissertation Committee

Patricia A. Mitchell _May 11, 2007_

Chairperson

Jeffrey T. LaBelle, S.J. _May 11, 2007_

_____ _May 11, 2007_

ii

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to those who encouraged my educational odyssey. They include my great-grandparents, Manuel and Rose Escover, who taught me about courage and risk, and my grandparents, Manuel F. and Leonora Escover, who lent emotional, spiritual, and financial support toward obtaining a good education. It is also dedicated my mother, Joyce Vierra Escover, for her emphasis on education, the determination to achieve, and personal strength and to my father, Manuel J. Escover, for his long hours of work.

There are others whose inspiration made this possible. They include my friend, Celia Rabinovitch, who helped me to find my way, to learn to love again, and to discover my unrealized capabilities. This dissertation also is dedicated to Dean Kent Child, Kathleen Sheridan, Kathryn McClelland, Caryn Krasne, Judge Thomas Breen, Peter C. Worden and Professor Rosemary Brogan. Each, in their own individual way, has provided the advice, insights, and support during this journey.

Finally, this research work is also dedicated to Dr. Patricia Mitchell and the rest of my committee, without whom this work would not be possible. Dr. Mitchell inspired, patiently guided, taught me pragmatism and

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

How might contemporary California community college leadership respond to policy challenges in a rapidly changing, global learning environment? How do the leaders of the community college system craft policy in a vast, complex organizational structure with government mandated, all-inclusive decision-making processes?

California's 109 community colleges comprise the California Community College System, the largest higher education system in the world. The system educates nearly three million students. (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office, 2006). The California Community Colleges prepare students for four-year public and private colleges and universities, work related vocational and technical careers, and a vast range of personal enrichment goals for the young and mature students alike. In meeting these diverse and complicated educational goals, community college leadership navigates through a veritable obstacle course of national, state, and local lawmaker demands. In addition to governmental fiat, college leaders frequently face conflicting public expectations from students, parents, employers, and

employees in a broad range of academic questions. (Collins,(2002).

Kater and Levin (2005) also argued that community colleges are under pressure from "globalization, academic capitalism, increasing governmental interaction and turbulence." This, they argued, has affected the power relationships between faculty and administration.

Cohen and Brower (2003) indicated that community colleges face a complex future of an ever-changing learning environment and evolving public expectations. Public funding cuts, periodic tax revolts by the public, a metamorphic global economy, changing worker skill sets, and employer expectations all challenge community college leadership to meet these differing and, at times, conflicting demands. In addition to the aforementioned issues, the California Legislature mandated a democratic, consultative, policymaking process in the California Education Code Section 70902 b 7, also known as AB 1725, in 1989.

Collins (2002) argued that this omnibus law shifted community colleges away from their K-12 foundations to improve the quality of education in the community college system. The law changed funding mechanisms, teaching qualifications, length of tenure review, faculty evaluation

through peer review, encouraged faculty development, and curriculum innovation. It also increased cooperation between the University of California and California State University systems in academic and curriculum areas. The law also changed the fundamental nature of collegial governance away from traditional leadership models to a democratic policy-making process referred to as shared governance. This process integrated the consultation of the internal college communities within each institution. AB 1725 recognized a role for faculty senates in each college in policy creation and execution much like the University of California and California State University systems. Local boards of trustees were mandated to collegially consult with local faculty senates. The law also mandated the participation of the Academic Senate for California Community Colleges in backing local senates and creating recommendations to the Community College System administration. White (1998) also stated that students and staff were included in the shared governance consultative model.

The reform led to increased involvement and experimentation in major decision-making within the California Community College System. Faculty became involved in personnel matters such as hiring, tenure, and employee

evaluation. This involvement also included instructional development, grading, and curriculum development (Collins, (2002). White (1998) asserted that staff and students were also involved with these processes.

Statement of the Problem

This research sought to explore the meaning of shared governance within the college and how it is applied with the college context. Shared governance is a California legal mandate under which colleges operate.

Cohn and Brawler (2003) referred to the Education Code Section 70902 b 7 as commonly and interchangeably known as "shared governance" or "AB 1725." This law defined the mandated collegial decision-making process, the requirements of the parties involved, and authority of the administration. The parties typically involved in this inclusive policymaking process are the publicly elected local district trustees, appointed administrators, the faculty, the non-certificated staff, and the students.

Kezar (2000) argued that an inclusive consultative process like shared governance can increase the effectiveness of policymaking. She stated that participatory, democratic models such as shared governance bring a broader range of experience and knowledge of the internal college community to weigh on decision-making than

traditional hierarchical leadership that typically existed prior to legally mandated shared governance.

Kezar (2000) seemed to place the argument for bringing a greater range of experience to bear on policymaking which endorses shared governance. It also seemed clear that college administrators by law must consult with the college community leadership prior to making major policy decisions. Leadership, policymaking, and application of law, it may be argued, are subject to the interpretive and experimental aspects of the collaborative process. This process is also open to the width and breadth of both personal and group application and practice in each unique college culture. The factors of personal and group interpretation, experimentation, and individual college culture may have an effect on the nature of shared governance and policymaking in an individual college culture. These factors in turn may have value in understanding the process and enactment of shared governance in other community colleges.

Existing research in the area of shared governance, including Kezar (2000), Kater and Levin (2005), Pope and Miller, (1999), Wright-Sanders (1997), Cohen (2003), and Myers (2005), all investigated shared governance from a quantitative survey research method. These studies also

investigated a number of college districts simultaneously. In contrast, this research sought to explore the meaning of shared governance and its enactment in a single college to discover a richer understanding of this concept in belief and action.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to discover what the leadership of the five communal groups within a specific college community understands about the meaning of shared governance and how it is applied. Additionally, this study also sought to understand how the individuals and groups involved in shared governance arrived at their understanding of the concept.

This exploration has potentially increased the understanding of how leaders formed their comprehension of shared governance and how they executed the process. This in turn may have disclosed potential new approaches for leadership to be more effective in marshalling collective resources within their institutions to adjust to a rapidly changing educational environment.

Background and Need for Study

Collins (2002) related that the California Community College System is a large, diverse constellation of 109 districts with multiple campuses which educate nearly three million students in a rapidly changing global environment. Kezar (2000), Pope and Miller, (1999) and Collins (2002) all argued that the system is faced with rapid change which is best met by utilizing collaborative decision-making processes. Schuetz (1999) clarified that shared governance is an involuntary, state government mandated, process in California, unlike other states.

Kezar (2000) and Collins (2002) argued that bringing in specialized knowledge and experience from faculty, staff, and students was more effective in responding to change. Collins (2002), in particular, held that this approach was more effective than autocratic, authoritarian leadership.

Healy (1997), White (1998), and Hartley (2003) all contended that shared governance could be a source of organizational chaos. Each expressed that shared governance was an impediment to responding to a rapidly changing learning environment. Healy (1997) stated that interest groups such as faculty, staff, or students would obstruct necessary reforms needed in the modern, rapidly evolving global learning environment.

Wright Sanders (1997), Pope and Miller (1999), and Ponce (2001) all argued that shared governance is a collaborative process. Wright-Sanders (1997) wrote that the shared governance process involves mutual trust between the parties involved in decision making but is subject to leadership beliefs. Pope and Miller (1999) also argued that shared governance is a process involving consensus building, an understanding of each group's roles, and shared ownership of institutional policies.

Kater and Levin's (2005) survey of 301 colleges found that many colleges utilized shared governance, but also related that a substantial number did not. Also, they discovered that the understanding of what shared governance means and how it actually varies institutionally. Pope and Miller (2005) noted that the perceptions of shared governance of college presidents were markedly narrower in scope than faculty senate presidents.

Unlike the Kater and Levin (2005) and the Pope and Miller (2005) studies, this research explored shared governance in a single location. Gavilan College is a small, single college district located on the central coast of California. The district extends over 200 miles from south San Jose to King City in Monterey County. The district was organized around the nucleus of San Benito

Junior College formed in 1919, as an adjunct of San Benito Joint Union High School. The college operated in this guise until 1961. The state of California mandated consolidation or formation of a new district for budgetary and size considerations. The San Benito Junior College Board of Trustees opted for consolidation with south Santa Clara County, which had no existing college physically in its area. Included in these small, rural, agricultural, communities were Morgan Hill, San Martin, and Gilroy. (Gavilan College Catalog, 2003-2004).

The college was physically relocated from Hollister in San Benito County to a 150-acre site above the Santa Clara Valley near the intersection of State Highway 25 and Highway 101. This site is near the geographical center of the district. The current buildings were completed in 1963 and classes were relocated to it. The college has been on this current site for over 40 years. The college serves nearly 5,000 full-time and part-time students at the Gilroy main campus and the two small satellite campuses in Morgan Hill and Hollister. There are over 150 administrative, faculty, and non-certificated staff employees. (Gavilan College Catalog, 2003-2004).

The research site is a small, single-campus district institution. The purpose of this study was to discover how

an individual college operated under shared governance
which in turn may increase empirical understanding of the
process.

Although the college campus is located in a rural area,
it has service areas which are in urban San Jose, suburban
Morgan Hill and Gilroy, and in rural San Benito County,
unlike many other community colleges which are either
urban, suburban, rural, or a combination of two in nature.

The college also had new leadership in the
instructional services, student services, business
services, and the presidency in the last three years. The
college had very stable leadership in the past, with only
the occasional turnover of key leaders due to retirement or
promotion. The greatest change was in the office of the
superintendent-president, with three presidencies since
1992.

With a new leadership team in administration, the
selection of four new trustees of a seven-member board, and
retirements within the faculty and staff, the exploration
of the research topic would be timely both in understanding
how individual leaders saw shared governance, and how they
put this jointly into action.

Understanding leadership beliefs and perceptions about
how shared governance operates is the subject of much

debate. This research explored these beliefs and perceptions in depth to contribute a greater understanding of leadership beliefs, particularly in an individual college district setting, and the enactment process to the ongoing debate of the scope of shared governance.

Most recent empirical research of multiple campus districts did not focus upon the activities of the leadership of the internal groups. These recent studies viewed shared governance from studies involving followers, or a combination of leaders and followers, or narrow studies of leadership development. This researcher found only one recent empirical study of a single community college which explored shared governance. That study, however, explored shared governance with followers as well as college leaders.

This study of a sociologically and geographically diverse district, focused upon the leadership. This may provide new understanding of shared governance in a rapidly changing educational environment.

Theoretical Foundation

Baldridge (1971) provided the basic foundational meanings for leadership and governance. His writings are on how the tripartite models of governance characterize organizational types and how leadership manifests its

character in each. He argued that there are three specific models by which academic governance may be studied. The tripartite models of governance are based upon "the operation of complex social systems (p.1)."

Baldridge (1971) referred to the structures within his organization and leadership theory as the bureaucratic, collegial, and political models. The bureaucratic model bears the imprint of Weber's (1948) theories of complex organizations. These include a hierarchical leadership structure with formal lines of communication and control. Rank and position within the organization are important and are central to exercising authority over others. The workplace is organized along rational, legalistic parameters in which leaders and employees operate. Formal, written policies guide the routine of decision-making and policy execution on all levels within the organization. Efficiency, competency, and limited goals are characteristic within this social structure. Appointment and promotion to positions within the organization are based upon ability and training.

Baldridge (1971) described the second model of organization as the collegial model. The collegial model is based upon an oligarchic, collective leadership means of governance. This theory is much like Goodman's (1962)

theory of a university governed by a community of scholars

which governs with a minimal professional, trained

administration. This system requires the full participation

of the faculty in governance and is guided by a calm,

consensus-driven process. The faculty would administer

their own affairs with little influence by bureaucracy.

Authority is derived not from position, but knowledge and

technical competency within one's own field of endeavor. A

humanistic, utopian, idealistic approach is the foundation

for this model, with the person treated as a unique

individual.

The third within Baldridge's (1971) means of

governance is the political model. This model is a

rejection of both the bureaucratic and collegial means of

governance. The model is a manifestation of the student

movement during the late 1960s.' The student riots of the

Vietnam War era, the organization of professors into

unions, the pressure of external interest groups on

educational policies, and the intervention of state

governors to restore order on campuses are seen as

political acts under this model.

Baldridge (1971) viewed these acts as emerging

concerns arising from a complex social structure within the

university. He referred to a structure composed of many

"miniature subcultures." These subcultures articulate their concerns, demands, and experiences to the complicated policymaking process. The policymaking process is then configured and reconfigured to incorporate the competing interests of each subculture.

Within this political model, there are certain assumptions. The first is that conflict is a normal, accepted, and dynamic part of the governance process. Since there are many subcultures within the institution, it is natural for all to bring their experiences, values, and understanding to decision-making. Democracy is a symptom of a pluralistic organizational culture, even though there is an elite oligarchic or autocratic leadership structure. Formal authority expressed by the leadership structure is limited by the competitive political pressure these subcultures can bring. Finally, the policymaking process is not only subject to competing internal sub-cultural claims and administrative leadership, but also external interest groups. These external groups can include political, social, and economic groups which seek to shape college policies. (Baldridge,(1971).

In particular, the political model of decision-making was the specific lens through which shared governance was explored. The political model includes the

aspects of interest group involvement, cross-cultural pressures, dispersed power, and tendency toward democratic decision-making. White (1998) argued that shared governance varies among colleges, with different levels of involvement by faculty, staff, and students. Kezar (2000), Northouse (2001), and Collins (2002) also provided a supporting basis for shared governance meanings.

From these foundations, the research explored the multiple meanings of shared governance to the group leaders, the influences upon it, the policies developed in the process, and the enactment of those policies.

<div align="center">Research Questions</div>

The research questions are derived from the primary research problem: what is the meaning of shared governance and how it is contextually applied?

Patton (2002) and Creswell (2003) are the basis for the design of the questions and methodology in this qualitative research. The questions here are developed to elicit the broadest possible understanding and meaning of shared governance in policymaking in a particular college within the limited context of this project. The research questions to be addressed in this study are as follows:

1.   How do leaders of the various constituencies
          which include the trustees, administration,

faculty, staff, and students of the college

understand shared governance?

2.   What factors influence these leaders'

understanding of shared governance?

3.   How do leaders enact shared governance?

4.   What policies have resulted from shared

governance?

From these questions, the research sought to discover emerging patterns of understanding and meaning of shared governance and its enactment in their college. This in turn yielded rich data which could be useful to college leaders in utilizing their internal resources to facilitate change in their colleges.

Glossary of Terms

The following glossary of terms is provided to define terms specific to this research:

AB 1725: Assembly Bill 1725, an act of the California State Legislature approved in 1989. In addition to reforming instruction and funding, provides for the input of individual college trustee boards, administration, faculty, students, and public in policymaking within the California Community College system.

Administration: The appointed leadership/management team of a community college including instructional and

support service personnel. This group includes college presidents, vice-presidents, deans, and program directors.

Associated Student Body (ASB): The organization by which students represent their collective group within the shared governance process.

ASB Student Government Meeting: A public meeting where student leaders meet, discuss, and formulate policy affecting students. College administration policies are also discussed in this forum.

Board of Trustees: The popularly elected governing board within each specific community college district in California. The board represents the populace within a district and is charged with selecting the college president and approving/disapproving major college policies within state education law guide lines.

Board of Trustees Meeting: A publicly noticed meeting under the Ralph M. Brown Act in which college policy is publicly discussed and formulated. Budgetary issues, senior management hiring and dismissals, faculty and staff appointments are all approved through this body. This body may meet and confer in private executive session to discuss pending litigation and personnel matters.

California Community College System: The 109 local community college districts which provide academic,

vocational, and technical education within California. The districts issue associate degrees, proficiency certificates, and community noncredit education.

California State Employees Association (CSEA): The collective bargaining unit for non-certificated support employees within the community college.

