

**UCLA**

**UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations**

**Title**

California Community College Faculty: Perceptions Regarding Running for Academic Senate President

**Permalink**

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0n46n871>

**Author**

Clinton, Maria Elena

**Publication Date**

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
Los Angeles

California Community College Faculty:  
Perceptions Regarding Running for Academic Senate President

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

By

Maria Elena Clinton

2014



## **ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION**

California Community College Faculty:  
Perceptions Regarding Running for Academic Senate President

By

Maria Elena Clinton

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2014

Professor Robert A. Rhoads, Co-Chair

Professor Richard L. Wagoner, Co-Chair

Faculty involvement in institutional governance has come to represent the norm within higher educational institutions. Community college faculty members' role in institutional governance has not been the major focus for studies. Currently, faculty members from Liberal Arts (LAC) programs represent about 70% of the faculty in California community colleges; they also represent the largest percentage (88%) of academic senate presidents. By comparison, approximately 30% of Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty represent only 12% of the academic senate presidents in 2012. This study identified and explored the differences between LAC and CTE faculty perceptions of their values and roles regarding their involvement in the academic senate and shared governance process at their institutions. In addition, the study also

identified and explored the notable differences and similarities between LAC and CTE disciplined full-time faculty member's perceptions of incentives and disincentives regarding running for Academic Senate president.

The qualitative research design was used to interview and study Liberal Arts (LAC) and Career Technical Education (CTE) full-time tenured and tenured-track California community college faculty members at two community colleges located in one Southern California college district. The researcher discovered that the majority of the CTE participants did not feel as though the academic senate or college valued their discipline or discipline expertise. In stark contrast, the majority of LAC participants did believe that the academic senate and college valued their discipline and discipline expertise. The study identified that LAC and CTE participants share more similarities when it comes to the identification and perception of disincentives. Although LAC and CTE participants identified the same incentives, they had differing perceptions of the exact meaning or motivation behind them. More research is needed in this area of study if community colleges want to continue to have faculty from all representative disciplines participate in shared governance at their colleges. If these areas are not thoroughly explored, there will be a continued lack of participation from faculty, especially CTE faculty.

The dissertation of Maria Elena Clinton is approved.

Gregory H. Leazer

Robert A. Rhoads, Committee Co-Chair

Richard L. Wagoner, Committee Co-Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

## **DEDICATION**

*This dissertation is dedicated to my mentor, teacher and best friend*

*Master Aircraft Mechanic, Jack Ritchie Halliday,  
without whose support and guidance I would not be where I am today.*

*Forever my gratitude, appreciation and love.*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>COMMITTEE PAGE.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>DEDICATION.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....</b>	<b>viii</b>
<b>VITA.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>CHAPTER ONE.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Statement of the Problem.....</b>	<b>1</b>
Definition of Terms.....	2
Background Information on the Problem.....	3
Research Questions.....	7
Research Sites and Population.....	9
Research Design .....	10
Significance of the Research for Solving the Problem/Public Engagement .....	10
<b>CHAPTER TWO .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Review of Literature .....</b>	<b>11</b>
Shared Governance .....	11
Faculty Perceptions of Shared Governance.....	13
Transfer versus Career and Technical Education.....	17
Taxonomy: The Need to Disaggregate.....	20
Summary .....	23
<b>CHAPTER THREE .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Research Design and Data Collection Methods .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Data Collection Methods .....	30
Data Analysis Methods.....	38
Validity and Reliability .....	41
Summary .....	42
<b>CHAPTER FOUR.....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>Findings .....</b>	<b>43</b>
Campus Climates for MCC and UCC.....	44
Academic Senate Frameworks for MCC and UCC.....	46
Summary of Findings for MCC and UCC.....	48
Research Questions 1: Shared Definitions but Differing Perceptions of Effectiveness.....	49
Research Question 2: Shared Governance is Committee Service and Participation .....	57
Research Question 3: “Death! There would go my Life” .....	59
Research Question 4: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly.....	66
<b>CHAPTER FIVE .....</b>	<b>89</b>



<b>Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations.....</b>	<b>89</b>
Overview of the Study .....	89
Review of Findings for Research Questions .....	91
Overview of the Study Limitations .....	94
Implications and Discussions.....	94
Implications for Practice.....	101
Implications for Future Research .....	102
Conclusion .....	103
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>105</b>
Consent to Participate in Research .....	106
Interview Protocol.....	109
Email Document .....	111
Document Summary Form.....	112
Participant Contact Summary Form .....	113
Wagoner’s Disaggregate Taxonomy.....	114
<b>References .....</b>	<b>118</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

I arrive at this point in my life with the full knowledge that I have not done so by my will alone. Many have guided and mentored me along the way. I am extremely grateful to the individuals who have mentored, supported, and encouraged me throughout my life and through this research study. I wish to express my deepest appreciation to the following:

First, the faculty committee in the Department of Education's Educational Leadership Program, in particular, Dr. Richard Wagoner who provided me with guidance and support throughout this process and who was always there to answer my questions and listen to my concerns; Dr. Robert Rhoads, Dr. Teresa McCarty, and Dr. Gregory Leazer who encouraged me through thoughtful suggestions.

Secondly, the faculty of the Professional Development Committee and Antelope Valley College Superintendent/President Mr. Edward Knudson and Board of Trustees, without their support I would not have been granted the semester sabbatical I needed to complete my study.

Thirdly, my role models and mentors Mrs. Shouling Ma Barnes and Jack R. Halliday. Without their guidance and support I would not be the person that I am today. Ms. Barnes taught me, that no matter what people take away from you they can never take away your knowledge and education. Mr. Halliday taught me, that with perseverance, attitude, determination and support, a person can overcome any obstacle and to always remember to help others overcome theirs.

Finally, my family, whose belief in my abilities always exceeded my own, and whose love and support were always there for me. I thank all of you in particular.

My mother, who in her memory I find great strength and courage and who always encouraged me to get an education;

My father, who in his memory taught me to never give up;

My brother and sisters, Paul, Nellie, Carolyn and Elaine who have always been there for me through the worst of times. No matter what, I love you all;

My Halliday family, Jack Sr., Jack Jr., and Newell for their never-ending love and support throughout the many years, with whom I am proud and honored to call my family.

## VITA

1991	Aircraft Mechanic Certificate Federal Aviation Administration Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
1991- 2004	Instructional Assistant-Aerospace Antelope Valley College Lancaster, California
1992	Associate in Arts, Aircraft Maintenance Antelope Valley College Lancaster, California
1992-1993	Mechanic NASA Edwards AFB, California
2000	Bachelors in Vocational Education California State University, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
2000	Inspector Authorization Federal Aviation Administration Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
2002	Master in Arts, Industrial & Technical Studies California State University, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
2004- Present	Assistant Professor Antelope Valley College Lancaster, California
2004	Certified SpaceTEC Examiner Certificate SpaceTEC Cape Canaveral, Florida
2006	Composite Structures Abaris Reno, Nevada
2008	Composite Airframe Structures University of California, Los Angeles Los Angeles, California
2008	Partnership in Excellence Award California Community College Association for Occupational Education Sacramento, California
2009	Certified Aerospace Technician SpaceTEC Cape Canaveral, Florida
2009	Management and Supervisory Courses Lockheed Martin Leadership Association Palmdale, California

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **Statement of the Problem**

AB1725 (1988) and Title 5§53203 of the California Education Code directs district boards to delegate authority and responsibility to district faculty through their academic senates in the shared governance process as it relates to academic and professional matters, i.e. curriculum, degree/certificate requirements, and grading policies. Over time, institutions of higher education have become increasingly complex organizations and the issue of institutional governance has become a point of major interest and contention for campuses (Gerber, 2001; Simplicio, 2006). Higher education institutions also face many external pressures, which further complicate the process of institutional governance. In addition, tensions have been exacerbated; increasing pressures and expectations are being placed on educational institutions by the government and businesses (Jones, 2011). Therefore, one of the areas to receive significant scholarly attention over the years is faculty involvement in shared governance (Hollinger, 2001; Keeton, 1971; Miller, 1996; Mortimer & McConnell, 1978).

As faculty involvement in institutional governance has come to represent the norm within higher education (Hollinger, 2001; Jones, 2011; Miller, 1996), faculty members from four-year educational institutions have become the major focus for studies in this area. In contrast, little research has been conducted about the involvement or perceptions of community college faculty members in shared governance (Kater & Levin, 2004; Levin et al, 2006; Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008). It is important to gain a better understanding of community college faculty perceptions because participation in faculty governance is a potential critical factor in a community college's future direction (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to identify and explore incentives and/or disincentives that California Community

College liberal arts (LAC) and career and technical education (CTE) full-time tenured faculty have regarding taking on the academic senate president position at two separate public California community colleges within a single district.

### **Definition of Terms**

The terms vocational, occupational-technical, and career and technical education (CTE) are used interchangeably in discussing the mission and the faculty who teach related courses at community colleges (Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

Shared governance is the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participates in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions (American Federation of Teachers, 2006). AB1725 (1988) and Title 5§53203 of the California Education Code directs district boards to delegate authority and responsibility to district faculty through their academic senates in the shared governance process as it relates to academic and professional matters, i.e. curriculum, degree/certificate requirements, and grading policies. Even though the term “participatory” governance is beginning to be utilized more than the term, “shared” governance at community colleges because “participatory” is more descriptive of the actual process, for this study the term “shared” governance will be used because most California community colleges are more familiar with it.

The term “effective” for this research study was defined in accordance with Title 5, §53200, for which "effective participation" means that affected parties must be afforded opportunity to review and comment upon recommendations, proposals, etc.; having given due and reasonable consideration to those comments (ASCCC).

The term “value” for this research study was defined as the regard that something is held to deserve, the importance, worth, or usefulness of something, specifically shared governance.

## **Background Information on the Problem**

Approximately six million students enroll in American public community colleges each year, and approximately 2.6 million (25%) of those students are enrolled in California Community Colleges (California Community College Student Success Task Force, 2011). Across the nation, community colleges employ nearly four hundred thousand full and part-time faculty members to teach this vast number of students (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Community college faculty members serve millions of students, but “despite their large numbers and the important role community college faculty members play, relatively little is known about them,” and even less is known about community college faculty involvement in shared governance (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. vii). Therefore, this study hopes to fill this critical gap in the literature.

Miller (2002) conducted a study of 2000 participants from various institutional types and found strong faculty support for the faculty’s role in institutional governance. Subsequently, Tierney and Minor (2003) conducted a national study of 3800 individuals at 750 colleges and universities which focused on the beliefs of faculty on the importance of shared governance. They reported, “Over 80% of faculty at doctoral, masters and baccalaureate institutions believed shared governance is an important part of their institution’s values and identity” (Tierney & Minor, 2003, p. 121). Even though the faculty from these universities agreed that shared governance is an important aspect of their institution, the opinions of community college faculty members were not the primary focus of these studies.

By comparison, Kater and Levin (2004) conducted a study on shared governance in community colleges. They analyzed collective bargaining agreements at over 300 community colleges and found that the most commonly cited areas of faculty participation were grievance

(93%), curriculum (56%), faculty evaluation process (52%), sabbatical recommendations (48%), retrenchment (47%), and the college calendar (42%). The researchers also found that within 56% of the contracts that provided for faculty involvement in academic policy, the language tended to be stronger than in other governance areas in which faculty are involved (Kater & Levin, 2004). Another study that involved community colleges was conducted by Welsh, Nunez and Petrosko (2005). They found that faculty at two-year institutions in the state of Kentucky were more involved in strategic planning than faculty at four-year institutions. Although these studies touched on some community college issues, they did not examine community college faculty opinions or perceptions of shared governance.

Townsend and Twombly (2007) reported several reasons for the lack of scholarly work conducted on community college faculty. One reason given was that research designed for publication is primarily conducted by faculty at research institutions as part of their quest for tenure, promotion, and merit pay. Another is that there are several challenges in understanding community college faculty, such as the limited research on community college faculty members, the limited scope of existing published studies, and the redundancy of studying the same topic at multiple sites (Townsend & Twombly, 2008). They also add,

The orientation of existing research is limited and primarily compares community college faculty members with their counterparts at four-year institutions. Such comparisons normalize the experiences and expectations of four-year college and university faculty, resulting in unfair portrayals of community college faculty as somehow inferior (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, p. xiii).



To gain a more comprehensive understanding of community college faculty, Townsend and Twombly (2007) identified career and technical education faculty as well as shared governance as areas that needed further research.

While the normalized experiences and expectations of four-year college and university faculty members color portrayals of all community college faculty, they are particularly problematic for CTE faculty. Status differences between four- year and two-year faculty members have created a hierarchy within the post-secondary educational system, and this hierarchy is evidenced within the community colleges, as seen with LAC and CTE faculty (Grubb, 2005; Seidman, 1985). Townsend and Twombly argue that this hierarchy may be caused by CTE faculty not being viewed as bridge builders for students to four-year institutions, causing them to be ignored and devalued, “perhaps even more than community college transfer faculty” (2007, p.136).

The Statewide Academic Senate for California Community Colleges (ASCCC) does not compile data on the quantity of faculty disciplines that were past or present Academic Senate Presidents. A review of the ASCCC website’s directory (<http://www.asccc.org>) revealed that only 12% of academic senate presidents were from the CTE disciplines. In addition, using the statewide Full-time Equivalency (FTE) summary by Taxonomy of Programs codes from the California Chancellor’s office, California career and technical education community college full-time equivalent is approximately 30%, which reveals a low participation rate for these disciplines (2012). Conversely, faculty from the LAC disciplines represent 88% of academic senate presidents in California community colleges, and their statewide FTE is approximately 70%. This difference in participation percentages between LAC and CTE faculty presents many

questions, including what factors are influencing LAC faculty to participate in shared governance roles.

Digging deeper into the CTE disciplines and following Wagoner's (2004) study, if CTE disciplines are disaggregated, a new picture emerges. The CTE disciplines are comprised of three major sub categories: computing and technology, professional programs, and trades and services. As previously mentioned, 12% of the academic senate presidents come from CTE disciplines. Half of that 12% of faculty came from the computer/business technology subcategory. A quarter were from Health Science (Nursing, Childhood Development, etc.), and another quarter belonged to the professional and trades/services programs. Why is there a larger percentage (88%) of LAC faculty serving as academic senate presidents? Do faculty members in the LAC disciplines have different perceptions of their roles in shared governance when it comes to running for the academic senate president at their college than do CTE faculty?