Faculty: The full-time tenured and part-time non-tenured instructional staff of a community college.

Faculty Senate: The faculty association within each college which is elected by faculty members to represent their group within the shared governance process.

Non-certificated Employees: The support staff of each community college which includes clerical support staff, maintenance workers, and other hourly non-management, non-faculty employees.

Praxis: Praxis involves making choices, deliberation, and what action to be done in concrete situations according to Bernstein, (1983) in the hermeneutic process.

President's Council: A collective decision-making body which includes all members of the college community except trustee members.

Ralph M. Brown Act: A California State Legislative act which mandates all public agencies must hold open, public meetings where decisions in all policy issues except

pending litigation, collective bargaining, and personnel issues must be decided openly with public notification.

Shared Governance: Shared governance is a collective consultative decision-making process which involves the college board of trustees, administration, faculty, non-certificated staff and students. This process is mandated in the California Community College System under state law AB 1725.

Limitations

Creswell (2003) referred to limitations as a means to identify potential weaknesses in the research study. This study was limited by the subjective responses of the participants and was also limited to a small college district with one campus. The findings may not be generalizable to all community college districts. Finally, the findings of this research might be subject to other interpretations than just those of this research or of the researcher.

The research sampled the leadership of each internal community rather than membership of each, or the entire overall college population, and allowed for a research to have focused upon the most influential decision-makers. The research was also limited to observation of meetings which involved shared governance and the involvement of the

leadership who were interviewed. The final limitation was the scope of the participants' responses that could lack specificity.

Significance

Creswell (2003) referred to significance as an area of the research which states the rationale and importance of the study. The audience for the research is those to whom it is addressed and the importance of the research to this audience. Areas also addressed are how the research adds to scholarly research, how it may improve policymaking, and how actual practice may improve because of this new information.

Shared governance is a legally mandated, democratic process by which entire college communities create policy, reform, and change within the California Community College System. The process is one that allows a broad range of experience in the development of curriculum, the hiring of administrators, faculty and staff, instructional methodologies, financial issues, collective bargaining, contract negotiations, and many other significant policy decisions within the community college.

AB 1725, the locus of the shared governance law, is subject to interpretation as many laws are. The understanding and the meaning of the law are subject to

human factors such as the meaning of language, the individual choices that each person makes, as well as the power dynamics of an institution. Group interpretation of the language and meaning of this legal mandate are also subject to interpretative and power dynamics as well.

This study may have identified not only the beliefs, the understandings, and the execution of shared governance, but also the model under which Gavilan College operates.

This study may significantly facilitate the greater understanding of individual and group processes by which they arrive at their interpretation of shared governance. By revealing a richer motif of shared governance theory, comprehension, and practice, both academics and practitioners may be able to utilize these findings to further advance qualitative research in community college governance. This in turn may help identify new and innovative ways to lead college communities.

In the global environment which is rapidly evolving, bringing collective skills, knowledge, and experiences to college leadership on all levels may better respond to these changes. Ultimately, the students and public may also gain from the increased level of understanding achieved by this research.

Summary

Shared governance is a state-mandated, democratic decision-making process within the California Community College System. The shared governance process within AB 1725 involves consultation among local trustee boards, college administrations, faculty, staff, and student organizations. Theoretical foundations for this law can be found in the tripartite theory of college governance by Baldridge (1971). The political model within this theory is a democratic process incorporating all major groups within the college community.

Recent studies indicated that shared governance varies from college to college. Many colleges still operate under the bureaucratic and collegial models of governance. Some studies also indicated some difference in perception of the meaning of mandate.

The purpose of this study was to explore the meaning of shared governance and how college leaders arrive at this understanding. The research site is a small, single-district community college in central California. The participants are the leadership of the five internal groups within the college.

The research questions for this work seek to explore how individual leaders understand shared governance, how

they came to that understanding, how they enact shared governance, and what policies have resulted from that process.

The research findings may help increase the understanding of shared governance which in turn may yield additional research questions. Increased understanding of shared governance and how collegians formed their understanding may also assist practitioners in their execution and enactment of this democratic form of leadership.

Subsequent portions of this research examine the literature in support of the research purpose and questions. The methodological portion of this text relates how the research was conducted, what questions were utilized to explore the research questions, and how the research was summarized and interpreted.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Overview

This review of literature addresses the two areas derived from the theoretical framework. The first of these two areas is the historical origins and the development of the community college in California. Cohen and Brawer (2003), Collins (2002), Brossman and Roberts (1973), and Cohen (1994) provided the basis for the historical development of the community college system in California. Each source contributed to the developmental background for the creation and evolution of the California Community College System and shared governance as a state-mandated process.

The second area addressed from the theoretical framework is leadership and governance in the California Community College System. Recent empirical studies of shared governance are also discussed and summarized.

Historical Development of California Community Colleges

Cohen and Brawer (2003) related that the California Community College System developed parallel to other community colleges nationally. The community college began in California as an appendage of public high schools in the

early 20th century. These early colleges were referred to as junior colleges and were created by a 1907 state law. The purpose of the law was to provide access to higher education for a greater audience of students while approximating the first two years of university curriculum.

Cohen and Brawer (2003) stated that the first California junior college was organized in Fresno in 1910. Other colleges were organized under subsequent laws as part of high school districts, state colleges, and separate junior college districts. By 1927, California had 16 of these institutions of higher learning.

Brosman and Roberts (1973) noted the junior college was more than "a democratic version of the English prep school", (p. 6), but part of higher education, offering courses compatible with four-year institutions. The colleges also became places for vocational and technical study as well.

Rapid post-World War II population growth and subsequent federal reforms of higher education during the Truman administration produced a profound change in the scope and expanded mission of junior colleges both nationally and in California. A report entitled *Higher Education for American Democracy* stated that a new system of public, community-serving colleges would serve the

communities in which they existed with little or minimal tuition or fees, have extensive programs offerings, and serve as cultural centers for their communities (Wright-Sanders, 1997).

Cohen and Brawler (2003) indicated that other federal reforms in education occurred in this period. These reforms included the G. I. Bill, a financial aid bill for war era veterans, which helped increase the number of college educated and also expand the number of community colleges.

Brossman and Roberts (1973) also noted that the community colleges were a place that allowed individuals "to obtain a degree as quickly, economically and as efficiently as possible" (p. 6), while utilizing government educational assistance. The schools became preparatory before moving on to four-year universities. They refer to post-World War II government educational reforms as part of these phenomena.

In the 40 years after the post World War II federal report *Higher Education for American Democracy*, California community colleges expanded both in number of college districts as well as numbers of students. The California Strayer Report of 1947 established open enrollment to virtually all students within the system. Another major factor in expansion was the 1960 Master Plan for Higher

Education, also known as the Donahoe Act, which identified the community college system as the third pillar of a triad in higher education in California including the University of California and the California State University systems. These major legislative milestones were reinforced in the 1987 Master Plan review (Wright-Sanders, 1997).

Subsequent to this review, the California State Legislature approved a major reform of the community college system. This reform, known as California Assembly Bill 1725, or simply AB 1725, would alter a number of elements within the system. The bill required the Community College Board of Governors to create and maintain a consultation process at the state level to ensure local community college districts utilize participatory governance within their colleges. In addition to the local process, the Community College Board of Governors also enacted a Consultation Council consisting of 18 representatives from local colleges. Included within this group are local trustees, administrators, faculty, staff members, and students. The council is responsible for evaluation of policies to ensure the integrity of the college system and the interests of the students. (California Community College Chancellor's Office, 2006).

Wright-Sanders (1997) related that local districts were mandated to create a shared governance process which included academic senates and other members of the internal college community in policymaking. Among the other AB 1725 reforms were credentialing, professional standards, and standards for college governance. These standards are commonly referred to as shared governance.

Collins (2002) referred to shared governance as a form of collegial governance borrowed from the university model of governance where "faculty would participate in governance" (p. 37). This law also "mandated local boards of trustees consult collegially" (p. 37) with each local college academic senate. Finally, the shared governance process was required as a condition for receiving state funding.

These conditions would set the stage for the greater involvement and experimentation with faculty and college administration. Faculty would share responsibility with administrators in hiring and firing personnel, designing curriculum, tenure review, and other major instructional policymaking and implementation. (Collins, 2002).

Both Kezar (2000) and Collins (2002) argued that shared governance is useful in helping colleges respond to a rapidly changing educational environment by combining

unique skills, experiences, and knowledge in the decision-making process. Both also argue that these diverse skills provide strength in responding to a rapidly changing learning environment with conflicting demands upon the community college system.

<center>Leadership and Governance</center>

Leadership is often a matter of understanding and interpretation. How leaders and followers reach that understanding, interpretation, and finally execution is the subject of much theoretical study and speculation as well as empirical research.

Northouse (2001) defined leadership as having multiple meanings to individual people. He stated that there are as many meanings of leadership to people as there are meanings for democracy, love, and peace. He further argued that there are several central, common components to leadership. Leadership is a process, involving influence. This process includes group context and goal attainment.

Leadership involves the influence of leaders over followers. Leadership takes place in groups with a common purpose. These groups can be small, communal, or encompassing a complete organization. Finally, this process of leadership includes leader attention to goal attainment. (Northouse, 2001).

Northouse (2001) also viewed power as having a relationship close to leadership. There are two types of power in leadership, positional and personal. Positional power is derived from an attained office within an organization. Personal power is derived from followers within an organization. Power is given to leaders by followers because of their faith in the leadership. Finally, power is a shared resource which de-emphasizes that leaders wield power alone, but jointly with followers to achieve common goals within organizations.

Baldridge (1971) noted that collegial organizations are a venue where leadership and administration function in three traditional frameworks, the bureaucratic, the collegial, and the political models. Richardson (1975) also concurred that there are three organizational leadership models. He described them as the bureaucratic, shared authority, and political models. The bureaucratic model he saw as a hierarchical pyramid in shape and responsibility.

Richardson (1975) noted the shared authority model involved what he described as a collegium, with shared power dynamics and all participants having direct access to the ultimate leadership. The political model according to Richardson, viewed the institution as a locus of vested

interests, identifiable power blocks, and shifting interests.

Baldridge (1971) viewed the three models differently than Richardson and named the collective leadership model differently. Richardson (1971) shared most of his characterizations of the bureaucratic model, but characterized it as a consensus model. Baldridge (1971) saw the collective, collegial model as faculty-driven. Richardson (1971) stated that the shared authority involved all college groups including the students. While both agreed that the political model involved competing interests, Richardson saw it as a model of conflict with strong, negative; connotations.

Baldridge (1971) characterized each of components of the triad as having distinctive characteristics and differences. The bureaucratic model is derived from Weber's (1968) theories on complex organizations from the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

Weber (1968) developed a bureaucratic model based upon a professional officialdom which is appointed on merit and on a rigid rule based hierarchical structure. Form and function of the organization are determined by organizational rules with either a single leader or small group of leaders exercising their authority through a

legalistic framework. Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir (2005)

described these governance structures as an autocracy,

based upon one leader, or an oligarchy based upon a small,

exclusive, collective leadership.

Kater and Levin (2005) saw these formalized roles as a

traditional method for decision-making and a rigid command

structure. Morgan (1997) had described this traditional

model as a unit within the political organizational model.

In this framework, employees deferred to management which

is often paternalistic in nature with a history of conflict

and delineation between leadership and employees.

Baldridge (1971) stated that the second model, the

collegial model, is based upon the notion of a community of

scholars administering a college. This theory, in turn, is

based upon Goodman's (1962) writings in this area in the

early 1960s.'

The community of scholars is notionally based upon a

consensual approach to administration grounded in what

Baldridge refers to as a "technical competence" (p. 6).

This theory also referred to the authority an individual

derives from his or her position and how it relates to what

is one's professional knowledge. Decision-making is based

upon consensus-building within the community of scholars.

Goodman (1962) rejected the notion of professional administration for a collective sovereignty of scholars with "a handful of unpretentious administrators" (p. 169) drawn from the faculty and with a handful of clerical and janitorial staff for specialized support tasks. Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir (2005) characterized this governing principle as an oligarchy which is characterized by a small, specific, and exclusive collective leadership.

Kater and Levin (2005) saw this level of internal participation as a historical occurrence, consistent with the experience of the mid-20th century. White (1998) argued that this model was preempted by the development of the political model in the 1960s.' Integral to this development was the social revolution of the civil rights movement, the anti-Vietnam war movement, and the related student protests.

Baldridge (1971) defined the third traditional model as the political model. This model is characterized by decision-making that is dispersed among many groups within a college. Ginsberg, Lowi, and Weir (2005) described this model as a democracy where all the members of an entity exercise power collectively, primarily through discussion and voting.

Baldridge (1971) made an assumption that there is an underlying democratic tendency at work despite formal administrative power, oligarchic groupings, and the process as a sign of organizational health. Decision-making is not formal or bureaucratic and involves input from many interests within the institution. This concept is much like Madison's theory of pluralism, which involves the collective discussion of issues, and the multiplicity of groups all contending for influence over policy. (Hamilton, Madison, and Jay, 1961).

Morgan (1997) also argued that this sort of political system is much like Madison. He referred to a plural nature which shapes organization life by the multiplicities of "interests, conflicts and sources of power"(p.160).Baldridge (1971) argued that this model is a result of the rejection of traditional autocratic/oligarchic, bureaucratic and collegial, and oligarchic leadership models as a result of the campus student unrest in the 1960s' when traditional authority ideas, figures, and institutions were challenged.

Kater and Levin (2005), and Baldridge (1971), stated that the dynamics of conflict, power, and political maneuvering are an integral part of the decision-making environment and its actors. The political model was a

rejection of both the bureaucratic, rigid, decision-making vehicle and the collegial, calm, consensus-driven framework. The political model embraces conflict and expects cross-cultural pressures in forming policy in a pluralistic process, much like a legislative lawmaking process. Kater and Levin (2005), in particular, also viewed this model as best suited for higher education, not just colleges, but also universities.

Collins (2002) and Kezar (2000) both articulated shared governance as a process which involves leadership which is not an authority based, command-and-control system referred to by Northouse (2001). Shared governance integrated some of the theories of organizational leadership which Northouse (2003) and Baldridge (1971) posited.

Northouse (2001) interpreted leadership as a relationship between leaders and followers, with leadership power deriving from followers working to achieve common organizational goals. He also argued that leadership is subject to interpretation as are abstract terms such as democracy.

Baldridge's (1971) political model described an approach toward democracy within the organization. Decision-making is part of a procedure that includes

multiple interest groups involved in and competing in a pluralistic process.

Recent Empirical Studies in Shared Governance

Since the enactment of shared governance as a state-mandated process, there has been controversy over the process and the effect on college leadership. Quantitative and qualitative research studies have tried to measure and explore shared governance on a variety of levels.

Recent empirical studies indicate both positive and negative assessments of shared governance in California Community Colleges. This section will examine both these arguments and provide a summary of the findings.

Birnbaum (2004) noted that most contemporary criticisms involving shared governance are faculty obstructionism and that contemporary governance systems cannot address changes within the external environment in which colleges operate. He also noted that there is an assumption within these arguments that there are factional obstructionisms which are making decision-making processes cumbersome. Additionally, he related that the opposed view of shared governance limits the value of what he refers to as human capital. The loss of the experience of the members of the college community reduces the influence of the leadership, the level of trust within the organization, and

experience which individuals and groups bring to decision-making. This section will review empirical studies which explore and investigate these two major arguments.

Healy (1997) is an advocate of the school of thought which views shared governance as an impediment to leadership. He argued that faculty, staff, and other related groups frustrate change and disrupt college governance by placing direct political pressure on elected trustees and administration figures. He also articulated that the interest groups often thwart the policy direction upon which senior administration may wish to embark. Finally, he asserted that shared governance interferes with college presidents' ability to execute their jobs.