A possible hypothesis for fewer faculty members from the CTE disciplines that serve in shared governance leadership roles may be due to the perceptions of detachment between CTE faculty and their educational institutions. Levin, Kater, and Wagoner reported that CTE part-time faculty felt more connected to their professional industries than to their educational institutions (2006). Perhaps, this perceived detachment from the institution may also be a factor for full-time CTE faculty, and may support this hypothesis. Equally important, other studies have indicated that CTE faculty perceive themselves as having a lower status within the community college than do faculty members who teach transfer-level courses (Levin et al, 2006; Shulock & Offenstein, 2012).

Another hypothesis is that community college faculty generally are considered to have a greater dedication to teaching and have less time for shared governance (Jones, 2011). Minor

(2005) found that in historically black colleges and universities, over 75% of the faculty did not see shared governance as an important part of the institution's value. These findings suggest that this is a result of faculty attitudes regarding faculty's time and commitment to students. These aforementioned elements are all possible disincentives for community college faculty concerning running for academic senate president.

Community colleges struggle to gain a respected position within the sectors of higher education. Community colleges have not reduced their effort and responsibility to serve underprepared and disenfranchised students despite the erratic changes in funding levels set by the state legislature, higher demands, and a lack of resources. As community colleges move forward into the next century, they will face unprecedented challenges reflecting the changing nature of both American and global society.

California Assembly Bill 1725 of 1988 states that the role of the academic senate is to “develop policies guidelines to strengthen the role of the academic senate with regard to the determination and administration of academic and professional standards, course approval and curricula, and other academic matters.” Community college faculty members are the heart of their institutions and need to be involved in decision-making and the shared governance process at their campuses (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). University faculty involvement in shared governance has received wide attention, yet there is a paucity of equivalent research on the community college level (Jones, 2011; Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

### **Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to address the critical gap in the research of Liberal Arts (LAC) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty's perceptions of their value, role, and function within their institution as it relates to their involvement in the academic senate.

Specifically looking at the similarities and differences between LAC and CTE disciplined full-time faculty member's perceptions regarding running for academic senate president at their institution. In addition, this study sought to identify and explore the factors that influence LAC and CTE faculty members' decision to run. If the incentives and disincentives were identified and the results disseminated, California community college academic senates would have the opportunity and information needed to address these factors and boost faculty participation.

No research has been published that identifies the major factors that affect LAC or CTE faculty members' decisions on whether to run for academic senate president at their institution. This study focused on the perceived attitudes that LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty have about their value, role and function as it relates to their involvement in the academic senate, specifically as it relates to running for academic senate president at their college. In addition, the study identified and examined the perceptions of disincentives and incentives that full-time tenured LAC and CTE faculty teaching in public California community colleges may have regarding running for the position of academic senate president at their college. The following research questions will guide the study.

1. How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?
2. What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college's academic senate at their institution?
3. How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?

4. What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members' decisions on whether they should or should not run for academic senate president at their institution?

### **Research Sites and Population**

Two California community colleges were selected from a single college district. A single district was chosen for comparison purposes because the academic senate structure would be relatively the same or very similar. The community college district was selected for the following two reasons: (a) it is considered a large public community college district by California standards; and (b) is representative of the diverse population types, such as students and faculty, in the state's system. Each college will be given a pseudonym to maintain confidentiality and hence will be referred to as Metropolitan Community College (MCC) and Urban Community College (UCC), each representing the characteristics of their location.

The culture and the working environment at each college are distinctive and dependent upon the relationships that exist among colleagues and constituencies. Although the collective bargaining agreements are district-wide, the local value and effectiveness of both the academic senate and the shared governance process may appreciably affect a faculty members' interest in running for academic senate president. The local culture and traditions present may also influence these factors.

A request for participation e-mail was sent to each college site inviting full-time tenured faculty from the LAC and CTE disciplines to participate in the study. The selection of faculty from different disciplines allows greater exploration in identifying the similarities and differences in LAC and CTE perceptions. Generally, only tenured faculty members are allowed to run for academic senate president statewide. Both tenured and tenured-track faculty members were selected to participate in the study.

## **Research Design**

The qualitative research design was the most appropriate design for this type of study because it is a “means for exploring and understanding the meaning of individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2009, p.5). In addition, this method is appropriate when working with populations that have not been the focus of quantitative research because it allows the researcher to connect with the participants in a way that is not possible through quantitative methods (Kuh & Andrea, 1991). Using this approach the researcher sought to identify the perceptions of the participants and to examine, if any, issues related to any perceived status differences (Creswell, 2009).

## **Significance of the Research for Solving the Problem/Public Engagement**

Community college faculty members are a critical part of the institutions they work for and the students they teach. Research needs to be conducted to gather informative data on the importance and function of LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty regarding participation in shared governance through academic senates in California community colleges. This data would be beneficial because LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty play such an integral role within the institution, state, and the nation (Grubb & Associates, 1999; Lumina, 2009; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). The faculty and the institution are interdependent, and faculty members are a major force within the institution (Levin et al, 2006). Data from this study can be used to identify any incentives and or disincentives that could affect LAC and CTE faculty decisions on running for academic senate president or faculty participation in shared governance at their campuses.

## **CHAPTER TWO**

### **Review of Literature**

The purpose of the study was to identify and examine any perceived incentives or disincentives that California public community college full-time tenured LAC and CTE faculty have regarding running for academic senate president at their college. To provide a framework for the study, the literature review focuses on the following areas: (a) shared governance, (b) faculty perceptions of shared governance, (c) transfer versus career technical education disciplines, (d) taxonomy, (e) and summary. The researcher would also remind the reader that the data on community college faculty, especially CTE faculty were sparse in regards to this research topic.

This dissertation relies heavily on the works of Willis Jones, Barbara Townsend, Susan Twombly, and Richard Wagoner because their work covers the vast majority of research conducted on community college faculty and shared governance as a whole. University faculty involvement in shared governance has received the majority of academic attention; however, more research was needed on community college faculty to enrich the higher education community's understanding of this complex area (Jones, 2011; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Additionally, there was a need for specific attention concerning the influence of academic disciplines on faculty governance (Jones, 2011).

#### **Shared Governance**

Faculty involvement in decision-making in community colleges is through some form of a senate or shared governance process (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Levin et al define shared governance as “the mechanism through which higher education’s major stakeholders actively participate in the decisions that affect their lives within the campus community” (2006, p. 47).

Community colleges are being asked to do more with fewer resources, while being held increasingly accountable for both organizational and academic decisions. This has led to an increased interest in understanding how decisions are made within colleges, especially shared governance decisions.

California community colleges differ from other California educational systems of higher education as well as from other community colleges across the nation. Almost all community colleges have some form of shared governance (distinct from unionization) or senates (Levin et al 2006; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). The data suggest that the faculty's role and influence may be larger and more pronounced in California community colleges. Each California community college has an academic senate that generally has representatives from all disciplines or divisions on its campus. However, there is little known about the role shared governance plays in the work lives of community college faculty or its importance or value to them (Collins, 2002; Thaxter & Graham, 1999; Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008).

While the state has mandated that California community college faculty be involved in college-shared governance, there was no consistency in the application of a shared governance process across community colleges (Wagoner, Levin & Kater, 2010; White, 1998). This affects how community college faculty perceive shared governance within their institutions and their participation. Community college faculty members have accepted an increasing role in managing the institution in lieu of resource rewards (Kater & Levin, 2005). However, this increase in duties has had effects on their work life that includes institutional service, such as participating in shared governance, chairing and serving on departmental and division committees, and also doing some administrative tasks (Levin et al, 2006; Murray, 2010; Townsend & Twombly, 2007; Wagoner et al, 2010).



This delegation of authority places faculty within the local academic senates in a unique position. There is evidence that indicates, “Institutions with strong academic senates or faculty unions have structures that support ongoing faculty participation in institutional decision-making” (Kater & Levin, 2004, p.3). In contrast, most colleges have challenges with recruiting faculty to serve on academic senate and shared governance committees, either as members of the committee and/or chair or academic senate president. During its annual conferences the ASCCC has held several breakout sessions “Recruiting Faculty to Participate in College Governance,” “Senate Recruitment and Retention,” and “Recruitment” to help colleges with this issue (2011). If shared governance is a mechanism for faculty to engage in decision-making and contributes to ownership and commitment, it is reasonable to question why more California community college faculty, especially CTE faculty, are not seizing the opportunity of having a more active role in the process (Collins, 2002; Townsend and Twombly, 2007).

Faculty members are still struggling to find stability and a professional identity within their institutions (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008; Wagoner, et al, 2010). This struggle is compounded by the tensions that are evident in the ways in which community colleges are managed and governed (Townsend & Twombly, 2007; Wagoner et al, 2010). These factors all have an effect on community college faculty perceptions regarding their working environment and whether they would choose to run for academic senate president.

### **Faculty Perceptions of Shared Governance**

Scholars engaged in research on faculty opinions about shared governance have focused on two primary areas: faculty beliefs about the importance of shared governance, and faculty opinions about their level of involvement in governance (Jones, 2011). Tierney and Minor (2003) found that 80% of faculty from doctoral, masters, and baccalaureate institutions strongly

support shared governance and agree that it is an important part of their institution's values and identity. However, this study did not specifically analyze community college faculty perceptions. Most of the research on faculty involvement is done at four-year and graduate level universities and it was assumed that the findings from these research studies would equally apply to community college faculty. From the literature, several possible faculty disincentives emerged. They were identified as a perceived increase in workload, a perception of their leadership role, insufficient or inadequate incentives or rewards, insufficient or inadequate training, and perceptions of inadequacy. With teaching being the majority of the work performed by community college faculty (Townsend & Rosser, 2007), faculty must still find time and encouragement to participate in shared governance at their institutions (Kater & Levin, 2005; Levin et al, 2006; Wagoner et al, 2010; Wagoner et al, 2010). While faculty members generally appear to view shared governance as important, 43% of faculty did not believe that faculty senates were highly valued at their institutions (Tierney & Minor, 2003). Williams, Gore, Broches, and Lotoski (1987) found that over 100 faculty members from the University of Washington did not believe there were sufficient incentives or rewards for faculty to participate in shared governance.

Wagoner et al (2010) argue that the concept of shared governance in community colleges may not have constituted advancement in joint decision-making so much as increased faculty work and responsibility. The expansion of work responsibilities and the enlargement of curricula affected faculty workload and thus participation in governance (Wagoner et al, 2010). The majority of the work that community college faculty perform is teaching, with average teaching loads around five three-hour courses per semester reported in 2004, which is different than at the university level where professors are expected to conduct research, publish in prestigious

journals, etc. (Townsend & Rosser, 2007; Townsend & Twombly 2008). Beyond working inside the classroom, faculty at many institutions also participate in institutional governance (Kater & Levin, 2005; Levin et al, 2006; Wagoner et al, 2010). Although most senate presidents do get release time, they continue to have significant teaching responsibilities.

Furthermore, anecdotal and personal experiences have led many to postulate a myriad of factors they believe are disincentives to community college faculty in considering running for community college administrative positions (Rosenthal, 2008). The same can be said for shared governance leadership roles, such as academic senate president. However, little empirical work has been done on the subject. An anecdotal example of a disincentive:

We destroy our leaders through burnout. They have no time to get trained. Faculty leaders are not identified. They are often discouraged. We have not had two candidates run for any faculty leadership position in years. Only those willing to be abused and overworked run for the positions (Partnership for Community College Leadership, 2000, p. 7).

Another possible disincentive is the perception of the role of faculty senate president. Hubble states in his aptly titled article, “Thankless but Vital: The Role of the Faculty Senate Chair,” “large portions of faculty do not see the senate as an important governance body ... but a necessary form of university service” (Hubbell, 2010, p. 147). The role of academic senate president is vital and needs to be seen as such. As Wagoner et al acknowledged, “If faculty limit themselves to just teaching only, they will miss the opportunity to provide expertise and direction to the college” (2010, p. 101).

The academic senate presidency shares some similarities with other administrative positions. Some of the challenges attributed to building administrative leadership are applicable

to the academic senate presidency. In a 2002 study, “California’s Community College’s Leadership Challenge: A View from the Field,”” Shulock examined the challenges faced by California community college leaders and how new leadership development efforts can help colleges meet those challenges. Shulock identified governance that involved AB 1725 for college administrators, and leadership recruitment and development as critical challenges. Shulock also recognized four challenges in recruiting leaders, including the reduced interest in leadership positions. Leaders traditionally come from faculty ranks, but there seems to be a shortage of faculty willing to step forward. The respondents’ cited disincentives included the perceived difficulties of the positions, contentiousness of the environment, and insufficient salary differential as compared to faculty positions. Another element from the Shulock study was the challenge of developing new leaders, a process that takes time and is more difficult in the community college environment (Shulock, 2002).

Additional research points to similar disincentives that may affect a faculty members’ decision to pursue administrative positions, such as lack of training, perceived stress levels, and lack of college-level support for release time (McCarthy, 2003; “Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community Colleges,” 2000; Shulock, 2002; Wild, Ebbers, Shelley & Gmelch, 2003). Although these disincentives are speaking directly to faculty taking on administrative positions, the same disincentives in principle could apply to faculty regarding running for academic senate president. Administrative roles tend to come with higher salaries, but at the community college level there is an insufficient salary differential as compared to faculty ranks (Shulock, 2002). Therefore, the underlying reasons for faculty not to consider taking on an administrative position may share similarities for faculty regarding running for academic senate president.

In 1995, 355 faculty from 85 California community colleges participated in a survey conducted by the California Community College Leadership Institute (CCLDI). Forty percent of the participants identified themselves as academic senate leaders. The survey results provided insight into potential incentives and disincentives regarding administrative positions. The majority of the participants indicated that they wanted more education and training for leadership than what they had received and 65% expressed a desire for training similar to that offered by the ASCCC. The participants shared a widespread notion that faculty leaders are overworked and that there was very little concrete support in terms of release time from their institutions. They also favored local leadership mentoring and programs as the best means of preparing faculty for leadership positions (Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community Colleges, 2000). Possible inducements that were identified were adequate incentives and rewards, such as sufficient release time, proper training and support from the institution, mentoring programs, and increased recognition of faculty contributions.

### **Transfer versus Career and Technical Education**

Community colleges and their faculty have had an essential role in the fabric of American education over the last hundred years. These faculty members represent a major labor force in the United States, almost one-third of all postsecondary education faculty, work at the community college level (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2006; Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008; Wagoner et al, 2010). Additionally, these faculty members' professional lives are shaped by the institution's missions, regulatory codes, and district policies (Grubb et al, 1999; Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Townsend & Twombly, 2008). CTE faculty members are usually under a considerable workload due to the programs with which they are associated. CTE faculty generally are tasked with managing their programs, which includes scheduling adjuncts,

purchasing supplies and equipment, repairing equipment, and managing advisory committees. CTE faculty members have to balance more elements, demands, and pressures than do academic transfer faculty (Grubb et al, 1999).

The original purpose of community (junior) colleges, assisting students to transfer to four-year colleges, is still dominant, and remains the highest-status purpose in most institutions. From the beginning, CTE and the traditional liberal arts education (LAC) have been in conflict, with CTE seen as lower in status because they do not matriculate to upper division institutions. Grubb et al points this out, “It is difficult to justify the existence of the community college solely by its transfer function; other purposes have become just as important, though lower in status; such as the occupational or CTE purpose”(1999, p. 5). Even though more than half of community college students enroll in CTE programs every year, CTE programs and faculty are not viewed in the same positive light as academic transfer programs and faculty (Shulock & Offenstien, 2012; Townsend & Twombly 2007; Cohen 2008). The quality of their instruction and their dedication to the institution is questioned as well (Townsend & Twombly, 2008).

In his speech, “Pathways to Prosperity: A Report from the Harvard Graduate School of Education,” US Secretary of Education Arnie Duncan acknowledged the lack of attention to Career and Technical Education, “...for far too long, CTE has been the neglected stepchild of education reform ... [and] that neglect has to stop” (2011). CTE education is viewed as a lesser or terminal form of education and there is strong evidence that supports the view that CTE faculty perceive themselves as having a similarly lower status at their institutions (Levin et al, 2006; Shulock & Offenstien, 2012; Townsend & Twombly; Wagoner, 2004). The low academic requirements of CTE faculty may exacerbate this perception. The qualifications for two-year community college faculty in vocational and career technical fields may be less than a Masters

and or baccalaureate degree when combined with work experience in the field (Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges, 2012).

Furthermore, members of community college faculty are still struggling to find stability and professional identity (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008; Wagoner, et al, 2010).

Due to the lack of sufficient data available on CTE faculty and their connection to shared governance, the researcher proposed the following hypothesis: CTE faculty members do not run for academic senate president within the California state public community colleges because they do not feel valued at their institution. This may be due to a lack of connectedness that CTE faculty have with their institutions outside of their own specific programs and their perceptions of a lower status than that of LAC faculty.

In 1985, a qualitative study of 76 community college faculty members across three states found that at least some vocational (CTE) faculty did not feel empowered at their institutions and that there was some hierarchical distinctions not only between CTE and academic transfer faculty, but also within the ranks of CTE faculty as well (Seidman, 1985). Although this divide is documented through studies of community college faculty, it is not directly addressed in literature (Grubb et al, 1999; Levin et al, 2006; Seidman, 1985; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Additional research has shown that CTE faculty report that they feel their programs and efforts are undervalued, due to inadequate provisions, disproportionate cuts to CTE programs and the general low priority of CTE education (Grubb et al, 1999; Shulock & Offenstien, 2012; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). Although dated, Seidman's 1985 findings are still applicable and have been exacerbated by the fiscal crisis. In their 2012 report, Shulock and Offenstien noted that there were status differences between transfer and occupational faculty. Transferable

education remains the highest status activity on most two-year campuses, and academic faculty members (LAC) tend to dominate faculty leadership and administrator ranks (Grubb, 2005). This perceived lower status could potentially be a disincentive that CTE faculty members do indeed perceive.

### **Taxonomy: The Need to Disaggregate**

As previously identified, community colleges have multiple missions that include academic transfer preparation, vocational-career and technical education, basic skills or developmental education, continuing education, and community service (Cohen & Brawer, 2008; Townsend & Twombly, 2007; California Educational Master Plan, 1960). Tensions between these missions have existed from the beginning of the junior college movement (Dougherty, 1994). Thus, CTE and the traditional LAC educational missions have also been in conflict. Research suggests that the division between the academic transfer and vocational training when it comes to part-time faculty stems from the competing missions of community colleges (Benjamin, 1998; Wagoner, 2004).

Another conflict in the literature regarding community college faculty is the conflict or ‘contradiction’ in the data, which is due to different types of studies. Qualitative studies tend to describe community college part-time faculty as “frustrated, demoralized, and overwhelmed” (Wagoner, 2004), while larger quantitative studies describe community college faculty as more content with their positions (Frye, 1994). Wagoner (2004) asserts that the reason for this discontinuity is that the quantitative studies were not designed to examine and explore academic values as perceived by the faculty in their analysis and therefore did not find the same level of dissatisfaction as qualitative studies. Tuckman was the first scholar to propose the use of taxonomy for part-time faculty. Tuckman’s research identified and captured the idea that part-



time faculty are a heterogeneous group with multiple motivations (as cited in Wagoner, 2004). Building on Tuckman's model, Benjamin disaggregated part-time faculty based on contradictory missions of community colleges (as cited in Wagoner, 2004). Using data from the 1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF), Benjamin divided faculty into two clusters: the liberal arts orientated cluster (LAC) and vocationally orientated clusters (VOC). The following is the breakdown of these two clusters.

The VOC is composed of the fields of professional health, nursing, occupational programs, law, business, engineering, physical sciences, and teacher education.

The LAC consists of history, English and literature, foreign languages, fine arts, sociology, philosophy and religion, biological sciences, and political sciences. In terms of the two major missions of community colleges ---the transfer function and training---the LAC can best be described as representing the transfer function, while the VOC can best be described as representing the training function (Wagoner, 2004, pg. 23-24).

Distinguishing the differences between academic transfer and vocational training is necessary for this study because of the differences uncovered surrounded the areas of qualification and satisfaction between the two clusters (Wagoner, 2004).

The competing missions between LAC and CTE have created a division that has had an effect on CTE community college faculty, involving perceptions of their working environment, and perhaps on whether they actively seek out academic leadership, which may lead to the administrative pipeline within their institutions. Wagoner (2004) utilized and expanded upon Benjamin's taxonomies. The ability to disaggregate the disciplines into clusters and categories allowed for a more detailed extraction of data related to the study. This disaggregation showed

that differences are present that represent a bifurcation between academic transfer and CTE part-time faculty (Wagoner, 2004). This divide is compounded by the fact that tensions are evident in the ways in which community colleges are managed and governed (Townsend & Twombly, 2007, 2008; Wagoner, et al, 2010).

As previously stated, the CTE full-time equivalent is approximately 30% for the state of California. Upon analyzing the data pulled from the ASCCC (2011) website, a small percentage (12%) of CTE faculty are currently academic senate presidents within the California public community college system. Wagoner's (2004) disaggregation model provides a detailed division within the disciplines. Disaggregating the data further into three categories: computing and technology, professional programs, and trades and services, the researcher found of the original 12% of CTE faculty identified as academic senate presidents, approximately half came from the computer and business technology departments, and the remainder was roughly split between the health and professional/trades & services programs. CTE faculty belonging to the computer and business technology disciplines had the higher percentage of participation. In summary, far fewer CTE faculty relative to LAC faculty serve as academic senate presidents.

Faculty tend to move through a pipeline originating from division chair to college president. There is no research available as to whether there is a marked pipeline that is either similar or different for LAC versus CTE faculty exists. However, is it possible that faculty members who have served as academic senate presidents also feed into this administrative pipeline? What are the incentives that cause academic disciplined faculty to serve in academic leadership roles and, more importantly, what are the disincentives that CTE disciplined faculty perceive which prevents them from serving?

## **Summary**

The California community college system is the largest educational system in the world, serving over 2.6 million students each year. This complex system provides an overabundance of shared governance leadership opportunities and challenges for faculty. There are multiple factors that may affect faculty decision-making when considering whether to run for shared governance leadership roles. With many leadership opportunities and positions available, why is there not an increase in the number of qualified candidates running? What keeps so many away and what motivates the few who do choose to run? Why are more faculty members not running for academic senate president, especially individuals with a CTE background?

In closing, the purpose of this study was to identify and examine any perceived incentives or disincentives that California public community college full-time tenured LAC and CTE faculty have regarding taking on shared governance leadership roles, such as academic senate president at their institutions. The conceptual framework will examine faculty perceptions of their role and their value within the institutions and how this may have an effect on their perceptions of shared governance and whether they actively seek out shared governance leadership roles. This is an important issue because, according to Cohen (2003), the success of a community college is dependent on effective leadership. Educational leaders have a tremendous impact on the field, shaping educational policy and practice.

## **CHAPTER THREE**

### **Research Design and Data Collection Methods**

Is there a difference between LAC and CTE faculty's perceptions of value within their institution and their involvement in shared governance? Faculty from the LAC programs – arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and physical and biological sciences – represent approximately 70% of the LAC faculty in California community colleges, and they represent the largest percentage (approximately 88%) of academic senate presidents. Conversely, of the approximately 30% of CTE faculty in California community colleges, only approximately 12% were academic senate presidents. Research has shown that CTE faculty sometimes view themselves as having lower status within the community college than LAC faculty members who teach transfer-level courses (Grubb et al, 1999; Levin et al, 2007; Shulock & Offenstien, 2012 Wagoner, 2004). Furthermore, there are hierarchical distinctions not only between CTE and LAC faculty, but also within the ranks of CTE faculty disciplines as well (Grubb, 1999; Levin et al, 2006; Seidman, 1985; Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

As previously mentioned in this study, there is limited empirical research data on community college faculty. Compounded by the fact there was even less available data on community college faculty opinions concerning shared governance, particularly CTE faculty opinions (Townsend & Twombly, 2007). In his literature review, "Faculty Involvement in Institutional Governance: A Literature Review," Jones (2011) recommended increased scholarly attention on how academic disciplines affect faculty governance.

Previous studies such as Kater and Levin's (2004) focused on shared governance in community colleges and analyzed collective bargaining agreements at over 300 community colleges. Additionally, in 2005, Welsh et al found that faculty at two-year institutions in

Kentucky reported more involvement in strategic planning than faculty at four-year institutions. However, even though both of these studies focused on community college faculty and shared governance, the scope of these studies was not community college faculty perceptions of shared governance within the academic senate at their college.

Due to the gap in the current research, this qualitative study identified and examined the perceptions that LAC and CTE California public community college faculty have regarding their role(s) and function(s) within their workplace, their academic senate, and the shared governance structure at their college. This study also identified several incentives and disincentives that community college faculty perceived concerning their willingness to run for academic senate president. Furthermore, this study also provided data that can be used to help inform the current practices regarding faculty participation with academic senate and senate committees at both a district and state level.

This chapter describes the qualitative design of the research, the data collection methods, and the data analysis procedures. In order to cover these areas, the following sections are included: (a) research design, (b) case study design, (c) overall design, (d) data collection methods, (e) population and sampling, (f) faculty disaggregation, (g) access, (h) documents, (i) interviews, (j) data recording procedures, (k) data analysis method,; (l) ethical issues, (m) validity and reliability, (n) and a brief summary. In addition, this study also explored LAC and CTE faculty members' opinions and experiences to gain a better understanding of their perceptions regarding whether the shared governance structure and process at their college fit their ideal value. The research was guided by following four research questions:

1. How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?
2. What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college's academic senate at their institution?
3. How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?
4. What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members' decisions on whether they should or should not run for academic senate president at their institution?

To describe the perceptions and experiences of LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty regarding taking on academic senate leadership roles, the researcher used an initial contact e-mail (appendix, p. 124) to identify interview participants (refer to the research design section for further information). Additionally, the researcher conducted document reviews followed by faculty interviews. Faculty participants were selected from two community colleges within a single college district in southern California.

### **Research Design**

This section covers what Yin (2003) defined as “a logical plan for getting from here to there, from an initial set of questions to some sort of answers or conclusions” which include possible recommendations (p. 20). Creswell's (2009) six steps for qualitative analyses and interpretations were utilized to help organize and prepare data for analysis. The steps used

included a thorough review of the data with detailed analysis and coding processes. In addition, in order to generate a description of categories and themes, the traditional coding processes were used. This helped advance descriptions and themes that were represented in the data, which ultimately aided in the final interpretation of the data.

**Qualitative design method.** The qualitative research design was the most appropriate design for this type of study because it is a “means for exploring and understanding the meaning of individuals or groups ascribe to a social or human problem” (Creswell, 2009, p. 4). In addition, a qualitative research method is appropriate when working with populations that have not been the focus of traditional research because it allows a researcher to connect with the participants in a way that is not otherwise possible through quantitative methods (Kuh & Andrea, 1991). Using this approach the researcher ascertained meaning from the perceptions of the participants and examined potential issues related to individual disinclination, as it related to the disincentives regarding running for academic senate president at their institutions (Creswell, 2009). Furthermore, the qualitative method allowed for the constructive or shared philosophical assumptions that may “change the lives of participants and the institutions in which individuals work or live,” through the identification of those disincentives that keep faculty from actively participating in the academic senate (Creswell, 2009, p.8).

The findings were inductively generated from the participants’ points of view/perceptions, which constituted the essential data for the study. This process involved multiple stages of data collection and refinement of categories of information (Charmaz, 2006; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1998) since one of the primary characteristics of good qualitative research is the constant comparison process. The researcher utilized this process between both the LAC and CTE participants, as well as between the two community college sites. This process

involved the merging of categories to maximize the similarities and the differences between the faculty disciplines and college sites (Creswell, 2009). This study identified, investigated and provided a comprehensive data analysis into the perceptions of LAC and CTE faculty regarding running for academic senate president, and their roles and function related to shared governance (Creswell, 2009). The units of analysis for this study are at two levels. The first level involved full-time tenured and tenured-track California community college LAC and CTE faculty; the second level involved two community college sites.

This study arose out of the researcher's need to study a complex social situation that involved the perceptions of LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty regarding running for academic senate president. The use of this design aided the researcher "to retain the meaningful characteristics of real-life events," (Yin, 2003, p. 2) which is necessary to explore perceptions and experiences of a specific population. Both Stake (1995) and Yin (2003) define qualitative research as the in-depth investigation of a phenomenon in its natural setting from the perspective of those who are involved in the phenomenon. Lastly, the qualitative method allowed the researcher to record the characteristics of perceptions, values, and influences of the participants that were meaningful to them.

**Overall design.** For the purposes of this study, two colleges were purposefully selected from one college district in Southern California out of 76 California community college districts. This community college district was selected for the following reasons: (1) it is a large public community college district, (2) it was representative of the demographic distribution in the state's college system, (3) it represented a large number of LAC and CTE faculty employees, (4) one of its colleges focused on LAC disciplines and programs, and (5) one of its colleges had a large concentration of CTE disciplines and programs. In addition, the sites selected for the study



were based on their classification as two-year, public associate's granting institutions in California by the Chancellor's Office. The researcher conducted preliminary research utilizing each of the college's websites along with data gathered from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office (CCCCO), a public-access databank to identify and select these two campuses according to the aforementioned criteria. These two community colleges also preliminarily agreed to participate in the research study.