Nussbaum (1998) shared Healy's beliefs that shared governance was an impediment to effective college administration. He held that shared governance fragmented leadership and authority, created friction between interest groups, faculty and staff intransigence, led to budgetary disorganization, and caused slow or incremental change within the California Community College System.

White (1998) explored assertions of shared governance creating disorganization and disorder within the community college system in a study of two community colleges. He referenced the political model of shared governance as a

source for chaos and gridlock in decision-making. His findings refer to a hybridization of governance, with elements of Baldridge's (1971) bureaucratic, collegial, and political models operative within the studied colleges. The findings also indicated disillusionment and disengagement from the process because of perceived lack of clarity of role and responsibilities as well as a divergence in fundamental issues such as compensation and workload. His study also found that the state-mandated model of shared governance failed to recognize differences within each institution. He argued for the need to create forms of governance which recognized the uniqueness of each institutional history, experiences, and culture.

Hartley (2003) explored, within a case study on shared governance, similar concerns as Healy (1997) and White (1998). He also cited the Baldridge (1971) tripartite model for college governance. He addressed concerns of a slow and inefficient collective decision-making process of shared governance. His qualitative study of a single, very small, Midwestern college leadership and the senior faculty sought to explore the quality of shared governance. The research findings were mixed with the factors of manipulation and creativity. Innovative factors brought members of the college community into the process and utilized their

participative skills. Manipulative factors included threats, isolation, and limiting access to those who might interfere with a desired policy objective by the administration. His findings indicated that the administrative leaders play a key role in determining and maintaining the governance process and there is a narrow range between manipulation and creativity.

Shulock (2002) studied community college leadership in California. She found in her study that participants felt that shared governance limited the role of trustees, constrained decision-making by college presidents and administrators, and changed the accountability of administrators. Accountability, to the participants, was to the faculty and other groups which frustrated leaders in making decisions.

In contrast to theorists like Healy (1997), who regard shared governance as an impediment to reform, practitioners such as former Community College Chancellor Nussbaum (1998), and researchers such as Hartley (2003), Shulock (2002), and White (1998) whose research revealed qualified views on the topic, the following researchers viewed shared governance in an affirmative light. Birnbaum (2004) theorized that human capital held value in leadership and decision-making. Collins (2000) argued theoretically that

shared governance was valuable in facing a rapidly changing environment in higher education. Rather than seeing a democratic process as an impediment, she also contended that the specialized knowledge, willingness, and ability of faculty, staff, and students could better assist their institutions than autocratic or oligarchic leadership.

Lucey (2002) noted that shared governance was also a valuable tool in the creation of policy. As a college president, she argued that inclusive policymaking was useful in developing major programs such strategic plans, budgeting, and institutional reorganization. She argued that good faculty-administrative relationships and strong trust levels are also an added value to the process. She also noted that collaborative decision-making makes the college a stronger institution with joint decisions being implemented enthusiastically.

Miller and Katz (2007) related that collegial governance is going through a period of cultural clash between corporate and collegial models. They noted that this clash involves a newer generation of administrators that embrace business type decision-making and faculty which value traditional, academic, collective policymaking. They noted that shared governance must move to a win-win model where trust, collaboration, power-sharing, and

participation need to be developed in a constantly evolving
sense of community.

Scott (2002) stated that shared governance is a
process with a due process of shared information,
communication, and opinion, the consideration of ideas,
compromise, and negotiation. She noted that the process is
a "deliberative, consultative practice" within a political
system. She also observed the existence of constituent
interest groups within the institutions. Finally, she
related that "mutual respect and trust" are part of the
process.

Schuetz (1999) argued that shared governance is a
system of shared decision-making. She noted that it was
based upon what she referred to as a social system. That
social system was something built among the governing
boards, administration, faculty, students, and staff. She
noted that:

> An ideal shared governance model is collegial in
> nature, recognizing the contributions of all members in
> a group consensus process. This process fosters a sense
> of empowerment, equal partnership, and a vested
> interest in successful outcomes of institutional policy
> and implementation decisions. (p. 5)

Schuetz also noted that shared governance involves the
engagement all groups in effective problem solving.

Favero (2003) also embraced the notion of the shared governance system effectively operating inside a social framework or system. This social framework requires collaboration between faculty and administrators to increase the performance of policymaking and governance. She noted that high performing governance systems include consensus building and the acceptance of policy results in the process by all parties. She further argued that the building of strong personal relationships among faculty and administrators is crucial to productive policy creation.

Morphew (1999) argued that shared governance is traditionally a part of collegiate leadership. He also noted that it is subject to changes and that it can adjust to environmental change. Among the changes that he listed included the growth of adjunct faculty and the need to include them in governance. He further related that technology and instruction would also be affected by shared governance, placing pressure on professors to reform their teaching. Finally, Morphew stated that traditional faculty-administrator relationships would need to change to address these changes in faculty and instruction. He called for a greater fluidity in these relationships to address these new challenges.

Eckel (1999) researched shared governance at four universities and explored difficult decision-making processes with faculty and administrators involved. He discovered that there is willingness on the part of faculty to participate and make difficult decisions, including the ending of programs when necessary.

Kezar (2000) explored shared governance in a single, very large, Midwestern community college district with a single campus. Her findings indicated variability in the perception of leadership and application. She found three groups similar to the Baldridge (1971) triad theory of organizational leadership. Some found their role as bureaucratic, others as political, and finally the remaining group as similar to the collegial model. She found that these differences were based upon personal and institutional experience, beliefs, and power conditions on campus. She concluded that the groups would be best utilized by an all-inclusive leadership culture.

Ponce (2001) studied shared governance in a single community college. He explored who was involved in shared governance, how the process operated, and the benefits, problems, and unresolved issues involved. He interviewed multiple members of each group, administration, students,

staff, and faculty. He also observed shared governance
meetings on the campus.

Ponce (2001) discovered that faculty, students, and
staff were largely absent from major decision-making. Final
decision-making was concentrated in the administration. He
also found there was no real consensus on the nature,
process, and level of communication in the shared
governance process among the participants. He concluded
that a collegial framework for decision-making ultimately
helps create a shared vision concentrated on the
organization rather than an individual leader.

Lapworth (2004) examined the tension between
hierarchical, corporate, and consensual democratic
approaches toward collegial governance. She argued that
shared governance need not decline because of the opposed
viewpoints. Her research also argued that governance is far
too complicated to support a simple one-dimensional
approach to shared governance. She stated that shared
governance would work best focusing on a role for academic
departments in governance. She also pointed out that the
development of a steering core which draws upon the
knowledge and abilities of the internal groups of a college
would further strengthen shared governance.

Kater and Levin (2005) also researched shared governance in the community college system. Their research analysis of 301 community colleges in California and throughout the United States involved the extent of faculty involvement in governance areas outside traditional areas of collective decision-making. The researchers utilized a collective bargaining contract survey which examined 238 labor contracts. They looked beyond faculty evaluation, instructional development and curriculum and to nontraditional areas included budget and down-sizing issues.

Kater and Levin (2005) found that faculty involvement was deeply embedded in organizational work far beyond instructional and faculty evaluation. Most collective bargaining agreements were found in fact did not stipulate to faculty participation in administration or management decision-making. They also learned that although many colleges restrict the scope of share governance, many more in practice embrace it. They observed variability in cultures which seemed to indicate variance in meaning and application of shared governance. Finally, their conclusions suggested an exchange between administration and faculty of increased productivity for an increased share political decision-making process.

Pope and Miller (2005) surveyed the development of college presidents from within academic senate leaders and their perceptions from the experience of being developed within a shared governance environment. Their findings indicated presidents perceived their administrative role was separate and distinct from democratic purposes. Decisions tend to be made independently while faculty leadership believed that they should be made collectively.

Summary

This review of literature examined the historical development of the community college system in California from its simple beginnings in the early 1900s.' It followed the periodic reforms which increased both enrollment, accessibility, and size of the system leading up to the tectonic reform event of AB 1725.

The philosophy behind the legislation of AB 1725 arose during the 1960's and campus unrest which challenged old established autocratic and oligarchic organizational leadership models. Baldridge (1971) articulated these changes in his tripartite model of college governance and leadership with the bureaucratic, collegial, and political forms. He saw the political model as a natural outgrowth of the civil *sturm und drang* of the 1960's.

Subsequent theorists and researchers examined and explored the meanings of leadership. Northouse (2001) theorized that leadership involved multiple means to multiple individuals. He also saw leadership as involving not only the aspirations of administrators, but also the followers involved in that process. This would appear complimentary to the political, democratic model.

Recent empirical research has attempted to address a concern against the political democratic model on the grounds that the model is too chaotic and prevents necessary change. Other recent research argued for an enlarged scope of the political, democratic model of shared governance. Their research showed that the democratic model blends expanded experience and knowledge of the college community to policymaking that an individual or small group cannot replicate.

Burnbaum (2004) identified two axes of thought as to the value of shared governance. One axis found shared governance as a potential impediment to effective decision-making in a global environment which demands corporate, autocratic, or oligarchic leadership. This position is discussed by theorists such as Healy (1997), Nussbaum (1998), and researchers which include White (1998), Shulock (2002), and Hartley (2003). White (1998) argued that shared

governance was chaotic. The roles for the participants, individual, and group, and the collective understanding of what shared governance means was unclear. Shulock (2002) found that shared governance created frustrations for administrators which limited their decision-making and narrowed their accountability to internal groups such as the faculty. Hartley (2003) discussed concerns about shared governance and efficiency. He concluded that shared governance was limited and was in part subject to pressures and manipulation for administration to achieve policy goals.

The opposed axis concluded that democratic decision-making and leadership was useful and inclusive. Theorists like Collins (2000), Lucey, (2002), Scott (2002), and Miller and Katz (2007) argued that shared governance is useful in addressing a rapidly evolving educational environment by bringing collective experience to decision-making. Schuetz (1999), Favero (2003), and Morphew (1999) noted the importance good of social arrangements between the interest groups and effective shared policymaking.

Researchers such as Eckel (1999) found that faculty and staff were motivated and willing to participate in shared governance. Kezar (2000) discovered variability among individuals about organizational theory with bureaucratic,

collegial, and democratic models all embraced within the same institution. She also contended that shared governance was limited by this and concluded the organization would best be served by embracing it.

Ponce (2001) found similar conditions in his single college case study. His findings referred to a limited scope of shared governance and argued the college would be better served by an all-encompassing form of shared governance.

Lapworth (2003) found that shared governance need not decline because of differences between administration, faculty, students, and staff. She argued for a more refined approach which would include these groups in parts of decision-making where their experience would serve best.

Kater and Levin (2005) observed broad involvement by all internal college groups in their survey of 301 community college collective bargaining contracts. Their study indicated a great deal of involvement in decision-making from all college groups whether contracts stipulated it or not. They concluded that most colleges embraced shared governance, had various beliefs as to the nature of the concept, and also concluded it was useful as a form of leadership.

Pope and Miller (2005) explored shared governance from the development of leaders from academic senate presidents. They concluded that shared governance would be helpful to prepare them for college presidencies. They also found differences in the perceptions of shared governance by college presidents and academic leaders.

These studies sought to explore or survey the nature of shared governance in a number of sites which vary from several hundred institutions to individual research sites. These empirical research studies tended to indicate findings that shared governance is variable in understanding, belief, and application among many institutions, interest groups, as well as individuals.

Some of the research findings indicated that understanding may be influenced by one's position within the organization, such as administration or faculty. Others also seemed to indicate that the level of involvement by faculty, staff, and students maybe be cultural.

This review of literature pointed to the need to explore the research questions within a single, community college district. This, in turn, provided additional comprehension of the processes involved in the application of shared governance in single district community colleges.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Restatement of the Problem

The purpose of this research was to explore the meaning and enactment of shared governance from the perspective of the leadership in a community college. The leadership represents the five groups within the college: elected trustees, appointed administrators, faculty, non-certificated staff, and students. Gavilan College, the research site is a single-campus, California community college district.

Research Design and Methodology

This research utilized a case study framework to explore the shared governance at Gavilan College. Creswell (2003) referred to case studies as a strategy or approach to qualitative research. He stated that case studies are means to in-depth exploration of programs, events, process, action, or individuals. The case study has limits of activity and time during which the researcher conducts the work. The researcher seeks to gather detailed information utilizing varied data collection procedures.

Patton (2002) stated that case studies capture the description of a community, organization, or program. He also stated that case studies are constructed from "the

smaller studies of individuals, family groups,

organizational units, and other collectives" (p. 297).

In this exploration, the primary problem was what does

shared governance mean and how does it operate? The

research process was limited to one college in the hopes of

discovering a deeper understanding of these issues by the

leadership of each internal group in the institution.

The research questions are as follows:

1. How do leaders of the various constituencies which

   include the trustees, administration, faculty,

   staff, and students of the college understand shared

   governance?

2. What factors influence these leaders' understanding

   and meaning of shared governance?

3. How do leaders enact shared governance?

4. What policies have resulted from shared governance?

Patton (2002) referred to these questions as designed

to elicit the broadest possible response from the

participants. His referenced qualitative research methods

of inquiry will be the methodology utilized in the study.

The qualitative methodology followed a constructionist

approach from which multiple meanings of experience were

explored from these experiences to discover a theory or

pattern that may develop. The case study approach placed

the researcher in the midst of the participants to explore their enactment process. This allowed the collection of data in an open-ended pattern of questions from which data emerged. From the emerging data, themes were developed from the participant observations and individual participant interviews.

Population and Sample

The population for this research study was the five individual leaders of the five internal communities within Gavilan College. These internal communities are the Gavilan College Board of Trustees, the administration, the Faculty Senate, the California State Employees Union local (CSEA), and the Associated Student Body government (ASB). The interview participants were individual leaders from each of these groups. The individual participants who represented these groups were as follows, the Board of Trustee president, College president, Faculty Senate president, non-certificated employees union president, and the Associated Student Body (ASB) president.

The research site was a single-campus district known as Gavilan College. The college is a small, single-campus institution located in south Santa Clara County since 1963. The college serves all of southern Santa Clara County, San Benito County, and a small area of Santa Cruz County. The

school has total faculty of 120 and serves over 5,000 students. The area is primarily rural and agricultural in nature. The college, originally named San Benito Junior College, has been in operation since 1919. (Gavilan College Catalog, 2003).

These leaders are from the elected trustees, appointed administrators, the faculty senate, classified non-certificated staff union, and the student government. Each of these leaders is president of their group, Board of Trustees, administration, Faculty Senate, CSEA union, and ASB student government. They are directly involved in the process of shared governance and have formed impressions of the process.

The Gavilan College Board of Trustees consisted of seven elected members, all chosen from the district at large, but three have a required residence in San Benito County. The remaining four are required to live in south Santa Clara County. The Board was chaired by a board-chosen president who serves a one-year term and presides over monthly meetings. The administration consisted of an appointed superintendent/president, vice-presidents of instruction, business services, admissions and records, and student services. There were also three departmental deans, each representing three instructional areas. They meet in

monthly President's Council meetings to discuss policymaking. The faculty was represented by a faculty senate, chosen from among their members. Their presiding officer was chosen from their organization and serves a one-year term. The Faculty Senate met once a month to discuss items pertinent to the members. The non-certificated staff was represented by a local chapter of the California State Employees Association (CSEA) chaired by a president elected to a one-year term. The student government was an annually elected 15-member body chosen by the students. The meetings are chaired by a popularly elected president chosen by the student body at large (T. Breen, personal communication, August 12, 2006).

<div align="center">Human Subjects Research Approval</div>

Approval was requested from and approved by the University of San Francisco Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the protection of human subjects within the research. In addition to the University of San Francisco IRB approval, permission was requested from the Gavilan College president and was approved. There was no IRB organization at Gavilan College. (See Appendix D).

There are two principles involved in IRB approval. The first is confidentiality of research data. The second principle is full disclosure of all parts of the research

process. The researcher followed the mandated University of San Francisco guidelines which are based upon federal IRB standards. Those included the protection of subject participants from undue risk to their persons, their personal rights, and dignity. University of San Francisco standards include respect for persons, beneficence based upon a risk/benefit ratio, and justice with fair regard for subjects. Informed consent was obtained from all human subjects involved and utilized a written consent on conforming documents (See Appendix B). Copies were provided to all participant subjects. IRBPHS approval was obtained before the collection of data and after faculty, committee, and advisor written approval. Copies of all relevant documents which included two copies of the written application with signatures, copies of questionnaires and other relevant instruments, permission letters from participants, informed consent or cover letters were submitted in IRB formula. (University of San Francisco, 2006).

<div align="center">Instrumentation</div>

Patton (2002) conceptualized the researcher in qualitative research as the principal instrumentation by which data is gathered, reviewed, and analyzed. Creswell (2003) stated this process involves how the researcher

takes an interpretive role which involves a protracted and "intensive experience with the participants" (p. 184).

Patton (2002) referred to the researcher adopting an authentic, neutral stance in qualitative research in order to aid in obtaining empirical findings based upon honest, meaningful and credible material. In addition, the researcher is "in an active, involved role in research while exercising a non-judgmental approach to participants thoughts, emotions, and behaviors" (p. 53). It was the researcher's intention during this study to achieve these goals while attempting to learn with empathy the participants' beliefs, feelings, and experiences. In addition to the researcher as the primary instrumentation, the use of a prepared interview questionnaire (See Appendix A) was based upon the research questions which served as secondary instrumentation to elicit responses from the interviewed participants.

Patton (2002) stated that interview questions should be designed to elicit the broadest possible response from the participant interviewed. The use of opener questions assists in preparing the participants to disclose their observations. Follow-up questions assist the researcher in developing greater response from the participants should the response be short, limited, or minimally responsive. A

closing interview question is utilized to help the
participants cover any item they may have not responded to
or felt was important to them.

The interview questions were based upon the research
questions for this work as derived from the main research
question. The primary research problem was what is the
meaning of shared governance at Gavilan College and how is
it applied. The research questions which explored the
meaning and application of shared governance are as
follows:

1. How do leaders of the various constituencies which
   include the trustees, administration, faculty, staff,
   and students of the college understand shared
   governance?

2. What factors influence these leaders' understanding
   of shared governance?

3. How do leaders enact shared governance?

4. What policies resulted from shared governance?

A series of interview questions were derived from these
primary research questions. They were open-ended questions
which sought to develop the participant interviewees'
understanding of shared governance. These questions are
listed as follows:

1. How long have you been in college leadership?

2. What was your background in preparing for

   leadership?

3. What does shared governance mean to you?

4. How did you arrive at your understanding of

   shared governance ?

5. What experiences brought you to that understanding?

6. What were some of these experiences?

7. How does shared governance affect relationships

   at the college?

8. In what ways does it affect these relationships?

9. What factors do you take into account in these

   relationships?

10. What do you do in the enactment process?

11. What sort of policy results do you get in the

    process?

12. What should have I asked you that I did not ask?

Profile of Researcher

The researcher is a political scientist and adjunct faculty member of Cabrillo, West Valley and Mission Community Colleges. He has worked within the community college system in this capacity since 1986.

As a graduate of San Jose State University, he holds an M.A. and a baccalaureate degree with honors in political science. His area of concentration was in comparative

politics. He is also a member of the Pi Sigma Alpha, the National Political Science Society, the Academy of Political Science, and Phi Delta Kappa International.

In addition, the researcher served eight years in local and state politics. He served as vice-mayor/city council member, redevelopment agency director, and planning commissioner for the City of Hollister. He also served as a county central committee chair for a major political party and on the state central committee as well.

The researcher worked as a vice-president/loan officer in the banking industry for several major California banks. This was for a period of 12 years analyzing commercial and agricultural credits.

He is a former student, adjunct faculty member, and foundation executive director of Gavilan College over a 31-year period. Over this period of time the researcher has observed six presidencies, a complete change in middle and upper level management, the turnover of four members on the elected board of trustees, and the retirement of most senior faculty and department heads.

In this 31-year period, the researcher has also observed the enactment of AB 1725 reforms involving instruction as well as governance and leadership. The researcher has personally supported shared governance and

collaborative decision-making in theory. He has also witnessed the practice of impeding rapid, deliberate, and necessary decision-making and political obstructionism.

<p align="center">Data Collection</p>

Creswell (2003) referred to the steps of data collection as a means to establish boundaries for the research study, collecting information through unstructured or structured observations and interviews. This process also includes the collection of documents or other printed materials as well as protocols for memorializing information. Data collection for the purpose of this research included interviews of college leadership, participant observation of relevant shared governance meetings, and the use of pertinent documents and professional literature as information sources for this research over a two-month period.

Data collection involved interviews of the leadership of each individual community within the college. These included the trustees, administration, faculty senate, CSEA president, and the ASB president. The researcher chose these individuals to be participants in the study based upon their experience and knowledge as leaders within the college. A letter was to be sent to the college president requesting permission to conduct research on site (See

Appendix C). Additional letters were sent to the college

board of Trustees, Faculty Senate, the President's Council,

CSEA board, and ASB senate requesting permission to observe

their meetings over a two-month period. (See Appendix E).

The researcher took written notes of the face-to-face

interviews. Also, participant observations were taken of

Board of Trustee, President's Council, Faculty Senate, CSEA

staff union, and ASB meetings. Written notes were utilized

to create a narrative of these meetings.

Data collection involved the obtaining of any

documentation given by the interviewees relevant to the

process as well as documents from each meeting. These

documents included informational handouts, internal memos,

meeting minutes, and agendas. The data from the three

methods was then combined. Patton (2002) referred to this

process of combining data as triangulation. Triangulation

reinforces a study by the utilization of methods or data.

In this research study, the three points within the

triangulation process were interviews, observation, and

documentation to support the research validity.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2003) referred to data analysis as of "making

sense of text and image data" (p. 190). This process

involves preparing data for analysis, the reflecting upon

data, and the interpretation of the data. The process also involves the transcribing of field notes, interviews, and the sorting of data. The analysis involves as well, a coding process which includes organizing the data into portions which have some sort of shared meaning. This allows for detailed descriptions about the participants, the events, and the places where these events take place. The process facilitates the generation of several themes. The next portion of the data analysis process is conveying descriptive information about the proceedings or participants. This may be facilitated by the use of narrative, a review of themes, and a discussion about the chronology of events. The final step in the process is the interpretation of data. A theoretical lens will be applied at this stage to describe the events and also call for change or reform. The interpretation could be based upon the personal understanding of the researcher, a comparison with the findings of other similar studies, and it may raise questions for future studies.

This research involved the transcription of the leadership interviews and participant observations of shared governance meetings. A coding process of this data was utilized, looking for five to seven common themes from the material.

The research questions used in leadership interviews which was analyzed arose from the primary research problem of what is the meaning of shared governance at Gavilan College and how it is enacted.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter enumerated the material findings of the case study field research and the interpretative understanding of the interviews and observations. The material findings are discussed in three sections and are gleaned from the observations and interviews conducted at Gavilan College during the two month study.

The participants interviewed included the Board of Trustees president, college president, Faculty Senate president, CSEA union president, and the ASB student government president. Each participant was given a pseudonym to protect their identity and privacy.

Interviews were conducted with the leadership of each group and were conducted on the college campus in private. Observations were conducted at two monthly meetings of each constituency. The meetings included the College Board of Trustees, the President's Council, the Faculty Senate, the CSEA union board, and ASB student senate meetings. The process was guided by Patton (2002) and Creswell (2003) to discover the data and respond to the four research questions.

The first section addressed the findings collected from interviews involving the interviewees' beliefs, perceptions, and experiences pertaining to leadership understanding, development of that understanding of shared governance and enactment of shared governance. Section two involved the exploration of the interviewees' beliefs and actions in the enactment process and the results of that process. The third section detailed the interpretation of research findings on shared governance. It also contained an analytical summary which addressed governance approaches posited by Baldridge (1971) and supported by other existing literature. In conclusion, the purpose of this study was to explore what shared governance meant to the participants. The study also sought to discover how it has been contextually applied as explored within a qualitative research framework.

Data Analysis

Creswell (2003) referred to data analysis as a process of making sense of the text and image information. This process involved preparing data for analysis, the reflecting upon data, and the interpretation of the data. This research involved the transcription of the individual leadership interviews and participant observations of shared governance meetings. A coding process of this data

followed, looking for five to seven common themes from the coded material.

The research questions used in leadership interviews arose from the primary research problem of what was the meaning of shared governance at Gavilan College and how it was enacted. The research questions which explored the meaning and application of shared governance are as follows:

1. How do leaders of the various constituencies of the college which include the trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students understand shared governance?

2. What factors influence these leaders' understanding of shared governance?

3. How do leaders enact shared governance?

4. What policies resulted from shared governance?

Site Description

Gavilan College is a community college located in the southern Santa Clara Valley. The college has existed as an institution of higher learning since 1919. It is located in a rural area just south of Gilroy, California. Although the college has been mentioned by name, all participants in the study were assigned pseudonyms to protect their privacy.

The main college campus was located on a 150-acre, oak-covered, rolling, hillside overlooking Highway 101. The college peers down from the hillside toward orchards and vegetable fields below. The majority of the buildings are concrete, tilt-up structures built during the 1960s.' The buildings and furnishings are modest, with coarse rock, concrete or redwood paneled finish, inside and out. A few of the buildings are temporary, modular structures, while the remainder are gradually being renovated since their construction 40 years ago.

The Gavilan College district stretches from King City in the south to San Jose in the north. It is bounded by the undeveloped Diablo Mountain Range in the east, and the lower Gavilan Range, from which the college took its name, in the west. The district is one of great geographical contrast, with several fertile farming valleys, mountainous range land and semi-arid, high desert to the south, and the San Jose metropolitan area in the north. Within the district are the communities of Aromas, Tres Pinos, Paicines, Panoche, San Juan Bautista, Hollister, Gilroy, San Martin, Morgan Hill, Coyote, and San Jose. Most of the communities number from villages of under a few hundred to several hundred thousand in metropolitan south San Jose.

Although the college has one main campus in Gilroy, two small satellite campuses are located in Morgan Hill and Hollister. Two expanded sites are slated for Coyote Valley in San Jose and Hollister, to serve the southern half of the college district.

Participant Profile

The study included five interviewee participants. Each of these was a leader of a particular constituency within the college community. They represented the trustees, administration, faculty senate, CSEA staff union, and the ASB, and student government.

Mr. T., the board of trustees' president, is an educator with a graduate degree in sports management. He is an athletic director at a local high school. Prior to his election to the Gavilan Board of Trustees, he was a member of the adjunct, or part-time, faculty of the college. He has served as a college trustee for seven years. He was elected to the board presidency in December, 2006.

Mr. A., the college president, is a professional administrator. He has worked in various administrative roles over 15 years at a number of community colleges in Los Angeles, San Jose, Monterey, and Saratoga, California. These positions included vice-president of business services, vice-chancellor, and interim president. He

possesses a tertiary degree in Business Administration. He has been the college president since 2003.

Ms. F., the Faculty Senate president has been an English professor with the college since 2002. She worked in the K-12 school system prior to that. She holds an advanced degree in English from Stanford University. In addition to her faculty senate position, she is the English department co-chair. She was elected to the Faculty Senate presidency in December, 2006.

Ms. S. is the president of the California State Employees Association (CSEA) local at the college. She is a research analyst at the college and has served in that capacity for the last five years. She was elected to the CSEA presidency in December, 2006.

Ms. SG. is the president of the Associated Student Body (ASB) at the college. She has been a student at the college since 2002. She has also worked in part-time instructional aide positions. In her early twenties, she has served in several executive board positions in the ASB. She has served as student body president for the last two years. She has also been active in CALSAC, the statewide student government association, and the state Student Senate.

The participants were demographically three females and two males. Of the females, one was Hispanic, and the other two, white, European-American. The males were both white, European-American.

Research Questions

As formerly enumerated in the text, shared governance is a government-mandated process which involves the involvement of several constituencies in the process of policymaking. This process involves a heuristic understanding of the law, the experience developed by praxis, the factors which affect understanding and praxis, the policies developed as a result, and the policy outcomes of the encompassing process. To achieve a measure of comprehension, a qualitative case study approach was utilized to examine these issues.

Each of the four research questions are organized and addressed in numerical sequence. The case study interview questions were designed to explore each of the specific research questions. The four aforementioned research questions are addressed with interviewee responses incorporated into the text as well as field observations related to the appropriate questions. Interview data from the research interviews in Part One addressed research questions one and two. These answers are from interview

questions 1 through 9. Interview questions 1 and 2 were opener questions, involving general knowledge about the individual participants' backgrounds. Interview question 12 was a closing question which asked if there were any other issues which were not covered in the interview.

Interview questions 10 and 11 are also utilized in exploring research questions three and four in Part Two. Observation data was also included with interviewee commentary in sequentially addressing those aforementioned questions.

<div align="center">Part One</div>

<div align="center">*Research Question One*</div>

How do leaders of various constituencies which include the trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students of the college understand shared governance?

The research findings have been arranged according to common themes emerging from the data. Participants within the study are all from the leadership of their respective groups. Those interviewed are the chosen, titular leadership of each internal constituency or interest group of the college. The participants in the observations are part of the leadership involved in a consultative or policymaking role. The themes developed from the research

are process, participation, praxis, relationship, and

policymaking.

Interview Question 1 of 1 for Research Question One

What does shared governance mean to you?

The respondents provided answers to the question based

upon personal experience. The interview participants had

three common reflections upon their understanding of shared

governance. Each felt that shared governance was a process

which they characterized as participative. Participation

involved them of having a voice in what could be described

as policymaking. Implicit within their personal

observations was the notion that shared governance involved

a collaborative, power-sharing, relationship. Their

reflections also seem to be based upon praxis.

Mr. T noted that he viewed shared governance as a

collaborative process involving the interest groups within

the college. He stated that:

> Shared governance is an information and decision
> process coming from all facets of the college, not top
> down, which involves sharing information and receiving
> input from groups within the college. It does not
> involve making the final decision, but sharing
> information and ideas in a decision-making process.

The college president, Mr. A, also noted that the

process involved collaboration and participation in

creating policy.

> It's an opportunity for people within a college to be
> involved in major decisions in a college. This gives
> than opportunity to contribute information and
> experience to the process.
> All get the opportunity to participate but don't always
> get to decide what the outcome will be. This gets the
> participants to provide their perspective and offer
> suggested courses of action as well. This is part of
> employee/employer relations.

Ms. F related that she was unsure of the meaning of

shared governance. She noted that participation was an

important part of the process.

> I am not sure right now what shared governance means
> now. I thought I had a loose understanding of the
> process, the law and in acting in the process. Now
> acting in the process, I am learning it is a real
> process, but I guess not an ideal democracy. I see our
> voice being heard as part of the shared governance
> process. It is however, necessary for everyone to step
> up for their voices to be heard. This is something I
> learned as co-chair of the English department. Now I
> am discovering what shared governance means and am not
> so sure of my understanding.

Ms. S remarked that shared governance meant having an

opportunity to be heard in a collaborative policymaking

process. She noted that:

> I see shared governance as not only an opportunity to
> voice an opinion, but also an opportunity to be heard
> and have our ideas applied to policy-making. The
> process was an acknowledgement that everyone has
> something to contribute to college governance. You may
> not always get what you want, but at least you are
> listened to, heard, and given an opportunity to be part
> of the system. Shared governance is not just lip
> service. Real shared governance is here because the law
> says it has to be here.