Conversely, the two community colleges that were initially approached declined the offer to participate in the study. This was problematic, as the researcher had to identify two alternate colleges from that district that would be willing to participate. This put limitations on the study. The researcher, after a considerable amount of time, was able to gain access to two other colleges within that district, on the contingency that the researcher would provide the college administration with a summary of the findings for their institution. The researcher would like to emphasize that it was difficult to obtain permission from the two colleges for the study. Later, it was discovered that the two previously identified colleges had developed some internal problems. One college was having some issues between the academic senate and the administration and the other college had just gone through some heated hurdles concerning academic and technical discipline representation.

The participating colleges were given the pseudonyms Metropolitan Community College (MCC) and Urban Community College (UCC). The pseudonyms also reflect the characteristics and the location of the colleges. The researcher chose these college designations firstly because they easily distinguish one college from another in terms of coding, and secondly, because the sites chosen closely mirror these designations.

Site #1- MCC was founded in the 1960s, and has established itself as an educational and cultural hub within the district and surrounding communities. It has an active student population of nearly 12,000 regular and extension students, over 100 full-time faculty members, 46% of whom are CTE and more than 300 part time faculty that create an educational environment unique in Southern California. MCC awards more than 600 degrees and certificates in almost 40 different fields, Associate Degrees in over 40 subjects, nearly 20 certificates of completion, and almost 30 transfer associate degrees. The campus is governed through collegiate consultation and shared governance agreements as well as by educational codes and standards. MCC is accredited by the ACCJC and WASC.

Site #2- UCC was founded in the 1940s. It is a comprehensive college with almost 100 disciplines being taught to more than 21,000 students each semester. It has almost 200 full-time tenured faculty members, 33% of whom are CTE faculty. It is recognized as one of the top transfer schools in California having alliances with UCLA, UC Berkeley, UC Davis, Cal State Northridge, CalTech and most other California universities. It offers courses in almost 100 subject fields with almost 200 majors, over 40 AA and AS degrees, and dozens of certificates. The campus is governed through collegiate consultation and shared governance agreements as well as by educational codes and standards. UCC is accredited by the ACCJC and WASC.

### **Data Collection Methods**

**Population and sampling– community college faculty.** The participants were chosen based on their willingness to participate in the research study. Generally, only tenured faculty members are allowed to run for academic senate president at their college, statewide. Since community college faculty are generally granted tenure by a Tenure Review Committee after their third or fourth year of teaching, only those faculty that had been granted tenure were going

to be selected to participate in the study. However, due to the low numbers of participants from MCC the researcher then included tenured-track faculty in the study. As a result, tenured-track faculty participants were also included at UCC as well.

Originally only full-time tenured track faculty were targeted to interview for the study. This was problematic for both campuses because the majority of full-time faculty declined to participate in the study. Since tenure-track faculty are not part-time or adjunct, they are essentially full-time employees of the college. The chair of the dissertation committee allowed this addition. Therefore, full-time and tenured-track faculty from both the LAC and CTE disciplines were interviewed. The expected number and/or range of participants was ten to fifteen participants per site. However, only six community college faculty (tenured and tenured-track) at site #1 (MMC) volunteered to participate. Twelve community college faculty (tenured and tenured-track) agreed to participate from site #2 (UCC). Additionally, an iPad mini was offered as an incentive to encourage faculty to participate in the study.

Another limitation to the study concerned the total number of interview participants, particularly the low number of participants from MCC. The researcher would like to point out that several attempts were made to gather more interview participants at this college. The researcher sent out two e-mail requests and did not receive any response from faculty at MCC. Ultimately, the researcher visited the campus daily for two consecutive weeks hoping to catch faculty during their office hours to schedule interviews. The researcher attempted to have equal representation from both LAC and CTE disciplines. The majority of full-time faculty at MCC declined to participate in the study. After obtaining only five participants at this college, the researcher sent out one last e-mail request to specific faculty who were identified by the five

participants, and was able to secure one more interview a couple of weeks later at this research site. In total, it took the researcher six weeks to obtain six interviews.

After experiencing issues with MCC, the researcher was more proactive with UCC. After the initial e-mail was sent out mid-week to all full-time faculty, the researcher waited until the following Monday and began visiting the campus from 9am to 6pm every day, except Friday, for two consecutive weeks. In addition, the researcher contacted the academic senate president and requested information on potential leads on faculty who they thought would be interested in participating. After one week, a second e-mail was sent and the researcher received responses from faculty. Because it was nearing the end of the semester and finals week was only a couple of weeks away, and faculty were already indicating that they would not have time to participate, the researcher ended the data collection after a little more than three weeks of recruiting. In total, it took the researcher three weeks to obtain twelve interviews at the UCC. It should be noted that the researcher was still attempting to get interviews from MCC during this time as well.

This study did not seek gender balance in its participants, because some CTE programs are traditionally gendered. The technical careers tend to be male-dominated while nursing is female-dominated. Overall, there were two males and four females interviewed at MCC, and six males and six females interviewed from UCC. In total, eight males and ten females were interviewed for the study. Additionally, the researcher was not able to acquire equal numbers of faculty from each of the seven disciplinary categories. Arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and physical and biological sciences are the three categories that are generally considered part of academic (LAC) or transfer curriculum. The categories of computing and technology, professional programs, trades and services, and low status professionals are generally considered vocational or training programs (CTE) (Wagoner, 2004). For complete

details about the specific fields included in each group, see appendix 127. The study was limited by the number of faculty that volunteered for each category of the study at each research site.

**Faculty disaggregation.** As explained in Chapter 2, the researcher disaggregated two-year faculty disciplines into seven categories identified by Wagoner (2004) based on the LAC and CTE disciplines. After analyzing the data, it became apparent that the findings could not be disaggregated because there would be a lack of richness in data. The faculty participation numbers were not sufficient for this level of analysis. While the disaggregation method used for this study is based in part by the work of Wagoner (2004), the researcher utilized this method to capture and compare the perceptions between LAC and CTE disciplines. General literature on higher education faculty indicates that there are differences between these categories, such as transfer verses training tensions in community colleges (Wagoner, 2004).

Finally, each community college and discipline was treated as separate and unique, but the data collected was treated as a window of opportunity to reveal LAC and CTE tenured and tenured track faculty perceptions regarding running for academic senate president. This allowed for a rich description and analysis of each community college as well as between the LAC and CTE disciplines.

**Access.** As previously mentioned the researcher did not gain access to the originally identified colleges and had to seek alternate research sites. The researcher was finally given access to conduct research and contact faculty at two institutions. The researcher formally contacted each college and followed that institution's protocol for conducting research at their institution. At one institution, this process involved several weeks. As a result, the process limited the timeframe in which the researcher could conduct the interviews. After several weeks, the researcher received formal approval from each campus to conduct the research study on the

condition that at the end of the study the researcher provide each college with a separate report on the findings for their college. Confidentiality of the participants was ensured for both campuses.

**Documents.** As is typical in qualitative research, an examination of relevant documents and public records was reviewed before conducting interviews (Yin, 2003). Therefore, the necessary college and academic senate document data were gathered and analyzed before the faculty interviewing process began. The documents obtained and reviewed were related to each campus' academic senate and general college information, such as: (a) academic senate operating procedures; (b) faculty handbooks; (c) college catalogs; (d) college directories; (e) correspondence regarding professional opportunities; (f) and statewide academic senate publications (Creswell, 2009).

These documents provided information concerning details not directly observable, such as the academic senate's operating policies and procedures, which comprised academic faculty leader recruitment and requirements, committee make-up, academic senate president role, duties and responsibilities. In addition, the academic senate presidents identified faculty whom the researcher contacted to request their participation through e-mail. All of the documents were public documents, which enabled the researcher to obtain the specific nomenclature and language used by each campus; they were accessible online and unobtrusive sources of information.

The researcher reviewed and created summary forms for each document type for the two college sites. A document summary form accompanied documents reviewed and only those that were identified as pertinent to the study were utilized (Miles & Huberman, 1994). An example of this form can be found in the appendix (appendix, p. 118). In addition, all interview transcripts

(electronic and paper), documents, and thumb drives were kept in a locked file cabinet and the computer used was password protected.

**Interviews.** Both Creswell (2009) and Merriam (2009) recommended the use of interviews for situations that preclude an observer's presence for events that occurred in the past and for uncovering a participant's thoughts, feelings, and intentions. Given these factors, a qualitative design incorporating interviews was most appropriate. While surveys can be helpful in acquiring a broad range of responses from a large number of participants, a qualitative research design was the appropriate design for this study because the study was specifically interested in the experiences and diverse nature of perceptions between LAC and CTE faculty.

Before conducting any interviews, the researcher developed an interview protocol (appendix, p. 122). A pilot interview protocol was created and tested at a site that was not related to this study. After the pilot testing phase was concluded, the feedback solicited from the pilot testing allowed adjustments to be made to the instrument, which honed in the focus of the information that was desired (Gall, Gall & Borg, 2007). Only after the interview protocol was pilot tested and revised and a new interview protocol developed was it utilized in the study. This interview protocol was not altered for each site. After careful review of the college documentation, nomenclature and academic senate processes, it was determined that the colleges were so closely related that there was no need to alter or customize the interview protocol for each site.

The interviews were conducted on-site at each of the two colleges. The interview locations were mostly in the participants' office, conference room, or other areas where the participant felt safe and comfortable. The researcher took notes and observed verbal and non-verbal communication, such as facial expressions, vocal tone, and body language of participants.

As a faculty member at a community college, the researcher was easily able to develop a rapport with the interviewees. This allowed for greater access to the richness of the participants' experiences and perceptions (Merriam, 2009). The researcher observed this rapport because faculty participants at MCC hesitated to accept the invitation to participate in the study until the researcher's status as active community college faculty was verified.

Individual face-to-face interviews were approximately 40-50 minutes in length. This followed preliminary reviews of institutional documents. Interviews were audio recorded utilizing a Livescribe pen and a back-up digital recorder. The researcher used open-ended interview questions to ask participants about their perceptions surrounding the issues of academic leadership, shared governance, and their values and roles. Transcripts were analyzed using the participant contact summary form. In addition, a spreadsheet was created as a housing document that helped with the development of initial descriptive themes/codes. An example of the participant contact summary form can be found in the appendix (appendix, p. 126). The information gathered through these steps allowed the researcher time to follow-up on questions or concerns from the interviews. Staying consistent with Creswell (2009) design, a detailed analysis with coding process was included with the participant contact summary form, which facilitated the traditional coding process by hand to generate descriptions of the participants, categories or themes for analysis. In addition, this summary form also added to the description and themes represented in the qualitative narrative (Creswell, 2009).

The participants were provided with the University of California, Los Angeles – Consent to Participate in Research form (appendix, p. 119). The researcher asked participants to read and sign the consent form before interviewing. Each participant read and signed the consent form before each interview was conducted. In addition, each participant was asked for permission



before digitally recording the interview; participants were informed about the purpose of the recordings, to capture the participants' responses in a more accurate manner, and each participant gave consent. Throughout the data collection process, the identity of the interviewees was protected, and none of the participants were coerced into participation unwillingly or to the detriment of their careers, to the knowledge of the researcher. The community colleges and participants were given pseudonyms to protect their confidentiality. As previously mentioned, a secured filing system was used to house the research data.

**Data recording procedures.** Two recording devices were used – a small digital recorder and a Livescribe pen. They were used to capture the verbal portions of the interviews and to ensure the quality of the recording. Detailed notes were also taken on the interview protocol form to record the non-verbal reactions during the interviews, as participants often revealed more than just words through facial expressions and body language (Creswell, 2009; Merriam, 2009). For example, some participants became uncomfortable with some of the questions and this would show in their body language. While other participants had strong and impassioned opinions and would often express that physically, such as bringing their hand down on the desk or table, after certain statements. Therefore, the researcher uncovered more information from the participant with follow-up questions, where observed body language indicated there was more information to be gained.

The researcher carefully noted the participants' key words and gestures during the interview process. In addition, note taking also aided the researcher in recalling the events, when transcribing. All recordings were transcribed by the researcher and were held to the strictest confidentiality standards. The recordings, thumb drives, and transcripts were housed in a safe location in a locked filing cabinet off campus, and the computer used was password protected.

## **Data Analysis Methods**

Using Wagoner's (2004) research, the researcher utilized a similar analytical framework to look at faculty perceptions regarding running for academic senate president. While Wagoner's framework utilized variables from Valadez and Antony's (2001) research that focused on satisfaction using five particular variables: overall satisfaction, job security, advancement opportunities, salary, and benefits, (2004), the researcher used a similar framework that focused on perceptions of incentives and disincentives regarding running for academic senate president. Similarly, the researcher looked at how community college faculty perceptions were based on several factors, including those that are discipline specific, such as perceptions of status, and faculty roles in governance, such as running for academic senate president (Levin et al, 2007).

Based on the purpose and research methods of the study, the researcher compared perceptions of incentives and disincentives between LAC and CTE participants and college sites. By constantly comparing themes within the same sets, the incentive and disincentive categories were determined (Creswell, 2009; Merriman, 2005). This was particularly important for emerging categories regarding perceptions of incentives or disincentives, and roles of community college LAC and CTE faculty. The unit of analysis for this study was the perceptions that community college LAC and CTE faculty have about their roles within the community colleges, and whether they would choose to run for academic senate president.

After reviewing the literature, the researcher identified a few potential preliminary codes concerning faculty perceptions that involved incentives and disincentives regarding running for academic senate president. These preliminary codes were workload and time commitment, sufficient and insufficient monetary incentives, advancement opportunities or professional

growth, and training/mentoring programs/pathways. The majority of these preliminary codes were seen in the literature.

The interview protocol separated the interview questions into sections; each section addressed one or two main research questions and encompassed or led into the next research question. After transcribing the interviews, the researcher reviewed them in conjunction with the participant summary form, notating any significant preliminary codes. The preliminary codes were housed with each research question that it addressed. This organizational process provided the researcher with a consistent location for information, which made it more readily accessible for analyzing.

**Analysis –documents.** According to Miles and Huberman (1994), research documents are generally lengthy and need to be clarified and summarized. The researcher must be able to identify the significance of the documents as they relate to the study. It is for this reason that the researcher created the document summary form to aid with the analysis of the documents from each site. This form was attached to each document that was reviewed. The form provided a brief overview of the documents, as well as a reference aid that supported the analysis of the findings. The main criteria for analyzing the site documents was to identify each site's governance structure, as it relates to academic senates, and the terminology used by each college regarding shared governance.

**Analysis –Interviews.** Miles and Huberman recommend interweaving data collection and analysis from the start; analyzing the data simultaneously is critical in order for the researcher to stay focused, to keep the volume of data manageable, and to look for questions or concerns that could be addressed while still in the data collection process (1994). The researcher reviewed the participant summary forms and some of the detailed notes while in the collection

process to help in addressing areas that may need to be altered. The researcher made note of some of the areas where the researcher could insert a probing question, or make more of an effort to pay attention to body language and facial expressions. After the interviews were completed, then came the analysis of the data, and the creation codes for assigning meaning to the descriptive or inferential information being compiled (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These codes were located on the participant contact summary form and the electronic spreadsheet, as well as the hard copies of the transcripts.

After conducting an extensive literature review at the beginning of the study, the researcher identified potential descriptive major category codes such as, “INCN” incentives and “DIS” for disincentives. However, in an effort to stay close to utilizing an aspect of grounded theory and letting the data speak for itself, the researcher did not create any other categories or sub themes before analyzing the transcripts. The researcher utilized a conceptual framework and research questions, in conjunction with the interview transcripts, to create a provisional start list of codes. These provisional codes were utilized at the beginning of the transcript and document analysis. Throughout the process descriptive codes merged under larger descriptive codes, and sometimes new descriptive codes emerged from the data being reviewed. The descriptive codes provided subsequent descriptive codes, which pulled together the mass amount of data the study generated (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Some codes changed and morphed as the research proceeded while others did not work and needed to be removed. The researcher was mindful of the importance of structure and the keeping of descriptive codes aligned with the conceptual framework and research questions. The researcher relied on the research questions to drive the analysis. In addition, the themes were provided with definitions from the interview data provided by the participants.

After the analysis of the data and themes, each site was analyzed separately and then compared. In this process, there are two levels of analysis -- the analysis of the LAC and CTE faculty within a site and the analysis of LAC and CTE faculty from the two sites.

**Ethical Issues.** Participating in this study may have required faculty to take some risk in regards to their personal feelings and opinions. Expectations needed to be clarified to ensure that the participants understood that their confidentiality would be maintained. Making expectations clear with college administrators and assuring faculty confidentiality helped support some participants as they moved out of their comfort zones to answer some of the research questions.

The researcher's role is particularly important to consider in qualitative research since they serve as the primary data collector and interpreter. The researcher can bring both insight and bias to the study (Creswell, 2009). Personal bias was a concern because the researcher is a full-time tenured CTE faculty member at a community college and has opinions on the research topic. However, the researcher's knowledge about community college faculty, particularly CTE faculty, proved helpful in designing the research instruments utilized and in establishing a trusting relationship with faculty participants.

The researcher also realized that these biases unintentionally influenced how data were collected, analyzed, and presented. Since the focus of this study is the perceptions that LAC and CTE faculty had regarding running for academic president, the credibility of this study rests with the responses provided by the interview participants and the researcher's ability to accurately code the data with little or no bias.

### **Validity and Reliability**

The credibility of any research is dependent on the assumptions of the researcher, research methods, and instruments used to collect the data and on how the data is analyzed,

interpreted, and presented. Thus, it is essential to implement appropriate safeguards to ensure that the reader can trust the authenticity of the research.

To validate the accuracy of the findings, the participants were asked to review the transcript of their interview to ensure accuracy, as recommended by Yin (2003). In addition, the use of multiple methods of data collection allowed triangulation of the findings and conclusions as a validation (Merriam, 2009; Yin, 2003). Each of the participants was able to review their interview and make corrections and additional notes wherever necessary. The participants had one week to review their transcript and provide feedback, corrections or additions.

In order to ensure the credibility of the study, the researcher closely monitored her own bias when working with professional colleagues. The researcher has worked in the community college system for over twenty years and has collaborated with many faculty members who may be participating in the study. The researcher had attended several state-level conferences and worked with many faculty members regarding CTE programs and industry related developments. In order to minimize bias, the researcher tried to remain impartial and only ask the interview questions and subsequent probing questions.

## **Summary**

The purpose of this study was to identify and explore any similarities or differences that LAC and CTE full-time tenured community college faculty perceived regarding running for academic senate president at their institution. This included any perceived incentives or disincentives that LAC and CTE participants had. This chapter described the qualitative case study methods that were used to collect and examine the interview and document data that addressed the study's purposes and research questions.

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **Findings**

This study investigated the difference between Liberal Arts (LAC) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty's perceptions of their value, role and function as it relates to their involvement in the academic senate. Specifically, looking at CTE disciplined full-time faculty member's perceptions of running for Academic Senate president at their institution. Faculty from the CTE disciplines make up 12% of the faculty that are academic senate presidents in 112 California community colleges, according to the data pulled from ASCCC website (2011). When comparing this percentage with the statewide full-time equivalency (FTE) summary by taxonomy of programs (TOP) codes from the California Chancellor's office, the CTE community college full-time equivalent in California is approximately 30% (2012), indicating that there should be a higher participation percentage from the CTE disciplines based on proportionality.

Moreover, this study identified and explored the incentives and disincentives that affect LAC and CTE faculty members' decision on whether to run for the position of academic senate president at their college. According to Jones (2011), there is a critical gap in research concerning the influence of academic disciplines on faculty governance. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to add to the research by identifying and examining what matters most to CTE faculty, framed by the following research questions:

1. How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?

2. What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college's academic senate at their institution?
3. How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?
4. What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members' decisions on whether they should or should not run for academic senate president at their institution?

To answer these questions, the researcher examined the perceptions of CTE and LAC faculty regarding running for Academic Senate president at two California community colleges within the Inner-City Community College District (pseudonym).

The findings in this chapter begin with a description of both colleges and their academic senate's purpose, eligibility, election criteria and responsibilities for the senate president, as gleaned from faculty interviews and a review of academic senate and college documents. Following the description of the college's Academic Senate's purpose and requirements, qualitative research findings are broken down into the findings and summaries for each of the four questions.

Again, the researcher reminds the reader that there were limitations to the study that encompassed both the research sites and the participants. These limitations were covered in detail in chapter three. (For further information, please refer to that chapter.)

### **Campus Climates for MCC and UCC**

Due the 2008 fiscal crisis that hit the state and the nation and the subsequent underfunding of California community colleges, most if not all colleges budgets were impacted.



Colleges were forced to reduce or eliminate services in order to operate within these restrictions. Like most colleges in the state, Metropolitan Community College (MCC) has had to weather the storm. According to the participants, the fiscal crisis coupled by a new and inexperienced academic senate president and officers made it possible for some administrators to utilize the academic senate as a tool of the administration versus its true purpose of being the voice for the faculty. This created a culture of distrust and apathy by the faculty. Metropolitan Community College faculty recently elected a new academic senate president and officers and interestingly, quite a few are from the CTE disciplines. Although faculty members espoused an ongoing distrust of the college's administration, they did express hopefulness in the new leadership. They are hopeful that the current academic senates' leaders will ensure faculty members have a voice within the decision-making process on campus.

Likewise, Urban Community College (UCC) was also struggling with financial cutbacks. Moreover, similar to MCC, the faculty had issues with its previous academic senate leadership. Faculty felt that the academic senate president was more of a tool for the administration than a voice for faculty concerning academic matters. Faculty participants described the previous academic senate as ineffective, partly due to the failure of the previous college president in following the shared governance process. Although the effectiveness of the academic senate was questioned, it was still seen as effective by UCC's academic senate and the majority of the faculty participants.

Eighteen faculty participants interviewed for the study. At MCC, six full-time tenured and tenured-track faculty members (Brad, Barbara, Gail, Lori, Mandy and Charles) were interviewed for this study. Half of the interviewees were from the LAC disciplines (Brad, Barbara and Gail) and half were from the CTE disciplines (Lori, Mandy, and Charles) with

varying years of experience. At UCC, twelve full-time faculty members were interviewed. Half of the interviewees were from the LAC disciplines (Frank, Helen, Paul, Matt, Pam and Wayne), and the other half were from the CTE (Nancy, Tim, Anna, Violet, Rachel and Scott) were interviewed. They represented both tenured and tenured-track faculty that also comprised half of the interviewees from the LAC disciplines and half from the CTE disciplines with varying years of experience. The CTE and LAC faculty responses were disaggregated using Wagoner's model (appendix 127). In addition, the researcher reviewed the academic senate documentation and college website to gauge senate design and structure for both campuses.

### **Academic Senate Frameworks for MCC and UCC**

Metropolitan Community College's academic senate, like most senates, is the representative body for the faculty consisting primarily of elected representatives. It is the official voice of the faculty in matters of campus-wide concern, which include the primary concerns of representing the faculty in all academic and professional matters and seeking to support the mission, vision, and values of the college. It provides the means for faculty to participate in the decision-making, shared governance process at the college. Likewise, the academic senate at UCC is the official voice of the faculty on academic and professional matters. Its mission is to cultivate a collegial and supportive community of educators and is the recommending body on academic and professional matters.

In addition, both senates are responsible for developing and recommending faculty hiring policies and procedures, including position prioritization and selection procedures for adjunct and probationary faculty. Both academic senates maintain several standing committees comprised of representatives in all major campus committees and play a central role in the governance and planning, including program review, accreditation, and budget allocation

processes. The membership includes department chairs and elected faculty representatives from each of the academic departments, including the library and counseling departments.

To run for academic senate president at MCC, a faculty member must be a tenured dues-paying faculty member. The nomination process is open for five consecutive college days for which the nominees are notified of their nominations and have five days to notify the senate of their willingness to be a candidate. The names of all candidates are distributed to all faculty members for a minimum of five days prior to election. Voting is held for five consecutive college days by secret ballot; only faculty (full and part-time) who have paid dues are eligible to vote. A majority of votes is necessary for election to office. Likewise, UCC's officers and the committee members are elected by the membership of the union association that is held in the spring term. Officers must be elected by a majority vote. If no candidate receives a majority, a runoff election will be held between the two candidates who received the highest number of votes in the first round on the ballot.

The duties of the MCC academic senate president are as follows: (a) serve as presiding officer of all meetings of the senate and executive committee, (b) serve as chairman of the executive committee, (c) serve as district senator, (d) serve as ex officio member of all committees, (e) serve on an advisory committee, (f) appoint all standing and ad-hoc committee members when the membership of the committee is fewer than stated in the bylaws, (g) approve disbursement of all funds, (h) call meetings of the executive committee, senate, and faculty, (i) prepare agendas for the meetings, (j) perform other duties as authorized by the senate, and (k) report to the senate and faculty on district senate business. Very similarly, the duties of the academic senate president at UCC are as follows: (a) serve as presiding officer of all meetings, (b) serve as president of the academic senate and preside at all of its meetings (several meetings

are listed here), (c) serve as chairman of the executive committee, (d) serve as ex officio member of the foundation, and (e) perform such other duties, incident to the office, as may be required by the academic senate.

### **Summary of Findings for MCC and UCC**

As previously mentioned, the purpose of this study was to address a critical gap in the research by identifying and exploring the difference between Liberal Arts (LAC) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty's perceptions of their value, role, and function within their institution as it relates to their involvement in the academic senate. Specifically looking at CTE disciplined full-time faculty member's perceptions of running for Academic Senate president at their institution. This study was to identify and explore the incentives and disincentives that affect LAC and CTE faculty members' decision on whether to run for the position of academic senate president at their college.

There were marked similarities between the college campuses, which belong to the same college district. Therefore, the academic senate structures, process, and membership requirements were very similar, if not the same. In addition, both colleges had recently elected a new academic senate president and executive committee (officers). Furthermore, participants at both campuses reported the faculty had recently struggled with, from their perspective, ineffective academic senates prior to the latest elections. This struggle was especially reported by the participants from MCC. Participants from both colleges reported that this type of struggle was mostly due to poor leadership at both the senate and administration levels. Faculty participants at both campuses represented their previous academic senate leadership as inexperienced, unknowledgeable, and incapable of confronting administration concerning the areas of following process and policies. Faculty participants at both colleges felt that

administration “called all the shots” and that the academic senate president was a compliant tool of the administration, specifically the college president and/or vice president of academic affairs.

Conversely, the marked difference between the two college sites was the fact that CTE faculty participants at MCC were more involved in the academic senate than those at UCC. In addition, faculty at MCC appeared to show disdain for the administration, which was also reported by one participant from UCC. One participant from MCC shared that there was a sense of hostility towards administration and apathy toward shared governance and the senate from the faculty. (Refer to chapter three for detailed information about each campus.)

### **Research Question 1: Shared Definitions but Differing Perceptions of Effectiveness**

How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?

*Metropolitan community college.* Both the CTE and LAC faculty participants at MCC shared a very similar understanding and definition of shared governance, describing its meaning as “the faculty have a voice in the shared decision-making” process at their campus. Mandy’s (CTE) remarks were typical and express the viewpoint of many LAC and CTE participants,

...faculty have a voice in running the institution, in helping to chart the course in the institution, and that the administration will listen to what we have to say and actually consider it in a real way.

However, one marked difference between the LAC and CTE faculty was that CTE faculty included that shared decision-making is also “the understanding that it’s not meant to go all one person’s way, it’s meant to have a dialogue.” They acknowledged that shared governance was not a one-sided decision-making process.

The researcher found that the LAC and CTE participants equally valued the shared governance process. Participants described its value in terms of “democracy,” which brings together all “parties,” and as a result helped to ensure focus remained on the goals and missions of the college. This focus in turn helped prevent the “parties from going in different directions” that are separate from the college’s mission and goals. Even though the participants agreed that shared governance had value, they expressed concerns about its overall effectiveness at their college. Five participants from MCC questioned the value that their administration placed on both the academic senate and shared governance process at their college. The reason that participants questioned the value of the senate was because the previous academic senate president and officers were inexperienced and were unable to oppose administration when the shared governance process was not being followed, according to the participants. Faculty participants also identified instances when the academic senate was used as a means to get faculty to go along with whatever decision the administration wanted to make. This can be seen in Lori’s (CTE) statement, “We had a senate, but it really was whatever the administration said,” then she went on to say that, the senate’s leadership role was to “come and pursue all faculty to [get them to] agree with whatever the administration said.” As a result, she felt like the faculty had “lost [their] voice as a faculty unit.” She made it sound as if the primary role of the academic senate was to hunt down faculty who opposed an issue or decision and attempt to persuade them otherwise for the administration.