Ms. SG, like her colleagues, felt that shared governance involved participative input for the interest groups in the college.

> To me shared governance is an opportunity for those constituent groups that would not have a voice if this system didn't have it. It has its positive and negative aspects. One of the negative aspects is that it is time consuming. It may also be manipulated. From my understanding of training in student government, it should be called participative governance.

All five interviewees referred the process as a participative process. The trustee president, Mr. T, expressed that "shared governance is an information and decision process coming from all facets of the college." Mr. A noted that "all get the opportunity to participate, but don't get to always decide what the outcome will be." Ms. F referred to "I see our voice being heard as part of the shared governance process." Ms. S stated that "You may not always get what you want, but at least you are listened to, heard, and given an opportunity to be part of the system." Ms. SG argued that "From my understanding of training in student government, it should be called participative governance."

The interviewees expressed participative process with other descriptors such as voice, democracy, sharing, and involvement in policymaking. The text would also seem to have indicated that shared governance is a limited process.

Ms. S asserted that "as an opportunity to voice an opinion." Ms. F noted that "it is not an ideal democracy." Mr. A specified that "all get the opportunity to participate but don't always get to decide what the outcome will be."

<div align="center">Research Question Two</div>

What factors influence these leaders' understanding and meaning of shared governance?

Interview Question 1 of 6 addressing Research Question Two

How did you arrive at that understanding of shared governance?

This interview question addressed the historical experience of the interviewees in the development of their understanding of shared governance. This involved observation, training, experience, reflection, and praxis on the part of the participants.

Mr. T arrived at his understanding of shared governance after his election to the board of trustees through training courses for college trustees. Prior to his election as a board member, he worked as a part time athletic instructor at the college. He reflected that part time faculty spent their time teaching.

> As a member of the part-time faculty, I never really realized the whole concept or the implications for the college. Part-time faculty didn't really share very

much in the decision-making process and spent their
time teaching.

I think I have a good understanding now. Becoming a
member of the board of trustees was crucial in gaining
a broader understanding of shared governance. The state
level trustee training is designed to familiarize new
and incumbent trustees in their duties,
responsibilities, and educational law. This helped
broaden my trustee knowledge beyond just the local
college's experience.

Mr. A responded that his understanding of shared

governance came from working at several community colleges.

He noted that as individuals have unique personalities, so

too has each college. These individual institutional

cultures, he noted, affect how the internal communities

interpret shared governance. He also stated that there was

variance from college to college where he previously worked

based upon administration and the other college

constituencies' experiences of shared governance.

I've worked in 4 regional colleges and each has their
own understanding of what shared governance means. The
situation is as a person has an individual personality,
so too has each college has their own institutional
culture which affects how the internal communities
interpret what shared governance means. There were
generic similarities between colleges. The level of
involvement depends on the school and its experience.

At M College, where I briefly worked, the
administration has been transitory in length of
employment. The faculty tends to assume a greater
decision-making role because administrators don't
typically stay very long, often just a year or so.

At W College, the administration typically made a major
decision and spent all their time trying to persuade

the faculty, staff, and students to accept it. Often
this meant a lot of anger directed at the
administration and trustees because if it.

Ms. F related that she learned about shared governance
by stepping and serving in leadership. She also noted that
she learned the guidelines of shared governance in those
meetings. She noted further that she also learned from
studying the documents from those meetings.

> I learned about shared governance by stepping up and
> serving in leadership positions. I am grateful about
> learning about the guidelines of shared governance in
> those meetings. I joined the Faculty Senate five years
> ago and observed how it worked there. I also learned
> by studying the documents that went with the meetings.

Ms. S commented that she learned about shared
governance from listening to many people on campus. She
noted they tended to share with her because of her access
to them. She also stated that in her staff position she
heard more from the faculty.

> Most of my understanding of shared governance was from
> listening to a lot of people on campus. I have access
> to most of the faculty here and they don't hold back on
> their views. I hear a lot because of my access to many
> people on campus. I heard more from the faculty than
> the staff.

Ms. SG felt that she learned from her colleagues. She
indicated "I spoke with other students who had experience
in student government". She also noted that she learned
about shared governance from a leadership class.

I spoke with other students who had experience in
student government. I also did a lot of reading on the
topic. I was skeptical about what I had heard at
student government workshops given by student
government advisers. I was pretty careful about what I
accepted from them. I also took a class, contemporary
leadership. It involved college leadership.

The interviewees in reflection also used other terms to

describe influential factors in shared governance to

include colleges having unique personality. Additional

factors included service, listening, and learning to

describe circumstances influencing their understanding of

shared governance.

Interview Question 2 of 6 for Research Question Two

What experiences brought you to that understanding?

This research question addressed what historical

experiences and praxis were formative in developing their

understanding of shared governance. The interviewees

primarily noted that the experiences which formed their

understanding involved praxis and observation of the

process.

Mr. T noted as in his response to the previous question

that:

Trustee training was the primary experience by which I
came to understand shared governance. The board has
been accused by the faculty senate of ignoring shared
governance when the decision was made to hire an
athletic director. The college president wasn't
communicating well with the faculty senate in this case

and this was the primary source of objection to the creation of the new position. Every group within the college needs to be educated in a potential policy making process. The trustee role in this process is also to assure that the administration follows through to educate these groups.

Mr. T found his understanding both in training and through experience in policymaking.

Mr. A noted that his experiences were colored by the reaction of people to the situations they face. He stated that:

My experience is based upon how people react in good and bad times. How people react in extreme situations is how I've come to understand shared governance. At the college three years ago, a five percent across the board budget cut was needed. With the college coming together, reductions were effected with a minimum of pain. There were no layoffs and people who lost their positions were redeployed to different positions within the college. The communities within the college acted together to help preserve the college and its programs. In the renovation process, the worst comes out in people. People resist moving out of their office spaces. There is a conflict between faculty desires and expectations in this renovation process. The state funding requirement obligates the reconfiguration of classroom and office space. Some of the faculty demanded involvement in the decision and wanting to make the decision all at the same time. This in effect would prevent the reform and the increased funding from happening. This appears to be a case of shared governance in conflict with another state mandate.

Ms. F felt that her experiences as a member of the Faculty Senate were crucial in forming her beliefs of shared governance. She related that:

The Faculty Senate was the main one where I learned about shared governance. I served on one of the

steering committees of the Faculty Senate. I also served as president of the board of the Santa Cruz Toddler Care Center. I learned how to run meetings there.

Ms. S reiterated her response from the previous

question which involved her experiences with coworkers. She

stated that:

My experiences were mostly with talking to the faculty and the administration, particularly while she worked on the college accreditation report for WASC. The report she helped compile involved a participative process from all parts of the college. At times the level of participation wasn't as good as it should be. When there were issues that contained real differences of opinion and there was no common ground, the differences gave way to the power structures. There are times when no consensus can be reached. There are times when a decision has to be made. Some issues can't be negotiated. The main issue is that it doesn't go that way all the time. We have the right to be a voice in the process.

Ms. SG related that her experiences were from

involvement in student government. She noted that:

One experience was definitely the creating of the Student Senate for the California Community College System. When we created the constitution and the by-laws, we had interim leadership. One student there said he felt he was being undermined by the student advisers and community college chancellor's representatives. He said he represented 3 million students and felt like he was being ignored. His comments helped me see how important one voice can be and how it can also be ignored.

Each seemed to develop an understanding through praxis

and training, as with Mr. T. The remainder learned the

process through the practical application or praxis and observation of the meeting process.

Interview Question 3 of 6 for Research Question Two

What were some of these experiences?

This question sought to discover specific incidents which made an impact on the participants' understanding of shared governance. The common consensus among the participants was that the experiences involved observation and praxis.

Mr. T related that his experience as a faculty member was part of these experiences. He stated that:

> Being a faculty member was part of this experience. I had little experience attending board meetings or seeing members of the faculty, staff or students attendance until I was a trustee. Their attendance and input are a vital part of shared governance. They not only get to see the decision-making process, but also have an opportunity to participate in the process.

Mr. A noted that the objections voiced in the current college renovations were similar to another college he worked for. He reflected that:

> The issue of renovation was similar to M College which also had renovations going on. People in such situations need to validate in their mind what the facts are in making the decision. At M College there were discussions over what the funding available for their renovation. There were issues over where money would come from to maintain the status quo. Faculty there wanted to make changes to offices, but the only place money was available was to take it away from instructional funding. They (the faculty) didn't want to do that, so their desires ran head-on into budgetary limitations and state policy requirements. In order to resolve a policy issue, the parties need to understand

the constraints, whether they be regulations, law, or budgetary. There also needs to be criteria to the solutions, and the other parties need to be free to propose solutions. It is important to include the ideas and comments of the other groups if possible. This usually makes the final solution acceptable. If administration can get a buy-in as they go along if they include comments and ideas from the other groups. It is important first to validate the facts of an issue before reaching a policy solution.

Ms. F saw Faculty Senate meetings as the place where she experienced shared governance. She related that:

I guess that the early Faculty Senate meetings were where I had these experiences. Faculty Senate meetings were much more formal than the Care Center. It was somewhat intimidating, with difficult jargon. I asked a lot of questions and through observation learned to identify terms.

Ms. S spoke of her experiences working with the college curriculum committee as her notable experience. She stated that:

Another of my experiences was working on the curriculum committee which she attended for the last five years. I saw real wrangling going on over course and course content. I feel that my view was different, as I was an observer and not a participant. This experience was one of the major reasons she took on the CSEA presidency. Few people were involved and they aren't really using their power in the shared governance process. If people aren't pleased by the circumstances, they need to take action.

Ms. SG narrated her experiences in student government to express a response to the question. She noted that:

Another example of these experiences involved a mentor of mine. He was involved in CALSAC, the community college student government association. At that time, CALSAC was engaged in the hiring process for the new

community college chancellor, Mark Drummond. Student comments and concerns in the hiring process put the students in a bad light with Drummond. When Drummond was hired by the governor, he proceeded to weaken the statewide Student Senate by separating it from CALSAC. By our questioning of the chancellor's office intentions, we hurt ourselves and lost influence. Another part of my experience is it seems to take a lot of time to get things done. Often things get held up by people who don't prepare for meetings by reading the materials. As a result, others suffer. Shared governance requires that people are engaged. Some do their part and others don't. The engaged ones don't slow the process down.

Other significant notes from these responses include both Mr. A and Ms. SG sharing specific incidents which affected their understanding. Both involved conflict between administration and another interest group constituency.

Interview Question 4 of 6 for Research Question Two

How does shared governance affect relationships at the college?

Interview question 4 sought to examine how shared governance affected the relationships among the constituencies at the college. Four interviewees viewed shared governance as having negative and positive aspects. These views seemed based upon both observation and praxis within the process.

Mr. T saw it having a positive affect on interest group relations at the college. He observed that:

Shared governance affects relationships at the college in a positive way. Every group has its own interests, issues, and topics which they want to advance. This process in itself is a good thing because it brings in potential ideas and actions to policymaking. This helps members of the college community feel that they are part of the process. Gavilan College functions well, usually because of shared governance.

Mr. A reflected that shared governance had both a positive and an adverse effect on the relationships among the constituencies. He noted that:

Shared governance both hurts and helps relationships at the college. As an administrator, A felt that part of his job is to educate the college members in issues and at times help sell them on a particular policy direction because of the need for it. As they become more aware of the issues involved, the facts, and implications, they become more convinced or sold on a new policy direction.

Ms. F said that she was unsure of how it affected relationships. She stated that:

This is something that I am just discovering. I don't know all the underlying relationship issues. I've been flying under the radar. Under the principle of shared governance, people usually just want to be heard. However, some people use it to disrupt or stall the process for their own ends. It also is a cumbersome process and people become impatient and may try to circumvent the process. There is a duality at work. People come from both ends. There are ideals at work here, wonderful ones, and it can also be torture too.

Ms. S said that shared governance affected the college in negative and positive ways. She noted that keeping the process away from personalities was crucial. She stated that:

Shared governance affects relationships at the college in both good and bad ways but that for the most part, it's generally good. The bad times are usually when someone tries to use it as a soap box to advance their agenda. Shared governance is a good way to solve problems if people can keep personalities out of the process. It works best when people avoid personal attacks and stay focused on the issues.

Ms. SG saw shared governance as a means to understanding the individuals involved in the process. She related that:

Shared governance helps those who are involved understand each other. Particularly in committee work, the dialogue humanizes the people involved. Involvement can also damage relationships if students get a bad image with a group. This in turn can affect their future relationships.

Significant comments from individual interviewees included issues which seem to involve interest group conflict over policymaking. Other specific notes include the misuse of the process by individuals or small groups to advance their interests or disrupt shared governance.

Interview Question 5 of 6 for Research Question Two

In what ways does it affect these relationships?

This question sought to discover how shared governance affects relationships among the interest groups and their leaders. Practical experience or praxis seems to be the common source of understanding.

Mr. T viewed shared governance as a means to bring the constituencies together into collaboration in the policymaking process. He stated that:

> I think shared governance affects relationships by bringing students, faculty and staff into the operating realities of the college. Student trustees and a student voice help make the college more responsive to their needs. Shared governance also helps faculty to face some of the realities of life and the college outside instruction. Shared governance also allows the needs and concerns of the faculty to be addressed as well. It's like a swinging pendulum in considering ideas between the contending groups which in turn becomes a balancing act.

Mr. A saw that shared governance can affect relationships when people take intransigent positions on issues. He related that:

> One of the major occurrences is that people take positions in decision-making in the shared governance processes that are inflexible. In moving some facilities on campus involving the theatre which required a movement of office facilities required in state funding mandates, the principals involved refused to make the required change. This is not shared governance when this occurs. Ultimately, the individuals will have no choice. By refusing to work in this process, they limit what affect or influence they may have when the move happens.

Ms. F saw both positive and negative effects of shared governance on relationships. She also noted intransigence as being a negative aspect. She said that:

> I would like to think that it has the potential to bring people together, but it can also mean a lot of tension. People use the process to stall and use passive-aggressive tactics to attack others ideas. Some people just don't participate too. They feel there is a

lack of transparency in the process. There is also some mistrust.

Ms S. like the other participants saw both positive and negative aspects to shared governance which include intransigence. She said that:

Shared governance mostly affects relationships at the college in a positive way but some issues never get resolved. Sometimes it seems that the people involved don't know how to break the cycle of impasse. It may be that the parties don't recognize that they have reached an impasse. Part of the perpetual issues is the lack of understanding of external issues. These include laws and mandates by external authorities like the state which make certain legal requirements which aren't negotiable.

Ms. SG saw shared governance in a positive light with a reasoned, collaborative flavor. She related:

Shared governance humanizes the people serving on the committees. Students come to understand faculty, students, administration, and students, as well on personal level.

The participants seemed to recognize both collaboration and intransigence as elements affecting the nature of shared governance at the college. Both Mr. A and Ms. S recognized that shared governance also exists within a realm of other legal mandates which require compliance above participative internal college processes. Ms. SG noted that the process humanizes and increases understanding among the contending interests.

Interview Question 6 of 6 for Research Question Two

What factors do you take into account in these relationships?

This interview question sought to discover the sorts of variables that might affect interest group relationships. There was a divergence among the participants on factors. All seemed to find their factors within practical experience. Mr. T and Mr. A noted factors which seemed to be collaborative and consultative. The others cited conflict over resource allocation and human, non-verbal communication as significant factors. Mr. T felt that consultation was a key ingredient. He noted:

> The process considers all groups in making leadership decisions. The decisions always make some people happy and others upset. That is par for the course. What is most important is the policy is in the best interest of students. All involved in the process have to look at how it impacts the students. The students are what the college is about.