Another concern CTE participants from MCC had in particular was the lack of knowledge and understanding among senior administrators of the academic senate’s role within the shared governance process. CTE participants identified the effectiveness of the shared governance process and the academic senate as tied directly to leadership, specifically the

academic senate president and the senior administrator. As one CTE participant noted, “It depends on who’s leading us.”

When it came to the question of the effectiveness of the academic senate, the participants at MCC identified ineffectiveness of the academic senate as linked to leadership. Similar to Lori (CTE) comments, Brad (LAC) also identified instances where administration ignored faculty input. He said that there have been times “when certain parts of the administration have sort of overrun the senate,” which in turn undermined its effectiveness. According to Charles (CTE), “I think administration doesn’t make efforts to address the concerns raised by the academic senate. They may listen, but decisions are still being made.” Some faculty participants struggled with determining how effective the academic senate was, especially if they felt their voice was just part of the process, and not seriously taken into account. Both the CTE and LAC faculty participants’ view of the academic senate’s effectiveness was determined if faculty perceived that administration was supportive of the academic senate’s role within the shared governance process. In addition, an academic senate whose leadership lacks experience and knowledge only adds more limitations to its effectiveness, according to the participants.

Despite all of the aforementioned challenges, overall CTE and LAC faculty participants’ from MCC responses ultimately indicated that they perceived that their current academic senate leadership had improved the effectiveness of their senate. It has accomplished this by ensuring “faculty voice” by following the proper policies and procedures using the Statewide Academic Senate’s model. Even though both the CTE and LAC participants did not perceive that the college or administration actually promoted shared governance or the academic senate, other than the contractual committee requirement, this appeared not to affect their perceptions of the effectiveness of the existing academic senate or its current leadership. Even though the academic

senate was “limited” by financial setbacks and had unknowledgeable administrators at times, it was essentially “pretty effective,” and according to faculty participants, “the only form of shared governance at the college.”

The researcher found faculty participants from both the CTE and LAC disciplines at MCC shared the same perceptions and opinions regarding shared governance, its value to them, and the effectiveness of the academic senate at their college. The researcher was also surprised to find that CTE participants at MCC were more involved in the academic senate and shared governance committees than the LAC faculty participants. Many had held previous roles as chairs of committees and departments. Nonetheless, there were no notable differences in the perceptions and or opinions between LAC and CTE faculty participants at this college regarding the belief that their current academic senates were essentially effective at their campus. Eight participants from both colleges identified the effectiveness of the academic senate and the shared governance process as directly linked to faculty and administrative leadership.

***Urban community college.*** Similarly, all twelve faculty participants at UCC described shared governance as a collaborative process where all constituent groups have a voice and share in the decision-making on campus. Nancy’s (CTE) remarks are a representation of the participants, “Everyone gets a chance...to have a say, a voice in what happens on campus...everybody gets to put their two-cents in.” There was an alternate definition given by Matt (LAC) who defined shared governance using ACCJC’s terminology, “The faculty should be running the academic, those aspects of the institution.” However, he stressed, “It doesn’t mean the faculty should run everything.” This comment was very similar to comments made by the CTE faculty at UCC.



All twelve participants identified the value of shared governance “ideally” was having a “faculty voice” in the decision-making process. Tim’s (CTE) comments were typical for this question saying, “I feel that I have a say.” He also felt that he did “affect the decision making process” on campus. In addition, LAC participants added that shared governance “empowers” and provides faculty with a form of “protection.” This provides a legal structure regulated by AB1725 and District/Board policies to ensure faculty participation in the decision-making process. Moreover, he added shared governance provided a platform for “transparency” of processes and decisions, which helped achieve some level of “consensus” for effective decision making.

Although participants at UCC stated that shared governance had value “ideally,” they were concerned that in reality this was not always the case. Anna’s (CTE) response mirrors that sentiment, “sometimes you’re not listened to very well.” The researcher observed that faculty participants, who perceived that they were not being heard or taken seriously, shared opinions about their disappointment and disillusionment with the process, as well as with the administration. This disappointment and disillusionment was true for both LAC and CTE participants from both colleges, which can be gleaned from Pam’s (LAC) response. She called shared governance a “pipedream” that was “not a reality” at her campus. In stark contrast from the faculty participants who identified that they valued shared governance, Tina (CTE) stated that shared governance “[did not] have a lot of value” to her. Tina (CTE) saw shared governance as a cumbersome bureaucratic process that not only slowed down progress, but also at times even prevented it. Her response was in direct opposition with the other seventeen participants from both colleges. It should be noted that prior to teaching at a community college Tina (CTE) worked in private industry and was accustomed to management-dictated changes and timelines.

Perhaps because CTE faculty members come from the private sector this could be a problematic disincentive because they are used to a different style of management, which for the most part is a top-down structure, according to one CTE participant.

As previously mentioned, participants from UCC similarly defined shared governance as having a “faculty voice” in the decision-making process on campus. However, some of faculty participants also expressed concerns about the effectiveness of this process at their college. The researcher found that some of the participants (two CTE and one LAC) identified certain “negative side effects” with this process. These side effects included the bureaucratic nature of “slowing down” processes and implementing change. Several participants identified levels of frustration with this particular negative side effect, even to the point that it was one of the determining disincentives preventing a particular participant from considering running for academic senate president. Moreover, LAC faculty participant called the shared governance process at her college a “joke,” because she felt it was a very “top-down” structure at the district level, which in turn transferred it to the college level. Her perception was that shared governance did not exist at her college.

The researcher also found that some of the faculty at UCC and MCC questioned the value that administration placed on the academic senate and shared governance. Consequently, according to the participants the effectiveness of shared governance can be tied to the value that it holds by all its stakeholders, specifically administration and the Board of Trustees. Five of the LAC faculty participants at UCC described their academic senate as effective. On the other hand, there were varying opinions from the CTE participants at this campus. A possible factor for the varying opinions could be because the CTE participants were not as heavily involved with the academic senate as the LAC participants.

One of the concerns, similar to the MCC participants, was that participants from UCC perceived that the effectiveness of the academic senate varied and was dependent on the leadership. Participants from both colleges stated that the effectiveness of the senate was dependent on whether administration valued the academic senate's role in the shared governance process. Participants from both colleges viewed the academic senate's effectiveness as directly related to leadership. An interesting response came from UCC participant Matt (LAC). He described the academic senate as being "almost too effective" because of the college's high turnover in senior administrators, specifically the college's presidents. A connection can be made between Matt's perception and Wayne's previous comment about the shared governance process as "empowering" and providing a form of "protection" for faculty. Shared governance provided protection from an administration that discounted their input, as well as empowering faculty with the ability to remove uncooperative administrators. In addition, the participant Matt (LAC) implied that shared governance could also be viewed as a process or mechanism that could allow faculty to be forceful with their opinions and or recommendations.

Interestingly, some faculty participants at UCC described the senate as having a "bloated sense of self-importance." One participant felt that some faculty on the academic senate "probably [think] they are very effective because they get to argue and try to stop things at times." This factor can be tied to the power to influence incentive, described in detail in the incentives and disincentive section.

In spite of all the aforementioned challenges and factors, the entire LAC faculty interviewed at UCC perceived that their academic senate was in fact effective. Only two CTE faculty participants actually stated that the academic senate was "effective," the responses from the remaining CTE faculty, with the exception of one, also pointed towards the college having an

effective academic senate. Both the CTE and LAC faculty participants did not see that the college or administration actually promoted shared governance or the academic senate, other than the contractual committee requirement, according to them. The fact that administration did not promote the senate did not appear to have an effect on their perception of the effectiveness of the existing academic senate or its current leadership, this finding was similar to the LAC and CTE participants at MCC. Overall, nine of the faculty at UCC viewed their current academic senate as effective at their college.

In conclusion, California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty from both research sites share similar definitions and understanding regarding the shared governance process at their institutions. Faculty participants from both colleges describe shared governance as having a “faculty voice” in the decision-making process, which is basically the American Federation of Teachers’ (2006, p. 4) definition (“the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions”) that was previously mentioned in chapter one. Moreover, seventeen participants from both research sites supported and valued shared governances, underscoring Tierney and Minor’s (2003) study, which found that most faculty from universities strongly supported shared governance. This is an important comparison because it illustrates a similarity between community college faculty and faculty from four-year institutions.

The researcher found there were no marked differences between the CTE and LAC faculty participants or between each of the colleges. Faculty participants from both community colleges all indicated that their current academic senate was effective within the shared governance process at their colleges. In addition, they both attributed this effectiveness to the effectiveness of the current academic senate leadership. They stressed that the effectiveness of an

academic senate is dependent upon the effectiveness of its leaders. The experience and knowledge of the academic senate president and officers, and also the experience and knowledge of the administrators and their respect for the role that the academic senate has within the shared governance process at their college, are all seen as direct links to the effectiveness of the senate and shared governance, by the participants.

## **Research Question 2: Shared Governance is Committee Service and Participation**

How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?

*Metropolitan community college.* All faculty interviewed at MCC were either chair of a department, or chaired and/or served on a shared governance committee, and/or were a past academic senate president or on the senate or senate subcommittee, which is to say that most of them speak from credible experience within the shared governance process. Both the CTE and LAC participants defined their roles and function in shared governance by describing their various roles and duties within their committees explaining how they communicate committee information with the rest of the campus, and serving as the voice for their departments and faculty. The faculty participants' typical responses were "the responsibility to show up" for meetings and have an "informed voice" because with "rights come responsibilities." Brad's (LAC) statement essentially outlined that process,

As department chair, I take concerns from the faculty to my department, to all the committees, and also to the academic senate in general, and vice versa. I take concerns from those committee meetings and bring [those concerns] back to the faculty. So I think that's my primary role [in shared governance].

*Urban community college.* Similar to the findings at MCC, all of the faculty participants at UCC were also serving on at least one academic senate and or shared governance committee. Even the tenured-track faculty participants were serving on at least two committees, which included both the CTE and LAC disciplines. Hence, all of the faculty participants interviewed were serving on more than the basic contractual one-committee obligation at their campus. Likewise, they too speak from credible experience within the shared governance process. A representative response can be seen from Helen's (LAC) statement, "I'm a member of those committees...those [committees] are doing the work on behalf of the senate, so what I do...being present and voting." Three LAC faculty participants at UCC were currently chairing a senate or shared governance committee and one is a department chair. Only one CTE faculty participant is the chair of a committee.

Conversely, CTE faculty participants at MCC were either chair of a department, or chair of a senate or shared governance committee. Only one LAC participant was a chair of a committee/department. An interesting discovery at MCC was two CTE faculty indicated that they may consider running for academic senate president, due to their concerns about the college as a whole, their program and students.

The researcher uncovered additional information not exactly related to the research questions, but pertinent to the overall scope of the study. Participants from both colleges who served as chairs of senate and or shared governance committees identified their role at the college in terms of their administrative duties regarding the committee(s) they were chairing. After listing their administrative duties, they would then include their instruction or instructor duties. Some participants focused solely on their role as a committee chair. In other words, they strongly identified with their administrative duties and function, more so than non-chairing

participants did. These individuals also expressed more of an interest and desire to run for academic senate president.

In closing, the researcher found no marked differences between the CTE and LAC faculty participants from each of the two colleges concerning their perceptions of their role and engagement in the senate and shared governance process. Faculty participants from both colleges defined their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate, by their membership/service on academic senate and shared governance committees, and nothing further beyond their participation on these committees. The work they performed in these committees, such as “attend meetings” and “reporting” committee work was their purpose and function when it came to their engagement in the academic senate regarding shared governance.

### **Research Question 3: “Death! There would go my Life”**

What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college’s academic senate, such as running for academic senate president, at their institution?

The researcher would like to mention that there were very lengthy pauses, long deep breaths, and even laughter before faculty would make statements such as, “I would never do that!” or “I definitely would not be interested in doing that.” Moreover, the faculty participants appeared somewhat uncomfortable, as expressed by their deep breaths, pounding their fist on the table, and nervous laughter. Some of the participants asked the researcher again to reassure them that the information they were providing was completely confidential.

***Metropolitan community college.*** Faculty participants from MCC who had or were currently serving as chair(s) of academic senate or shared governance committees had a higher level of interest in running for academic senate president. This interest could indicate that

personal beliefs and perspectives may be one of the strongest links to a faculty member's willingness to serve. The CTE participants had chaired more committees than the LAC participants. One of the CTE faculty was a previous academic senate president. The other two participants both stated that they would consider running for academic senate president at their college in the future. On the other hand, Lori (CTE) who has chaired more than two committees and is a department chair, responded that she would "never consider" it. This participant considered the role to be very "challenging" because of the "inconsistencies" in the processes and "poor communication" that occurs on the part of faculty and administration. These challenges along with the expectation that you are going to "fix everything" she stated,

It becomes an expectation that you're just going to fix everything, and even though it may have taken ten years for things to get into the condition, the shape that's it's in, the expectation is that you're going to fix it, like in your first month (laughter) of the term.

She went on to add that she would not want to put herself through such frustration and unrealistic expectations and could not understand why somebody else would. For her, she did not have any willingness or desire to run; it simply was not an option, which brings up the question: Why would anybody want to run?

One of the CTE participants who was previously an academic senate president at MCC identified a sense of "personal responsibility" to the college and the students as the main motivating factor for running for the academic senate president position. This person felt that it was a moral obligation to ensure that faculty and the college supported the students and the community. In the past, this participant has had to step in into leadership (chair) positions



because processes were not being followed or ignored, which affected faculty input and representation.

Brad (LAC) a department chair identified and described an alternate motivation or incentive. He stated,

I guess if I had really strong faculty support. Like if dozens of faculty came to me and said look, we want you to do it, we need you to do it, we trust that you can do it, and we support you.

An individual's sense of responsibility to their colleagues and students and/or support and encouragement from faculty may have an effect on faculty member's perceptions regarding running for academic senate president.

In comparison, the perceptions of taking on the role of academic senate president were different for CTE and LAC faculty participants at MCC. For the CTE participants, it was due to their own inner sense of "personal responsibility" to the faculty, their discipline/program, students, and college. For LAC participants it was based on the support and need from the faculty. When it comes to decision-making, faculty participants can be influenced by either internal or external pressures or forces.