Mr. A also noted that consultation was an important component that impacts relationships. He stated:

> I look for a general sense of the faculty and campus as a whole when looking at making a reform or change in policy. As an administrator, one needs to weigh every type of proposed change. Moving a policy change is a gradual process, with a measured effect on the group of people involved. It's better to move change gradually, using political capital carefully. An example of this was changing the college schedule to increase enrollments which ultimately affects the level of state funding the college receives. Educating the faculty and other communities in increasing afternoon and evening

offerings was a gradual process. A nearly empty campus in afternoons and evenings is under-utilized. Potential students go to other colleges where there are offering in these time slots. This ultimately affects the actual amount of FTES dollars the college receives. With most college funding based upon the FTES formula, lower enrollments affect what the college may do in terms of new programs.

The Faculty Senate president, Ms. F viewed resource allocation and personality conflict as two major effects on relationships. She related:

Resource allocation is the best issue. It all comes down to that. People get disgruntled about resource allocation and use that in the debate. Personalities also enter the issue. The temper of the people involved can make the process explosive. However, if there is a shared vision, things can go well.

CSEA president, Ms. S, saw empathy and understanding as major issues involving relationships. She said:

There are a few basic factors in the relationships. The first is empathy and understanding each others' point of view. There was an inherent conflict with each leader of each group having their own mission. These conflicts are usually over resources and money. Sometimes these conflicts involve individuals. Understanding is the key to beginning the process of sorting out conflicts between the parties. They need to look at what their mission is as leaders.

Ms. SG saw human expression as a major issue involving shared governance relationships. She felt that non-verbal communication impacts shared governance. She noted:

I take into account body language and facial expressions. You can tell if people are hiding things by the way they look or the way they say things. To me, it says more than what they actually say. I consider other issues, including the personal life they lead,

whatever they are wearing, what their children act
like, and essentially what is visible.

The interviewees seemed to have divergent views on
what they saw as factors affecting shared governance. The
leaders of the trustees and administration saw
collaboration and consultation as significant. The faculty
and staff leaders were concerned with resource allocation
and how it affected relationships. The student leader saw
interpersonal communication as having an impact on shared
governance.

<center>Part Two</center>

This section of the research findings involved both
the participant responses in individual interviews, but
integrated observations of the participants within meetings
which are part of the shared governance process. Two policy
review items were selected from the observations to
illustrate the enactment process and potential policy
results. The first item involved not actual policymaking,
but a review of policies and procedures by the Western
Association of Colleges (WASC). The second item was an
actual policy change, a position reclassification, and
proposed hiring of a vice-president of student services for
the college.

Research Question Three

How do leaders enact shared governance?

Interview question 1 of 1 for Research Question Three

What do you do in the enactment process?

The question was designed to elicit how the participants worked toward policy creation in their shared governance environment. The interviewees shared education and advocacy as the most common acts in the enactment process. The leadership of the faculty, staff, and students came to a general consensus on this aspect of enactment. The leadership of the trustees and administration saw education, communication and collaboration as the main issues.

Mr. T saw the enactment process as involving collaboration. He also reflected that decisions made require communication. He further noted that:

> As a board member, I need to act as a sponge to each group's ideas. One has to be willing to take a chance and be open to other's ideas. As a trustee leader, one needs to be professional in decision-making. There are also times when one has to have the strength to make the tough decisions. A leader needs to be open and do better than a just listening because decision by college trustees and administration is exercising their power. He stated one needs to demonstrate the willingness to listen and also show compassion. There are times when one has to make decisions that are in the best interest of all groups as well.

Mr. A noted that the enactment process involved education

of the interest groups on the importance of an issue. He

also related that this process of education varies

according to the severity of the circumstances. He stated:

> My approach is to float an issue that requires reform
> or change. This process involves a few months,
> allowing people on campus to think about and digest
> the issues. The next step is to put out more details
> which includes why create the change and what we need
> to do in the change process. This process involves
> about 6 months to a year of gradual absorption of the
> issues involved. The process involves education, step
> by step discussion of duties and policies, the taking
> into account of people's objections and their
> suggestions. If there is a crisis, then the amount of
> time will be much less. At other colleges such as M
> College it might take three years to affect the same
> type of change. Another college, like W College, might
> approach the problem differently, selling the policy
> to the communities in the college after they had been
> implemented. This also met the greatest amount of
> resistance from faculty, staff, and students.

Ms. F related that she saw enactment involving

education of her constituents, not unlike Mr. A. She stated

that her role also includes acting as a conduit to advocate

for her group to the other interest groups including the

administration and board of trustees.

> I see my role as one to disseminate knowledge as a
> department co-chair of the English department and
> faculty Senate president. I act as a liaison between
> the faculty, the board of trustees, and the
> administration. In some ways I am a conduit to the
> President's Council, which is mostly informational.
> Faculty complaints are filtered through the Senate. My
> job is to be a faculty advocate. For example, Measure E
> funding is to upgrade classroom and office facilities

space on campus. Federal funding to the college is also based upon classroom size. So classrooms and office space are being reconfigured. People are being squeezed in this process and are upset over these changes. This is about resource distribution like we discussed earlier. I have to get explanations from the board of trustees and the President's Council for the changes and relay them back. I end up being a go-between to these bodies.

The CSEA president, Ms. S, stated that she felt that enactment involved her acting as an advocate for her constituents. She also noted that she sought to create consensus.

> As a leader in the enactment process I try to let people know her philosophy. The local organization is not mine, but theirs. I am working for the members, not myself. My role is to work as a liaison between the CSEA members and the powers that be at the college. My philosophy is different than previous leadership, is to find consensus among the members and listen to their concerns.

Ms. SG viewed her efforts in enactment as which could be characterized as an advocacy effort for students. She related that this helped keep the administration attentive to their needs.

> We update students on the events or policies we are involved in. When we have revised student government bylaws and strategic planning for student government we let students know. I think through our comments and what we say in our committee meetings. That shapes the decisions we make there. We also do surveys of students to find out what they are thinking. We did that when the administration wanted to do away with the student health service fees. We were concerned for students that this was their only access to some health care. We

wrote to the administration, the faculty, and staff. I
even wrote an article in the local newspaper about.
After this, this president consults us before taking
action.

The interviewees tended to include the concepts of

education, communication, advocacy, and collaboration as

the primary elements of enactment. There was no common

agreement on any particular element, but advocacy was

shared by Ms. F, Ms. S, and Ms. SG.

<p align="center">*Observations for Question Three*</p>

Observations were made of shared governance meetings

which involved what the individual leaders do in the

enactment process. These observations covered two monthly

meetings of the College Board of Trustees, the President's

Council, the Faculty Senate, the CSEA staff union, and the

ASB Student Government. This researcher sought to find a

pattern of behavior by the interviewees. Also, a common

issue or issues were also sought in these meetings so as to

discover how they each responded to the same issue.

Two issues appeared in most of the meetings, WASC college

accreditation and the administrative reorganization. The

first item involved the reclassification of a position and

the proposed hiring of a new vice-president of student

services. This dealt with enacting a proposed policy.

This topic was not presented to the Board of Trustees at their January 9 or February 13 meetings because it is still under study by the rest of the college community. There was no opportunity for observation of that body or the board president in the enactment process.

The President's Council took up the issue at its February 14, 2007 meeting. Mr. A presented this item to the leaders and representatives of the Faculty Senate, CSEA, and ASB councils.

> Mr. A. then went on to the next agenda item, Administration Reorganization. He said that "this was going to take about two or three months to do. My recommendation is to go back to the three vice-president organization created several years ago. I want to separate Instruction from Student Services. I want to eliminate the two deans of administrative services and student services within the organizational chart. I want to make the Vice-president of Student Services permanent. SS, the current occupant of the position, is on an interim basis and has done a good job."

> He went on to say "that we don't need a new hiring process." If we do, applicants will hear that there is an inside candidate, (SS) and won't create a large enough pool to have a regular new hire.

> A went on to say that he wanted to go to the Board of Trustees in May with the proposal. No one so far has opposed the plan.

> Ms. F questioned saying "why don't we go through a full hiring process?" Mr. A responded by saying "If we have a full hiring process and SS is hired, people will say why spend the time if you already figured on appointing SS? It will also have the effect on the hiring pool if there is a strong internal candidate. We won't be able

to get a pool large enough because outsiders will hear about the strong internal candidate."

SB also said that this also makes for "an ethical dilemma" for college in the selection process. A finally said that "he would poll all the groups (in the shared governance process) on it. F said, "that it would be okay."

It appears that the administration would like to keep the current occupant in the position and is trying to convince the other groups to go along. This is the first, if what appears to be, a small question, perhaps challenge of the administration policy choices.

The college president and the faculty senate president were the most active in this exchange with the vice-president of business services in a supporting role. A and F agreed to discuss the item with the other constituent interest group members. Their exchanges seemed to involve the education of the other groups' leaders, advocacy for the administration position, and communication.

The Reorganization Item was then reviewed at the Faculty Senate meeting on February 20, 2007. Both Mr. A and Ms. F are main figures in this exchange.

Ms. F then moved the meeting on to the next item, Administrative Reorganization. F asked Mr. A, the college president to explain where this item is in terms of approval. A stated that the item would come before the President's Council before any action is taken.
A proceeded to explain the background on the item. He stated that during the budget cuts in 2003, it was decided at that time to eliminate one of three college vice-presidents and combine some of the duties within the Vice-President of Instruction and Business Services. Two deans' positions were recreated to handle

parts of the job. The deanship of enrollment management was eliminated and became a student services position. A dean of student services was recreated. SS, the current interim dean, was hired to fill that position. The board of trustees has decided they want to return to the three vice-president format.

Mr. A stated he would like to have a discussion and a decision by May because of budgetary considerations. He stated he would like to move SS, into the position without going to a nation wide search. A felt that having a full search would be difficult, especially if other candidates felt there may be an internal candidate. It would be more cost effective to not go with the search, move SS up to the position of VP of Student Services and eliminate the dean of student services position. SS has also done a very good job in the current position.

Ms. F interjected and asked how much time do we have to discuss this item? A responded that he wanted to hear back everyone's positions by May.

F stated that the senators should go back and discuss with their departments and get a sense of how members felt.

These exchanges seemed to indicate education on the issue by the administration, communication, and advocacy for the administration position for reorganization.

The same item would be covered again at the Faculty Senate meeting on March 5, 2007. Here again, the dynamics are between the college president and the faculty senate president.

F then moved on to the following item, the Administrative Reorganization Proposal. Mr. A was in attendance. F asked if he had any information that he wanted to contribute to the discussion. A said that he wanted feedback from the Faculty Senate and wanted to end the discussion in May. At that point a recommendation would be made by the President's Council to the Board of Trustees. There was no further comment.

It seems that Mr. A is following up with the Faculty Senate to educate the senate further on the issue. It also seems that he is communicating that he wants a response within a given period of time.

The Reorganization item was also brought up at the CSEA meeting on February 22, 2007. D, the union vice-president and President's Council representative sought a sense of the membership on this item.

> D also brought up the issue of administration Reorganization and the hiring of SS as student services vice-president. She wanted to know if the members had any concerns about the elimination of the dean of student services position and the moving of SS into the re-created vice-president of student services position. She asked if there were any thoughts or concerns. There was no response from the members.

Ms. S, the CSEA president, made no comment on the item. It appears that the nature of this observation involves education and the communication of facts to the members by the leadership.

The item again came up at the March 14, 2007 meeting. Here again D, the vice-president, sought a sense of how the membership viewed this reorganization.

> S moved to the first agenda item, approval of minutes. There was quick, unanimous approval. She then moved the meeting to officer reports. The room was filled with low cross talk between members which was barely audible. Ms. S continued through the items, calling upon D, the Vice-President. D functions as the CSEA

representative at the Board of Trustees meeting and the President's Council.

D brought up the issue of hiring SS as vice-president and the elimination of the dean of student services position. She asked if there were any problems with the issue. She said she had heard no negative comments on the issues. DR, a CSEA member questioned whether the student services department could function without the middle management position of dean. She felt that it could not and the lower level associates would have difficulties without a mid-level individual.

There was a great deal of give and take between D, DR, C, another member over this proposal. It seemed like good healthy disagreement which was focused on the issue, rather than personalities. There was background crosstalk among members while the three principals made their points. D finally asked members to e-mail her their concerns on the issue before tomorrow's President's Council.

The exchange seemed to indicate communication involving a genuine discussion and an argument over whether the CSEA members should support this reorganization.

The item was not discussed at the ASB student government meetings observed. Ms. SG did not bring up the topic at the two meetings observed.

The common themes of these observations seemed to indicate a process of education by the administration, the communication by administration, and the advocacy of their position among the interest groups. Most of the dialogue entailed the communication of facts and a request for a period of consideration. Some level of collaboration also

seemed to be present when both the Faculty Senate and CSEA requested input from their members to formulate a response to the administration initiative.

Research Question Four

What sort of policy results do you get in the process?

Interview Question One of One

What policies have resulted from shared governance?

This question sought to explore particular policies which were a result of shared governance and the leadership's beliefs.

No particular pattern emerged from the participants' responses. Most spoke in generalities about communication, collaboration, process, and general outcomes rather than one or more specific policy developments. Only Ms. SG spoke about a particular issue involving student health fees and successful advocacy results. The other four leaders spoke about communication and advocacy or had no specific response.

The board president, Mr. T, stated that policy outcomes cannot always be anticipated. He felt that collaboration is vital to effective shared governance. He noted that:

> Sometimes the results aren't what were anticipated in the policymaking process. The outcomes can be different. What we can do is adjust, interpret, and use what works. Shared governance at its best, works by allowing people to have input into the process rather

than making decisions from above. The imposition of decisions, or forcing decisions upon the school tend to have a low probability of success and create resentment.

Mr. A saw policy results as positive, but did not

enumerate any particular example. His focus on the question

seems to be on broad policy and collaboration rather than

specifics.

In general, the results are positive. The board of trustees tends to support his efforts as long as they see progress in policy changes. They have a general view of what they want and tend not to become involved in policy details. The board works toward achieving their broad strategic goals and meeting community needs.

Faculty Senate president F had no specific policy, but

rather like her administration colleague, spoke about her

general beliefs of advocacy. She did note some programs in

which she had interest.

I'm not sure exactly. I try to set goals as Faculty Senate President, but it is early in my one-month tenure. I see working on Student Learning Outcomes as meaningful tools in helping faculty in measuring student success. I see them as a way of improving student and faculty performance. As a member of the curriculum committee, one thing I would like to see is the integration of Student Learning Outcomes with the development of curriculum. I also have interests in using the process to develop new distance education and pedagogy. I think that faculty and administration can achieve these things by a win-win strategy and developing shared visions.

Ms. S was unsure of how to respond to the question. She

did relate that she is new to her position as president of

the CSEA. She said she was still looking to formulate goals

and objectives. These seem to indicate the themes of

advocacy and communication.

> I'm not sure how to respond to the question. I've just
> begun my term as CSEA chapter president at the college.
> I am working on the goals and objectives of the
> organization. My previous experience in this area was
> presenting ideas to the board of trustees and various
> committees on campus. At this point in her tenure,
> formulating policies and major issues are my goals for
> the organization.

Ms. SG, the student government leader noted that they

successfully advocated for students on health fees. She

said this made the administration and board of trustees

more attentive to their concerns. These themes seem to be

advocacy and communication for her group.

> We didn't quite get the result we wanted on the student
> health fee. We did notice a difference in our
> relationship with the president. He paid attention to
> us after that. So did the board of trustees. Now they
> want to know what we think. The college president made
> the decision during the summer when student government
> wasn't in session. I think this was wrongly done. The
> local paper wrote an editorial about it and put
> pressure on the college president. Now he doesn't do
> this sort of thing anymore.

Observations on Question Four

This observation on the WASC accreditation review

involved the review of college policies and procedures.

Question four involved policies which resulted from shared

governance. The observations were of the Board of Trustees,

President's Council, Faculty Senate, CSEA union, and ASB

student government meetings. The issue which emerged from
the research which best suited reviewing policies enacted
from shared governance dealt with accreditation. The WASC
accreditation is an audit of how a college operates. This
amalgam of observations covers a common theme which was
observed by the researcher in most of the meetings.

The common themes within these observations seem to
involve communication among groups and members, education
by the administration, and some elements of collaboration
by the groups involved in the education process.

Notification of the accreditation visit was presented
at the January 9, 2007 board of trustees meeting. Mr. A
made the report to the board which can be interpreted as
education. He noted:

> The college president, A, gave a report on college
> accreditation. He said "the WASC visit would take place
> March 6, 7, and 8. There would be a nine member
> accreditation team. He anticipated a good report. A
> also spoke of his attendance of an American Council of
> Educators panel discussion in Hawaii. He said "the
> conference was for several days and it was too much
> time off from work.

The board president's role in this meeting was one of
limited collaboration compared to the administration
president. Mr. T's role entailed:

> T, the trustee president, has presided over the
> meeting, seeking motions and seconds to items, but has
> not needed to exercise persuasion or argument to move

members any particular way. Decision-making seems very
collaborative, with no disagreements.

He took no action nor made any comment on the item.

WASC accreditation was again discussed at the January

24, 2007 President's Council meeting. Again, Mr. A was the

focal person in educating the members of the council.

> Mr. A went on to say that "they will want to see normal
> meetings like the President's Council. Just conduct
> your meetings as usual." He went on to say that the
> WASC committee will tell us what recommendations they
> may have for the final report. A said "that this
> usually involves 4 to 8 items. The committee won't give
> us an overall recommendation on our accreditation
> status. Previous reports from the WASC commission were
> favorable and these would be compared against the
> current one. If there are problems, they may require
> more investigation. This committee report is not
> final."

The college president's role in this agenda item was

central and dominated the meeting. He communicated the

educational facts regarding the visit. The other leaders at

the meeting, which does not include a trustee

representative there, listened passively to the

presentation.

> Mr. A seemed very relaxed and calm through his
> presentation. The rest of the group simply listened.
> He made a point of recognizing the work and
> documentation that the public information director made
> available to WASC. He said he felt she had done a good
> job in providing WASC with things they wanted.

The following meeting of the President's Council on February 14, 2007 again covered the WASC accreditation visit. Again Mr. A was the presenter of the agenda item.

> A went on to talk about the WASC accreditation process. He said that members of the President's Council would be interviewed by the visiting accreditation investigative committee. He said that "the members would be asking what this concept means for each of you. They will probably want to talk to each of you for about an hour."

> He went on to say that for the exit interview, "they won't give us exact information from their report, but they will give us a general idea of what there will be issues on. I know they are going to say something about student learning outcomes. We know to expect that."

> Most members simply made notes of his comments and said nothing during this point of the agenda.

Once again, the other interest group leadership made notes but no comments on the item of information. The nature of the communication was educational.

The Faculty Senate meeting of March 5, 2007 did not have a discussion of the accreditation, but it did have a visit from the accreditation team. Ms. F, the presiding officer, made no comment on their visit. There seemed to be a different atmosphere to the meeting.

> The meeting was held as previously in Mayock House, the faculty club. The room seems different; there is a sort of a tension in the air. There are seven observers, members of the WASC accreditation team.

F's role involved no active discussion of the purpose of

the visit.

> The meeting was called to order at 2:30 promptly. F,
> after calling order, apologized that there was no
> minutes for approval from the previous meeting. Also,
> several reports will be deferred until the April
> meeting.

> The senate members quietly viewed the agenda which F
> said was just revised to reflect certain report
> changes.

   The CSEA meeting of February 22, 2007 had no agendized

item for the WASC accreditation visit. Ms. S had no

comments on this item. The item was not on the March 14,

2007 meeting agenda either, nor was there comment from S at

that time.

   The ASB student government did not hold any

discussions of this item in its February 27, 2007 meeting

nor did their president, SG, comment upon it. The item was

agendized for the March 13, 2007 meeting. At that meeting,

Mr. A made a presentation, which seemed to be educational

in nature, to the group regarding the report.

> The meeting moved to public comments. Mr. A asked to
> address the group. He took the floor to report on the
> WASC accreditation report for the college. He noted
> that the report by the committee was very positive,
> with only three items for the college to improve on. He
> said that the good commendations outweighed the
> recommendations. He also remarked that this process
> takes place every six years, with a three year follow
> up. A' concluded by thanking the ASB and its members
> for their participation.

SG, the ASB president made no comment on the report.

The shared themes of these meetings and the WASC accreditation visit seemed to indicate the thematic patterns of education and communication of the facts regarding the visit and the important nature of accreditation.

Part Three

Part three involved the interpretation of findings of the field research at Gavilan College. The findings include the themes developed from part one of the interviews and part two which included both interviews and observations. Finally, this section considered the governance approaches as related by Baldridge (1971).

Part one addressed findings collected from interviews with the participants. The nature of these questions were to address their beliefs, perceptions, experiences and development of its understanding, and the enactment of shared governance. Part two noted the exploration of the participant interviewees' beliefs and actions during the enactment.

Part One Questions

Part one research findings revealed several themes from research questions one and two. Research question one

sought to know the interest group leadership's understanding of shared governance. It had one interview question which revealed three common themes in the analysis which included participation, process, and collaboration in policymaking. Participation meant that the groups involved had some measure of voice in decision-making. The process involved a system within which discussion took place which led to decision-making. Collaboration for interviewees seemed to mean an opportunity to work together in finding solutions. Their reflections seemed to indicate that shared governance was a collaborative, power-sharing relationship including all the interest groups within the college which did not guarantee policy outcomes favorable to all groups.

Research question two had six interview questions. These questions sought to explore how interviewees achieved their understanding of shared governance, what experiences developed their understanding, and what effect it had on the relationships at the college.

Interview question 1 of 6 sought to discover how the interviewees arrived at their understanding of shared governance. They noted that it involved a historical framework which had several themes. These themes included observation, training, experience, reflection, and praxis. These factors included observing meetings, training in

their positions, actual practice within meetings (praxis), and reflection upon these experiences. The consensus of the participants was that their beliefs of shared governance were developed by observation and praxis. Only one interviewee developed his knowledge mostly by external, specialized training.

Interview question 1 of 6 attempted to discover what experiences brought the participants to their understanding of shared governance. Once again, as in the previous question, observation and praxis (actual experience) were the common denominators for the interviewed. As before, the trustee leader was the only individual participant to have external training. As in the previous question addressed, shared governance understanding at Gavilan College is acquired by observation and actual practice.

The following interview question, 3 of 6, sought to probe what actual experiences were formative in their belief structure. As with the previous questions, observation and praxis are the main shared reflections from the interviewed. These observations and experiences included attending meetings and observing meeting procedures.

Interview question 4 of 6 involved how shared governance affects relationships at the college. The

consensus of the responses involved either observation or
praxis. These experiences were typed as positive or
negative by the respondents. Positive views included
collaboration and interest group input. Negative views
included personality clashes and obstructionism or
intransigence. It seems that the effect of shared
governance on college relationships depends on the issue or
the individuals involved.

Interview question 5 of 6 sought to explore some ways
that shared governance affects these relationships. Praxis
seemed to be the common source of understanding. The
participants seemed to recognize that collaboration and
intransigence affected relationships. Two respondents also
noted that regardless of shared governance processes,
external legal requirements can override internal issues.

The final interview question, which addressed research
question two, explored factors which affected relationships
within the college. The common understanding in this item
was praxis. Mr. T and Mr. A noted that consultation and
collaboration were significant affecters. Ms. F saw
resource allocation and personality conflict as having
major impacts on relations. Ms. S. noted that empathy and
understanding are better means to resolving conflicts over
resources. Ms. SG felt that non-verbal communication such

as body language had a great impact on shared governance issues. There seemed to be no consensus on what factors affected relationships.

<center>Part Two Questions</center>

Part two involved research questions three and four. Research question three involved shared governance enactment. Research question four sought to examine policies which were a result of the process.

Research question three was linked to interview question 10. This asked leaders what they did in the enactment process. They were also observed in shared governance meetings. The participants noted communication, collective education on issues, collaboration among themselves, and interest group advocacy as shared values in the enactment process.

The observation for this question was a policy proposal to reclassify a student services position and rehire a vice-president of student services. This would involve the hiring of the interim dean of student services for the new position. The item was processed through the President's Council, Faculty Senate, and CSEA union meetings for review during the two month study. What emerged in the process was education begun by the college president down to the other interest groups meetings. This

also included communication between the parties and advocacy by the college president for the change.

Research question four involved policy results obtained from shared governance. No consensus pattern appeared from the interviewees. They spoke in general terms about collaboration, process, and general policy outcomes. Four of the five noted that advocacy and communication are important in making policy.

The observation that surfaced from the observations of the two-month study that met a policy result requirement was that the WASC accreditation visit. The WASC study is a six-year, periodic audit of the college's policies, procedures, and educational programs.

The college president both educated on and communicated the issues regarding the WASC committee visit. He was central to this process at the Board of Trustees, President's Council, and Student Government meetings during the study. The Faculty Senate and CSEA meetings did not have action items on this.

                                Summary

It appears that Gavilan College leadership has a collective, participatory model of shared governance. The process includes communication, education, participation, and interest group advocacy among and between the five

interest groups. The study revealed that there is conflict between individuals and groups which is characterized in the extreme as obstructionism or intransigence. Collaboration and communication were perceived as positive aspects by the participants.

Does Gavilan College correspond to Baldridge's (1971) definition of a political model? He related that the model includes group involvement, cross-cultural pressures and conflict, dispersed power, and a tendency toward democratic decision-making. Competition for resources and conflict are accepted as part of the process. Based upon the interviews and observations of this study, Gavilan College is an example of a successful political model that exemplifies Baldridge's description.

Chapter V

Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Conclusions

This research study explored the understanding, meaning, enactment, and results of policies created through the shared governance process at Gavilan College. It explored these elements by interviewing the leadership of the five constituencies or interest groups on campus. These are the trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students. These groups collectively and individually are subject to external laws and regulations, not the least among them shared governance, which is also known as AB 1725.

Four major research questions were part of the exploration of these concepts. Each of the research questions was part of a process to develop themes from the interviews and observations of the participants.

Research question one asked: How do the leaders of the various constituencies which include the trustees, administration, faculty, staff, and students of the college understand shared governance? One interview question was asked of each participant leader to explore their beliefs.

Interview question 1 of 1

What does shared governance mean to you? The shared
meaning of all interviewed was that shared governance is a
limited, participative, process. They used descriptors such
as voice, democracy, sharing, and involvement. The shared
meanings seemed to come from the praxis of shared
governance.

Research question two asked the participants: What
factors influence these leaders' understanding and meaning
of shared governance? Six interview questions were utilized
to explore their beliefs.

Interview Question 1 of 6

How do you arrive at that understanding of shared
governance?

This question attempted to discover what historical
experiences formed their individual understanding of the
concept. The common themes that developed from the
interviewee responses involved developing their philosophy
of shared governance from training, observation,
participation, and praxis. Interviewees also used similar
descriptors such as service, listening, and learning as
they described their feelings.

Interview Question 2 of 6

What experiences brought you to that understanding?

This question sought to develop what practical experiences formed their understanding of shared governance. The participants related that praxis and observation were the primary means of their understanding. Only one of the participants related training as their primary means of understanding.

Interview Question 3 of 6

What were some of these experiences?

The goal of this question was to explore specific incidents which made a major impact on the interviewees understanding of shared governance. As with the proceeding interrogatory, they responded that observation of proceedings and praxis of shared governance was the common learning experience.

Interview Question 4 of 6

How does shared governance affect relationships at the college?

This question sought the impact of shared governance on relationships in the college community. The common response related that observation and praxis are the source of the participant's knowledge. They noted that positive impacts included collaboration and interest group input. Negative impacts were characterized as personality clashes, obstructionism, and intransigence.

Interview Question 5 of 6

In what ways does it affect these relationships?

This question sought specific effects upon interest group relationships. Practical experiences or praxis appeared to be the common experience. The participants noted that both collaboration and intransigence affected relationships. Two participants also noted that external factors such as the law could also have an impact on college internal relationships.

Interview Question 6 of 6

What factors do you take into account in these relationships?

This final interview question sought variables that might have an impact on college relationships. Although all participants said experience was the source of their understanding, none had a common theme. Some saw collaboration and consultation as factors. Others felt resource allocation, personality conflict, empathy, understanding, and non-verbal communication as factors.

Research question three asked: What do you do in the enactment process? The question sought participant efforts in policymaking through the shared governance process. A single interview question was utilized. In addition to an

interview question, observations of a single policy

enactment were also used.

Interview question 1 of 1

What do you do in the enactment process?

Participants noted that communication, collective

education, interest group advocacy, and collaboration among

themselves were themes in the enactment process. The

observation of a policy proposal to reclassify a student

services position seemed to indicate a process involving

the education of the college groups prior to a decision.

The process also seemed to have involved communication and

advocacy between the parties.

Research question four was: What policies resulted

from shared governance? It also had one interview question

and a common theme observation which sought to reveal what

policies resulted from the process.

Interview Question 1 of 1

What sort of policy results do you get in the process?

No single theme emerged from their responses. The

participants spoke in general terms about collaboration,

process, and policy outcomes. Most related advocacy and

communication are important in policymaking.

The single common observation that emerged in

policymaking results involved the WASC college

accreditation visit that was about to begin. The college president was the primary figure in this process. He made several educational presentations about the accreditation process to three of the five interest group meetings in the course of field research.

The results of this study indicated a collective participatory process of shared governance developed through observation and praxis. Salient factors which were found in the process included communication, education, interest group advocacy and participation among the five interest groups. Negative factors included personal conflicts, obstructionism, and intransigence within the process. Positive factors included collaboration and communication within the shared governance process.

The understanding, meaning, enactment, and resulting policies are a measure of the quality and commitment to shared governance by the interest groups and individuals of the entire college community. Additionally, these elements have a bearing upon the leadership of each of the constituent interests there. Understanding the philosophical beliefs and actions of these group leaders should shed metaphoric light upon the shared governance process because of their crucial leadership roles in policymaking.

Common perceptions among leadership may have had a significant positive impact on the nature of shared governance at the college. This research study sought to explore and discover the beliefs, the development of those beliefs from praxis, the process of enactment, and the resultant policies from the shared governance process.

The research indicated that the college leadership had similar beliefs about participation, collaboration, education, and communication in the shared governance process. They viewed the process as participatory and collaborative which was learned by observation or praxis. Participants also held positive and negative perceptions of the process. The positive views included collaboration and group input. The negative aspects were characterized as personality clashes, obstructionism, and intransigence. Resource allocation was also noted as a source of conflict.

Policy enactment themes observed and related in the interviews included communication, education, and advocacy. The findings indicate that the leadership tended to share common values which facilitate the process. Observations discovered that the college president, in particular, had a crucial role in informing the other groups about policy change and success, as in the reorganization and accreditation items. Without crucial information provided

by the college president, the participatory nature of the system could not function.

Implications

Shared governance is not a simple system to carryout at Gavilan College. There were five interest groups and five individual leaders which contributed to the complexity observed. However, the complex process which was observed at Gavilan College yielded valuable data on a well-managed process. This research data revealed several strengths which may be helpful to other colleges. The strengths indicated in the research were education both on policy materials and the shared governance practice, good communication between the groups, collaborative efforts by groups, and group advocacy. Nevertheless, the model was not free from conflict. The participants noted that there were personality conflicts, obstructionism, and intransigence. These findings are consistent with the political system model.