The perceptions of not running for academic senate president from both the CTE and LAC participants at MCC were based on the following factors. It was considered "too much work for the grief," described as a heavy workload that required a huge time commitment. In addition, the inconsistencies of college policies, procedures, and poor communication between faculty and administration were other contributing factors. Moreover, participants also cited "messy politics, lack of knowledge, insufficient release time and unrealistic expectations on the part of both the faculty and administration" as other factors or reasons for why they would not

run for the senate president position. CTE and LAC participant shared only one disincentive, which was the workload. CTE participants identified the heavy workload, huge time commitment, insufficient release time, inconsistencies in policies and procedures, poor communication, and unrealistic expectations as disincentives. LAC participants identified the heavy workload disincentive as well, but they also identified and indicated that it was a position that had to deal with “messy politics,” and that a faculty member would have to be well informed about the senate and shared governance processes.

***Urban community college.*** Similar to MCC, faculty participants at UCC who had or were currently serving as chair(s) of academic senate or shared governance committees had a higher level of interest in running for academic senate president. An analysis of the responses received revealed robust levels of participation of faculty members serving on at least one academic senate and/or shared governance committee; even the tenured-track faculty participants were serving on at least two committees, which included both the CTE and LAC disciplines. In addition, the analysis of responses also revealed that the LAC faculty participants had chaired more committees than faculty from the CTE disciplines and indeed, they were more willing to run for academic senate president. Again, the experience of chairing committees could indicate that personal beliefs and perspectives may be one of the strongest links to a faculty member’s willingness to serve.

When faculty participants at UCC were asked, “What are your perceptions of taking on the senate president leadership role here at your college?” there was the immediate laughter from most faculty participants, followed by subsequent refusals. Interestingly, some faculty were surprised with the question at first, seeking clarification on whether the question was referring to them personally, or generally referring to anyone else. Immediately, five of the six CTE faculty

participants stated that they would not be interested in running for academic senate president. When the researcher asked them to describe why they felt this way, there were various factors and disincentives given by the participants. These reasons included the position being “too political,” which was similar to the perception of MCC participants, or taking them “out of the classroom.” Nancy’s (CTE) response was especially intriguing. She expressed the following sentiment “as in personally! ...Death. There would go my life. You know my perception would be pain and misery.” Nancy (CTE) found the role way too political, having to “dance between people,” as well as the fact that shared governances had no value to her. She was very disappointed in the whole process. Three LAC participants stressed that they were not interested, stating similar factors identified by the CTE participants, as well as from faculty participants from MCC. Responses like, “no, absolutely not,” “It’s not for me,” and “I just don’t see it.” They identified the role as having to attend “too many meetings,” along with an “overwhelming workload,” which required a huge time commitment, on the part of the faculty member. In addition, the shared governance process lacked a proper set of systems and procedures, which would be needed for timely and effective action on agenda items.

Nevertheless, one CTE participant at UCC said she might possibly consider it. Anna (CTE) said, “I suppose, if the timing came up and it was the right thing to do at that time.” However, she was worried about the time commitment because her CTE program required a demanding time commitment in addition to her teaching workload. Half of the LAC participants at UCC indicated that there was a possibility they would run for academic senate president, as well. All three indicated that timing was the issue. Wayne (LAC) was “on the fence” and had concerns about the timing of the next election and worried that it would interfere with his current college commitments. Likewise, Matt (LAC) expressed that he “may at some point” wish to run

for senate president, but wanted to wait for a turnaround in faculty membership on the senate before pursuing that position. He felt that with the current senate committee membership he would not be able to be effective in that role. Frank (LAC) who has been an academic senate president in the past also said that he would, perhaps one day, run again for senate president, if the timing were right and he was needed. With the possible exception of one, the CTE participants at UCC expressed no interest in running for academic senate president at their college. In comparison, half of the LAC faculty participants at UCC articulated that there was a possibility provided the timing was right. In general, the LAC faculty participants at UCC were more likely to run for academic senate president than CTE faculty participants are at UCC.

When the researcher compared the responses from both college campuses, participants from MCC and UCC who had or were currently serving as chair(s) of academic senate or shared governance committees, expressed a higher level of interest in running for academic senate president. The CTE faculty participants who had chaired more committees than the LAC faculty participants were more willing to run for academic senate president at MCC. Similarly, faculty participants from UCC who had or were currently serving as chair(s) of academic senate or shared governance committees, also expressed a higher level of interest in running for academic senate president. Again, a faculty members experience and interest in committee work could indicate that personal beliefs and perceptions of connectedness with an institution may be one of the strongest links to a faculty member's willingness to serve.

The researcher found no marked differences between these colleges concerning the level of interest related to the chairing of committees and their subsequent interest in running for academic senate president between the LAC and CTE faculty participants that has chaired committees/departments. Moreover, it appears that because more LAC participants had chaired

more committees they were more interested in running for academic senate president at UCC. Similarly, the CTE participants who chaired committees were more interested in running for academic senate president at MCC, as well.

When faculty participants were asked why they would or would not consider running for academic senate president, they provided several incentives and disincentives. Faculty participants from the LAC disciplines at MCC cited faculty support as an incentive to running for academic senate president. Faculty participants from the LAC disciplines at UCC cited a sense of responsibility/service, professional growth, and timing as incentives to run for academic senate president. In comparison, faculty participants from the CTE disciplines at MCC cited a sense of responsibility/service mentality as an incentive to running for academic senate president. Similarly, faculty participants from the CTE disciplines at UCC cited personal fulfillment and timing as their incentives to running for academic senate president.

Faculty participants from the LAC disciplines at MCC cited workload and responsibilities along with being too political a position as disincentives to running for academic senate president. Although faculty participants from the LAC disciplines at UCC also cited a heavy workload and responsibilities, they also identified the bureaucratic dysfunction as disincentives to running for academic senate president. Faculty participants from the CTE disciplines at MCC cited workload and responsibilities, bureaucracy and dysfunction, along with insufficient release time as disincentive to running for academic senate president for them. Faculty participants from the CTE disciplines at UCC cited workload and responsibilities, less time in the classroom, and politics as disincentives to running for academic senate president for them.

In closing, the researcher discovered that at both colleges, the majority of the LAC participants identified workload and responsibilities, bureaucratic dysfunction, along with being too political a position as disincentives to running for academic senate president. The majority of CTE participants felt the same and added less time in the classroom coupled with insufficient release time as further disincentives to running for academic senate president. There was no marked difference in the perceived disincentives workload and responsibilities, bureaucracy and dysfunction, and the political nature of the position between LAC and CTE faculty participants at both colleges.

#### **Research Question 4: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly**

What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members' decisions on whether to run for academic senate president position at their institution?

Again, all of the faculty interviewed indicated that they participated or that they had a role in shared governance, such as a chair or member of a committee, department and/or senate, and were currently taking on more than the basic one committee contractual obligation. Therefore, they had a general knowledge and understanding of the processes of committee and chair duties and responsibilities.

When faculty were asked, "Can you give examples of incentives to serving as an academic senate president here at your college?" they immediately responded "no" and laughter soon followed; this was true for both campuses. Another interesting factor was that the participants would begin with an incentive and then divert to a disincentive. The participants would read the question again or the researcher would repeat it or ask a probing question, participants then would go back to an incentive but ultimately regress back to disincentives, until once again redirected by the researcher. This was interesting because the participants did not

have any issues identifying disincentives for becoming academic senate president. However, they did struggle in identifying incentives.

The study was able to identify several incentives and disincentives provided by the interviewed faculty from MCC and UCC. The incentives are presented first, followed by the disincentives.

***The Good (Incentives).*** Both the CTE and LAC faculty participants identified several incentives, in hierarchal order, regarding running for academic senate president at Metropolitan and UCCs. The researcher was able to identify and explore the following incentives (a) monetary, (b) sense of responsibility/service mentality, (c) professional growth, (d) power of influence, (e) personal fulfillment (f) recognition, (g) support, and (h) mentorship/mentor program.

At MCC, the *sufficient monetary* incentive was defined as release time, reassigned time and/or stipends. What is interesting about this incentive is that the majority of faculty mentioned monetary incentives. However, two out of the three CTE faculty participants indicated that there was never enough release time allocated, and therefore it could not be seen as an incentive. As seen from Lori's (CTE) comment, "It's never the money, and it wouldn't be the money anyway because you can't pay enough for the hours." Even though they identified release time as an incentive, they indicated that release time would not necessarily be an incentive for them.

At UCC, *sufficient monetary* incentives were described as release time, reassigned time, stipends, bonuses, and paid travel to attend conferences and events, and even a Tesla automobile. Both the CTE and LAC faculty participants mentioned that their academic senate president had some form of release time or reassigned time; however, the release time that was granted was always described as inadequate for the workload. As seen with the participants at MCC, faculty

participants would identify reassigned time as an incentive then immediately indicate that the current release time assigned was inadequate. A typical comment was, “I know a lot of people put more time into it, than what the release time is. Therefore, I don’t think that’s an incentive.”

In comparison, all faculty participants at Metropolitan Community College identified release time as an incentive. At UCC, five LAC participants and three CTE participants did so as well. This incentive was identified by the majority of the faculty participants in the study. Again, even though monetary compensation was identified as an incentive, some participants felt that it was not, or would not, be an incentive for them personally. This was partly because the reassigned time would not be enough to cover the actual time it would take to be an effective senate president.

At MCC, the *sense of responsibility or service mentality* incentive was described as those incentives that were related to wanting to be an “agent for change” and having the “desire to see the college succeed” and the “drive to want to have the system work.” The majority of faculty participants identified this incentive and it is best represented by Charles (CTE),

Most people who go for [academic senate president]...generally want to see the college move forward. Otherwise nobody would put themselves through that, and they care about the students, and they want really to be [a] positive [influence] on this campus.

At UCC, the *sense of responsibility or service mentality* incentive was described as wanting to “provide more support for faculty.” This category/theme for incentives was closely related to the personal fulfillment incentive; however, this incentive seeks to improve and help others, rather than seeking internal improvement using the platform of “service mentality,” as one previous LAC academic senate president called it.



In comparison, three CTE and two LAC participants from MCC identified this incentive. In addition, four CTE and two LAC participants from UCC also identified this incentive. Over half of the faculty participants interviewed for this study identified this incentive. It should be noted that CTE participants generally identified this incentive more than the LAC participants did. Perhaps this could indicate internal motivation is more of a driving force for CTE faculty participants than for LAC faculty participants.

At MCC, the *power to influence* incentive was described as being able to influence the decision-making at their institution. One CTE faculty participant Charles described that he got more involved with the academic senate and shared governance process because he wanted to get more support for his discipline and program and more minority students interested in his program. Although he did not describe it directly, his response indicated that he saw the academic senate as a mechanism to gain more influence on the outcomes and success of his program.

At UCC, the *power to influence* incentive was described as being able to influence the decision-making at their institution, as well. The ability of the academic senate president to “talk directly to... the top administrators, so [their] viewpoint gets carried across much quicker or more directly than those who do not have that role,” was identified as an important incentive that also may serve in helping advance the faculty member. Likewise, CTE faculty participant Scott stated, “For some, might be this idea of being part of the decision-making and having the ear of administration.” LAC participant Matt was more direct with the implications for this incentive. He said, “because then they’ll get to be in charge.” Having the ability to push forward their agenda or protect their discipline and department were identified as incentives.

Another interesting discovery came from Wayne (LAC). He talked about why he thought some faculty would be more interested in running for academic senate president,

I think there are some people who get into shared governance because in a way they feel like they can protect their department. It's much easier to tell someone by e-mail that you have to cut half their classes than it is to have to do it looking at them in the eye and telling them face-to-face. So, if you are at the table, if you're in the room, if you're part of the discussions, I think, you may in fact be more protected.

Wayne described almost the same factors for why he got more involved with the academic senate. Which were very similar to that of participant Charles (CTE) from MCC, which were previously mentioned.

In comparison, one CTE participant from MCC and five participants from UCC identified power to influence as an incentive. One CTE and four LAC participants identified influence as an incentive at UCC. This incentive was identified by more LAC participants than CTE participants. In addition, CTE participants from MCC viewed the position as a tool to improve one's program and student recruitment. The LAC participants from UCC perceived it as a mechanism to control or influence decision-making and move their personal agenda forward.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *professional growth* incentive. At UCC, the *professional growth* incentive was identified as those incentives that advanced the skills or expertise to succeed in a profession, to "move beyond the classroom." Within this category of incentives, networking was included because networking contributed to the advancement of a faculty member's career through their association with senior staff and administrations. As perceived by Pam (LAC) participant,

There was incentive for a previous academic senate president to serve as the president of the academic senate...because she [college president] took a chancellorship, and he [senate president] ...became a dean in one of the colleges where she's now the chancellor. So, he got to move up, move from the academic, teaching [position], to being a dean.

The ability to “work closely” and having “access” to “senior administrators and staff,” which allowed an academic senate president or faculty member to build those “networking” connections, was what another CTE faculty participant identified as an incentive as well.

All of the LAC participants at UCC identified professional growth as an incentive. In contrast, only one CTE participant identified this incentive.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *personal fulfillment* incentive. At UCC, *personal fulfillment* incentives are described as the “need to feel fulfillment,” because the job of being an academic senate president is sometimes a very difficult position with little to no recognition of that person’s accomplishments from faculty or the college, and an incentive would need to have some sort of personal motivation for some of the participants. CTE faculty participant, Anna described it as to, “know you’re doing something good for a larger group of people. It’s gotta be personal, because it’s not people coming up and telling you that you did a good job!” Similarly, a LAC participant described it as wanting to, “aspire to something greater,” and being personally “motivated to make change.”

Overall, half of the faculty interviewed at UCC identified personal fulfillment as an incentive. Four CTE participants and two LAC participants identified this incentive. Again, this incentive is similar to the *sense of responsibility* incentive and CTE participants expressed this type of internal force or motivation as a requirement in an incentive for them.

At MCC, the *recognition* incentive was described as the recognition for doing a job well, similar to staff recognition. Lori (CTE) said, “just the recognition...the purpose behind the award...it’s important for people to see what’s being done...and why people are stepping up to do it,” was important and not whether or not a person received release time. In addition, Mandy (CTE) was frustrated with administration and how they were always looking at the “things that faculty won’t do” as opposed to seeing all the things that faculty do accomplish. She went on to add just the simple act of recognition would go a long way in getting more support from the faculty.

At UCC, the *recognition* incentive was described as having a certain level of “prestige” that came with the “title” academic senate president. One CTE faculty participant, Tim stated, “I think it gives [a person] number one recognition, if you are looking for that.” On the other hand, a tenured-track CTE faculty participant, Violet, indicated that there was not enough recognition of the academic senate president,

I guess if there was more glory...maybe if there was more pomp and circumstance when the new president is selected or elected and it was a really big deal, then that might make it more appealing.