Baldridge (1971) noted that a political system has a democratic form of decision making. It contains formal administrative functionaries, oligarchic collectives, and interest groups contending for influence in policymaking. He stated that the political system involves the dynamics

of maneuver, conflict, and power in a pluralistic process, much like politics.

The political system at Gavilan has demonstrated most of these attributes. The strengths revealed at Gavilan College indicate that communication, collaboration, and the sharing of information in an educational process are positive components which may be utilized by college leadership elsewhere. These positive attributes could be crucial in making the process more effective at other community colleges.

Recommendations for Professional Practice

Gavilan College's participative processes appeared to be functioning effectively, with involvement in policy challenges both large and small. There are be commonly held values about shared governance which seemed to make it work very well.

The strengths demonstrated at Gavilan College provide opportunities for other institutions within higher education, including community colleges. These strengths include (a) expanding communication between interest groups within an institution, (b) working to increase collaboration in policymaking and problem solving, (c) educating each other on policy issues, (d) increasing education on the shared governance process, (e) finding

ways to make interest group advocacy a normal accepted tool of policymaking, and (f) utilizing communication, collaboration, and education to build common trust between the advocates.

<div align="center">Recommendations for Future Research</div>

Shared governance has been a fixture of the California Community College System since 1989. A range of quantitative and qualitative research has been conducted in the system.

Continuing opportunities for new qualitative as well as quantitative research in shared governance leadership formation exist and will continue to do so. Among these possibilities include: (a) studies in the area of advocacy and conflict management in the shared governance process, (b) research into what elements necessary to create collaboration and trust within a participative governance model, (c) the effect of external legal mandates upon shared governance, (d) shared governance law and the education process among interest groups, (e) interest group leadership style and its potential impact on shared governance, and (f) research on college presidential leadership and its effects on shared governance.

Final Comments

Shared governance is a complex process through which policy must navigate. It requires the input of scores of people and time taken from job performance. This, at face value for some, might be inefficient or even wasteful. There are some theorists such as Healy (1997) and Hartley (2003) who argue that democratic decision processes are chaotic. What was observed at Gavilan College was a system of governance which appeared to have the collaboration, cooperation, and open sharing of information among the five interest groups. The college leadership of all five groups seem to sincerely embrace the process of shared governance. The college president appears to be the crucial element in the process, communicating to all groups involved while trying to balance, respect, and fairly interpret the contributions of all interest groups. All the groups appear to invest in the process in a sincere manner. Trust and sincerity among the parties seem to exist as a result of his leadership philosophy and abilities.

Shared governance is not a panacea to public policy problems any more than democracy is to politics. Shared governance is a means to approach policy challenges in a rapidly changing educational environment, while utilizing the human resources of the institution. Kezar (2000) argued

that bringing greater collective resources to bear on policymaking may be more efficient because of the broader range of knowledge and experience within a unique college culture. Conflict and consensus building often do require time. However, the time and resources committed to making policy may produce better work relationships and perhaps ultimately higher productivity and morale.

To this organizational leadership student at a Jesuit university committed to social justice and a political scientist, the democratic process holds particular value. Shared governance is in essence a form of limited democracy within the workplace. It can function as an important check upon the exercise of unrestrained power by either an autocratic individual or a select, oligarchical, few. Shared governance can make the individual within the institution share in the responsibilities and accomplishments in a well-run organization. As stakeholders of the organization, the many share in the power dynamics of the institution. Shared responsibility can also facilitate recognition of the intrinsic value of the human individual, the ability of the individual to rise to leadership, the dignity of human endeavor, and the value of individual expression within ever larger and depersonalizing organizations.

This case study at Gavilan College furnished the researcher with a greater understanding of the shared governance process and its' complexities, the participant's roles, the crucial nature of leadership, and how collaboration, cooperation, and participation between people can effectively change an organization.

REFERENCES

Baldridge, J. (1971). *Academic governance.* (1st ed.).
Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co.

Bernstein, R. (1983). *Beyond objectivism and relativism: science, hermeneutics, and praxis.* (1st ed.). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brossman, S., & Roberts, M. (1973). *The California community colleges.* (1st Ed.). Palo Alto: Field Educational Publications, Inc.

California Community College League. (2003). *Participating in shared governance.* Retrieved October 9, 2003 from http://www.ccleague.org/ceos/sharedgov.asp

California community college chancellor's Office. (2006). *The consultation council.* Retrieved September 15, 2006 from http://www.cccco.edu/executive/consultation/consultation.htm

Cohen, A. (1994). *Managing community colleges.* (1st ed.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (2003). *The American community college.* (4th Ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, S. (2003). *The relationship between organizational culture and shared governance in a Northern California community college district.* (UMI No. 9315947).

Collins, L. (2002). Shared governance in the California community colleges. *Academie,* 8 (4), 36-41.

Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches.* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Eckel, P. *The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: enabler or antagonist?* (1999, November). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, Texas.

Favero, M. (2003). Faculty-administrator relationships as integral to high performing governance systems. *American Behavioral Scientist,* 47, 7, 902-922.

Gavilan Community College District. (2003). *College profile Gavilan College Catalog, 2003-2004.* Gilroy, CA: Gavilan College Information Office.

Goodman, P. (1962). *Compulsory mis-education and the community of scholars.* (1st ed.). New York: Vintage Books.

Hamilton, A., Madison, J., & Jay, J. (1961). *The federalist papers.* New York: Mentor Books.

Hartley, M. (2003). The promise and peril of parallel governance structures. *American Behavioral Scientist, 46 (7),* 923-945.

Healy, P. (1997). Leaders of California's 2-year college system say governance structure is at a breaking point. *The Chronicle of Higher Education,* 44, A33-35.

Kater, S., & Levin, J. (2005). Shared governance in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 29,* 1-23.

Kezar, A. (2000). Pluralistic leadership: Incorporating diverse voices. *The Journal of Higher Education,* 71 (6), 722-744.

Lapworth, S. (2004). Arresting decline in shared governance: towards a flexible model for academic participation. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 58, (4), 299-314.

Lucey, C., (2002). Civic Engagement, Shared Governance, and Community Colleges. *Academie* 88. (4) 27-34.

Miller, M., & Katz, M. (2007). Effective shared governance: academic governance as a win-win proposition. *The NEA 2004 Almanac of Higher Education*

Morgan, G., (1997). *Images of organization* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Morphew, C. (1999). Challenges facing shared governance within the college. *New Voices in Higher Education, 105*, Spring 1999, 71-79.

Myers, K. (2005). *Leadership Congruence within California community college.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Francisco.

Northouse, P. (2001). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Nussbaum, T.(1998). *Reforming the governance of California community colleges*. Paper presented at 20th annual Earl V. Pillias lecture in higher education. Retrieved April 4, 2007 from *http://www.cccco.edu/gen/pullias.htm.*

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ponce, G. (2001). *A case study of shared governance at Imperial Valley College.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego.

Pope, M., & Miller, M. (1999). The skills and tasks associated with faculty leadership in community college governance. *The Journal of Applied Research in the Community College,* 7 (1), 5-11.

Richardson, R. C. (1975). *Reforming College Governance.* New Directions for Community Colleges, n. 10. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schuetz, P. (1999). ERIC digest. *Shared governance in community colleges.* Retrieved November 25, 2006 from http://www.ericdigests.org/2000-2/shared.htm

Shulock, N. (2002). *California community colleges'
    leadership challenge: a view from the field.
    (*Policy Issue Report) Sacramento, CA: Institute
    for Higher Education Leadership and Policy,
    California State University, Sacramento.

Scott, J. (2002). The Critical State of Shared
    Governance. *Academie* 88. (4) 35-47

University of San Francisco. (2006). Protection of
    human subjects. Retrieved September 23, 2006 from
    http://www.usfca.edu/humansubjects/

Weber, M. (1968). *The theory of social and economic
    organizations* (5th ed.). New York: The Free Press.

White, K., (1998). Shared governance in California,
    New directions for community colleges, 102,
    Summer 1998, 19-29.

Wright-Sanders, B. (1997). *A comparison among
    perceptions of a shared governance environment by
    trustees, administrators, academic senates, and
    faculty associations.* (UMI No. 9734346).

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

Participant Interview Questions

INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

Opener Question:

1. How long have you been in college leadership?

Follow-up Question:

2. What was your background in preparing you for college leadership?

Shared Governance Questions:

3. What does shared governance mean to you?

4. How did you arrive at your understanding of shared governance?

Follow-up Questions:

5. What were the experiences which brought you to that understanding?

6. What were some of these experiences?

7. How does shared governance affect relationships at the college?

8. In what ways does it affect these relationships?

9. What factors do you take into account in these relationships?

Shared Governance Questions:

10. What do you do in the enactment process?

11. What sort of policy results to you get in the process?

Closing Question:

12. What should have I asked you that I did not ask?

APPENDIX B

Consent form for participation in a research study

UNIVERSITY OF SAN FRANCISCO

CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Purpose and Background

Mr. Matthew Escover, a graduate student in the School of Education at the University of San Francisco is doing a study on shared governance in a single community college. There has been research interest in the field of shared governance in the community college system in recent years. The purpose of the research is to develop what shared governance means to the leadership, how they developed that meaning, and how they enact it at this community college. The leadership includes trustees, administration, faculty, non-certificated staff, and students.

I am being asked to participate because I am a leader of one of the five groups within the college college. These groups are the trustees, administration, faculty, non-certificated staff and students.

Procedures

If I agree to be a participant in this study, the following will happen:

1. I will answer interview questions about shared

governance, the meaning it has for me, how I developed that meaning, how it is enacted on campus and what policies have resulted from the enactment.

2. The interviews are conducted by the researcher and will be electronically recorded. In addition, the researcher will make written notes during the interview and observation proceedings.

3. I will be asked about my career development and involvement in college leadership.

4. Interviews will be conducted in a private place which is comfortable for and agreed to by the interviewee. Observations will be made during open meetings.

5. I will also be observed in shared governance meetings during which policies may be made.

Risks and/or Discomforts

1. It is possible that some of the interview questions may make me feel uncomfortable, but I am free to decline to answer any questions I do not wish to answer or to stop participation at any time.

2. Participation in research may mean a loss of confidentiality. Study records will be kept as

confidential as is possible. No individual identities

will be used in any reports or publications resulting

from the study. Study information will be coded and

kept in locked files at all times. Only study

personnel will have access to the files.

3. Because the time required for my participation may be

up to 2 hours, I may become tired or bored.

Benefits

There will be no direct benefit to me from

participating in this study. The anticipated benefit of

this study is a better understanding of the effect of the

shared governance on community college policy-making.

Costs/Financial Considerations

There will be no financial costs to me as a result of

taking part in this study.

Payment/Reimbursement

I will not be reimbursed for my participation in this

study which involves an interview. If I decide to withdraw

from the study before I have completed participating or the

researchers decide to terminate my study participation, I

will not receive any reimbursement.

Questions

I have talked to Mr. Escover about this study and have had my questions answered. If I have further questions about the study, I may call him at (831) 636-2838 or Dr. Patricia Mitchell at (415) 422-2079.

If I have any questions or comments about participation in this study, I should first talk with the researchers. If for some reason I do not wish to do this, I may contact the IRBPHS, which is concerned with protection of volunteers in research projects. I may reach the IRBPHS office by calling (415) 422-6091 and leaving a voicemail message, by e-mailing IRBPHS@usfca.edu, or by writing to the IRBPHS, Department of Psychology, University of San Francisco, 2130 Fulton Street, San Francisco, CA 94117-1080.

Consent

I have been given a copy of the "Research Subject's Bill of Rights" and I have been given a copy of this consent form to keep.

PARTICIPATION IN RESEARCH IS VOLUNTARY. I am free to decline to be in this study, or to withdraw from it at any point. My decision as to whether or not to participate in this study will have no influence on my present or future

status as a student or employee at USF.

My signature below indicates that I agree to participate in this study.

_____

Subject's Signature

Date of Signature

_____

Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

Date of signature

APPENDIX C

Requesting Permission to Conduct Study Letter

December, 2006

Dr. Steven Kinsella

Gavilan College

5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.

Gilroy, CA 95020

RE: Permission to Conduct a Research Study

Dear Dr. Kinsella,

As a doctoral student at the University of San Francisco, I am currently in the beginning stages of my doctoral dissertation. The topic I have chosen for my dissertation research is shared governance. As shown in the attached copy of my proposal, I would like to conduct a study of shared governance at Gavilan College.

My research seeks to discover the beliefs, understanding and enactment of shared governance of the leadership of Gavilan College. The leadership I wish to interview and observe are the leaders of the trustee board, administration, faculty, non-certificated staff, and student government. I hope to develop from the research a deeper understanding of the shared governance process at work at Gavilan College. This in turn may prove useful in the future

implementation of shared governance both at Gavilan and other community colleges.

The purpose of my letter is to request permission make to Gavilan College a setting to conduct this research. Please do not hesitate to contact me regarding this request, should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Matthew Escover

Appendix D

Human Subjects Approval

December 8, 2006

Dear Mr. Escover:

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRBPHS)
at the University of San Francisco (USF) has reviewed your request for human
subjects approval regarding your study.

Your application has been approved by the committee (IRBPHS #06-087).
Please note the following:

1. Approval expires twelve (12) months from the dated noted above. At that
time, if you are still in collecting data from human subjects, you must file
a renewal application.

2. Any modifications to the research protocol or changes in instrumentation
(including wording of items) must be communicated to the IRBPHS.
Re-submission of an application may be required at that time.

3. Any adverse reactions or complications on the part of participants must
be reported (in writing) to the IRBPHS within ten (10) working days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRBPHS at (415) 422-6091.

On behalf of the IRBPHS committee, I wish you much success in your
research.

Sincerely,

Terence Patterson, EdD, ABPP
Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects
----
IRBPHS University of San Francisco
Counseling Psychology Department
Education Building - 017
2130 Fulton Street
San Francisco, CA 94117-1080
(415) 422-6091 (Message)
(415) 422-5528 (Fax)
irbphs@usfca.edu

Appendix E

Notification of Observation

January 2007

Notification of Observation

This letter is to notify your organization that you will be observed as part of research approved by Steve Kinsella, your college superintendent and under the Ralph M. Brown Act open meeting law. I am a graduate student at the University of San Francisco.

As the observer, I will be making observations of the shared governance process at your meetings over a two month period. I will be taking written notes of your meetings. No electronic recordings will be made. I may request copies of your agenda and meeting minutes.

Should you wish to read the transcript of your meetings, please feel free to ask. I will provide you at copy on your request.

Sincerely,

Matthew Escover

Appendix F

Letter of Thanks to Interviewees

Matthew Escover

1651 Cienega Rd.

Hollister, CA 95023

April 2007

Gavilan College

5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.

Gilroy, CA 95020

ATTN: (interviewee name)

Dear (interviewee name)

This letter is to extend my thanks for your cooperation during my doctoral research regarding Shared Governance at Gavilan College, a Case Study. I sincerely appreciate your responses.

Your time and reflections were a vital part of my field research on shared governance at the college. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions regarding the research.

Again, many thanks for your contribution to my research.

Sincerely,

Matthew Escover

Appendix G

Letter of Thanks to Observation Groups

Matthew Escover

1651 Cienega Rd.

Hollister, CA 95023

April , 2007

Gavilan College

5055 Santa Teresa Blvd.

Gilroy, CA 95020

ATTN: (Observation group name)

Dear (observation group leader)

    Please accept my thanks for participating in my dissertation research on "Shared Governance at Gavilan College: Case Study." I sincerely appreciate your kindness and cooperation in my observations of your organization.

    Your interactions and comments were a vital part of my field research. Should you have any questions regarding my research, please feel free to contact me.

    Again, many thanks for your contribution to my research.

Sincerely,

Matthew Escover