In comparison, two CTE participants from MCC and two faculty from both the CTE and LAC disciplines at UCC identified recognition as an incentive. This incentive was identified by more CTE participants than by LAC participants at both colleges. There were differences in the perception of what “recognition” identified or was associated with for the participants. LAC participants indicated that the “title, prestige and associated entitlements’ were the incentives. In contrast, CTE participants identified “recognition” as the accomplishments of doing a job well or of taking on such a role. Although Tim (CTE) identified the “title” aspect, he also added, “If

you're into that." He also indicated that would not necessarily be an incentive for him. Generally, CTE faculty come from the private business sector and typically received some sort of awards or recognition for job performance, which was not always monetary. Perhaps CTE faculty members who were accustomed to private industry standards where recognition is often utilized to promote efficiency and profit feel the need for that particular incentive, more so than LAC faculty.

At MCC, the *support from faculty and administration* incentive was described as an incentive that involves positive reinforcement from faculty and administrators. Only one participant from the CTE and one from the LAC disciplines identified this incentive. Lori (CTE) recalled being supported in her earlier role as a chair of a committee, which involved being supported to attend off-campus conferences, making contact with others and networking, and being able to share that information with her campus as important incentives. In addition, Brad (LAC) indicated that overwhelming support and encouragement from faculty might be incentive enough for him to run.

Faculty participants from UCC did not identify the *support from faculty and administration* incentive. Overall, only two participants from MCC indicated that this would be an incentive. What is interesting about this incentive is that it is described in detail as a disincentive, not having support from faculty and or administration, but was not really stressed by the majority of participants in the study as an incentive.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *mentorship/mentor program* incentive. At UCC, the *mentorship/mentor program* was identified as an incentive by only one CTE faculty participant. This individual felt that having a mentorship program or a mentor available for faculty who are considering running for academic senate president would be seen as

an incentive. Again, CTE faculty members come from industry where training and training programs are a constant for employees. CTE faculty members were often taught that they must receive proper training before performing certain tasks and jobs; it is a requirement and not always an option.

Faculty participants from both college research sites shared the following incentives: sense of responsibility/service mentality, monetary motivations, power to influence, and recognition. Overall, more CTE than LAC participants identified sense of responsibility, support, personal fulfillment, recognition, and mentor/mentorship program as incentives. CTE faculty members often have careers outside of the college so they can remain relevant in their discipline. On the other hand, LAC participants identified professional growth, and power to influence more than did the CTE participants. Lastly, they equally identified monetary incentives. LAC and CTE participants identified many of the same incentives; however, they had differing perceptions of what those incentives represented to them personally.

***The Bad (Disincentives).*** When MCC faculty were asked, “Can you give examples of disincentives to serving as academic senate president?” they did not hesitate to provide their input, and aside from some boisterous laughter, it was much easier for the participants to list disincentives than incentives. The researcher was able to identify the following disincentives: (a) workload and responsibilities, (b) lack of support, (c) insufficient monetary motivations, (d) bureaucracy and dysfunction, (e) less time in the classroom, and (f) no mentorship/mentor program or pathway.

At MCC, the *workload and responsibilities* disincentive was stressed by half of the faculty participants. They mentioned some of the work requirements, which included the necessary attendance and membership on numerous committees not only at their campus, but

also at the district level. In addition, there were also state-level conferences and plenaries that the senate president would need to attend throughout the academic year. Another issue brought up was the time a person would have to dedicate just to become knowledgeable about the shared governance process, policies and the Education Code. One CTE instructor commented on “how much of their [faculty] time is required” to fulfill that role, and he felt that “some people take it on without understanding” that it is a “full-time job” and “they get buried.” Barbara (LAC) specifically described the work of a senate president as “difficult.”

Similarly, at UCC, the *workload and responsibilities* disincentive was identified as the amount of “workload” and “time commitment” needed for this role. It too encompassed all the duties and responsibilities that an academic senate president was accountable for, according to the participants. These duties also included the time that it takes a faculty member to read up on all the required documentation needed to be an effective leader. This disincentive was by far the most stressed by both the CTE and LAC faculty participants.

Almost all of the CTE participants identified one or more of the workload requirements and responsibilities as a disincentive. In addition, CTE participants identified the position as a particularly “thankless” and “time consuming” job. Similarly, the LAC faculty identified the excessive amount of “hours” that are required to do the “quagmire of paperwork.” Wayne’s (LAC) response was typical,

Having to put in more hours than you’re getting paid for, having hundreds of faculty members need you to be their voice so you’d have to be constantly available to them.

In comparison, two CTE and two LAC participants from MCC identified heavy workload as a disincentive to running for academic senate president. The vast majority of participants

identified several elements of this disincentive, as aforementioned. At UCC, all of the LAC and five CTE participants identified this disincentive. The researcher found no notable differences with this disincentive.

At MCC, the *lack of support* disincentive was identified as having an unsupportive faculty and or administration. It was previously identified that being a senate president was a “challenge” that came with “unrealistic expectations” by both faculty and administrators. The lack of support would indeed be a disincentive for a faculty member in choosing to run for academic senate president. The fear of not having faculty support was represented by Barbara’s (LAC) response,

You just can’t elect them and then leave them to do the work and to fight the battles... It can be a very lonely place, when people don’t support the senate and its president. That can deter people.... Not wanting to stand out there alone, or the feeling that they might be left out there alone. It can be a lonely place; they need people to support them in that position.

On the same note, Brad (LAC) described how an “unsupportive faculty, apathetic faculty and uncooperative administration” would be enough of a disincentive to prevent an individual from running.

Similarly, at UCC, the *lack of support* disincentive was identified as a lack of support from faculty, administration, and the College Board, as well as staffing support and resources, such as personnel and a senate budget. The majority of the CTE faculty identified several factors of what they perceived as lack of support for this role. They identified the issues of having an unsupportive faculty and administration. Frank (CTE), a previous academic senate president said, “faculty are constantly battling administration...you have an unresponsive Board, you’re



just banging your head against the wall.” These situations are frustrating. In addition, Paul (LAC) commented on how the lack of support from faculty can undermine an academic senate president’s position,

If you don’t support their agenda, they could say that the [senate president] is not representing me. Because that has happened at our college, lots of times. Where [faculty] felt that a former senate president had a different agenda or had presented themselves as, not what they [the faculty] want.

In comparison, all of the faculty participants at MCC identified lack of support as a disincentive. At UCC, nine participants identified several elements of this disincentive. Both LAC and CTE participants equally identified important factors related to this disincentive. The researcher found no notable differences with this disincentive.

At MCC, the *insufficient monetary compensation* disincentive was directly related to the workload disincentive. The majority of the faculty participants commented on the workload, and thereafter identified that the amount release time given fell short of the required time needed for the job. Charles (CTE) comments were a representation of that perception, “I think the biggest disincentive would be the amount of work that it requires, and the fact that’s there’s probably not enough release time given to do it.” The CTE participants identified this disincentive versus only one LAC participant; this could be because CTE participants were more involved with the academic senate and could observe the workload and time commitment first hand.

At UCC, the *insufficient monetary motivation* disincentive was identified as insufficient release or reassigned time for the workload that is required for the position. Over half of the faculty participants from both the LAC and CTE disciplines identified this disincentive. As previously mentioned in the workload and responsibilities disincentives section of this study,

several faculty participants identified key responsibilities and duties of the academic senate president position, and then immediately after identifying these essential functions talked about the insufficient release time allotted for this position. The CTE participants made remarks similar to “not enough release time” and “no financial advantage” due to the workload and time commitment of the position. Similarly, the LAC faculty participants made similar statements that included, “lack of release time” and “having to put in more hours than you’re getting paid for.” Frank (LAC) said that there was actually a “financial disincentive” to being an academic senate president. He experienced a loss in income when he left his position as department chair to accept being the academic senate president. Therefore, faculty members who are chairs of their department at UCC have the potential to lose income by becoming the academic senate president.

In comparison, one LAC and all three CTE participants at MCC identified insufficient release time as a disincentive. At UCC, four LAC and three CTE participants felt that the position of academic senate president carried a heavy workload and the amount of release time allocated at their institution did not cover the actual time to accomplish the work. Both LAC and CTE participants equally identified this disincentive. The researcher found no notable differences with this disincentive.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *bureaucracy and dysfunction* disincentive. At UCC, the *bureaucracy and dysfunction* disincentive was identified as inconsistencies in senate and administrative processes, as well as having to go through “red tape” and the excessive time it takes to institute change or get approval for an agenda item within the shared governance process. This definition is best described by Paul (LAC), “It’s difficult to make changes, the process, the shared governance process whether it’s trying to get the agenda,

or trying to bring something, or some kind of program, whatever it is, anything.” Adding to that description, Pam (LAC) said, “Disincentives kind of live in the realm of the level of dysfunction and unaccountability at our college.” Similarly, Helen (LAC) a tenured track participant, described the committees she is a member of and how that had affected her perception of shared governance and the senate,

I don’t find, so far in my experience, the committees really seem to do anything...I find being a warm body frustrating...because, if you are like me, you’re on a couple of committees that you don’t find very useful, you’re not going to ever say the senate is something I’m excited about.

As a result, the dysfunction and ineffectiveness seen in subcommittees of the senate may act as a deterrent or disincentive for not only tenured-track, but also tenured faculty.

In comparison, four LAC and two CTE participants at UCC felt the bureaucratic nature and dysfunction of both the senate and shared governance process were disincentives for faculty when considering running for academic senate president. More LAC participants identified this disincentive than did CTE participants. Perhaps this could be because LAC participants chaired more committees and were more knowledgeable about the process and timelines. The researcher found no notable differences with this disincentive.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *less time in the classroom* disincentive. At UCC, the *less time in the classroom* disincentive was identified by two LAC faculty participants, “to do more administrative work and less teaching is just a down-side,” and “taking you out of the classroom, removing you from your students, which is the real reason that you became a teacher in the first place” was seen as a disincentive. Although the CTE participants did not name *less time in the classroom* as a disincentive for this specific prompt,

two CTE faculty had cited it earlier when asked about their likelihood of running for academic senate president.

In comparison, two LAC and two CTE faculty participants at UCC identified spending less time in the classroom to do administrative work as a disincentive. The researcher found no marked differences with this disincentive.

Faculty participants from MCC did not identify the *lack of a mentor/mentorship program or pathway* disincentive. At UCC, the *lack of a mentor/mentorship program or pathway* was also included in the incentive section of this study. It was mentioned again as a disincentive by the same CTE faculty participant Nancy, who expressed that a lack of mentor or mentorship in place could be seen as a disincentive for some faculty. Similarly, LAC faculty participant Wayne stated,

There is a lot of knowledge that is needed to be an effective senate president... There's a big learning curve, and it's certainly something you just don't jump into. We don't have a real pathway to becoming senate president at this campus.

Only a couple of participants mentioned having a mentor/mentorship or pathway, but the researcher included this disincentive because those two participants felt strongly about it.

In conclusion, for the disincentives a heavy workload, insufficient monetary motivations, and lack of support were the three disincentives identified by faculty participants from both college research sites. In addition, the researcher did not find marked differences between LAC and CTE participants' perceptions of disincentives. However, the disincentives themselves are noteworthy. Which is to say that faculty serve for their own personal reasons or incentives.

However, faculty participants do not serve for the same reasons or disincentives, thereby making those disincentives potent.

**The Ugly (Perception of Value).** In addition to the aforementioned disincentives, most CTE participants at MCC were not as confident that their discipline expertise was valued, unlike the LAC faculty who perceived their discipline expertise to be valued. One CTE participant felt her discipline expertise was valued because she was, “very forceful about my discipline, [so] yeah I believe it gets valued.” Overall, more LAC than CTE participants felt that their discipline expertise was valued. CTE participants’ responses were quite different from LAC participants, typically CTE participants responded with an “I don’t know” answer to the question. Lori, a CTE faculty member questioned whether recognition gained via forceful means was actually authentic,

It’s almost like you have to be loud, or argumentative or, be strong, just to get things across. That’s where I don’t know the value, how do you measure the value? Like, will they listen? Yeah. Will they act on it? That’s questionable, depends on how forceful you are...do you have to be there every time to fight for it...when there has to be a fight, is that really [being] valued?

On the other hand, all three of the LAC participants immediately identified their discipline as being valued at their college.

CTE participants from UCC were not as confident that their discipline or discipline expertise was valued. Nancy (CTE) shared her thoughts, “No, no I don’t think so. I think they still have this perception of what exactly [my discipline] is, and so, no I don’t think it is seen as incredibly valuable at the college.” Scott’s (CTE) comments were particularly interesting; he

said, “if you’re a [CTE] department... I can see how that might be the case.” He expressed that some CTE disciplines were not valued as much as LAC disciplines.

Moreover, the majority of CTE participants described that they felt as though their discipline and discipline expertise was not valued by the academic senate and by the college as a whole. Again, Scott (CTE) believed his CTE discipline was somewhat valued and added that his discipline brought in a lot of money for the college, “so [administration and the college] can’t discount [his discipline’s value} too much.” As a result of these findings, a possible disincentive for CTE faculty members at UCC could be their perception of value within the college. It should be noted that most of those participants that indicated they were interested in running for academic senate president in the future also said their discipline and discipline expertise were valued. There were two exceptions, one CTE and one LAC participant did not feel as though their discipline and discipline expertise were valued. In comparison, the majority of the LAC participants described that they felt as though their discipline and discipline expertise was valued by the academic senate and the college as a whole.

MCC participants were asked to comment on the fact that only 12% of academic senate presidents come from the career and technical education disciplines. Two out of three LAC faculty responded, “No” that it did not surprise them and the third faculty participant stated, “Maybe, it doesn’t surprise me.” Similarly, one CTE participant commented on how they never thought about it and did not know if that surprised them or not, while another CTE participant responded, “No” that it did not surprise him. However, he added that he “didn’t think it’s good” and that it is a problem that “needs to be remedied.”

When the researcher questioned participants on the reasons why CTE percentages were not as high as the LAC percentages there were various ideas presented. The LAC faculty

participants commented on how faculty from the Social and Behavioral Sciences were most likely to be the highest percentage of academic senate presidents because their discipline lends itself to that role due to the political nature of the discipline, stating it is a “natural fit.” Moreover, they added that liberal arts disciplines have to do with human behavior and they have more “tolerance and patience.” Additionally, “liberal arts and academic transfer educators would really care more about having shared governance” because they are “pressed to do the job because everybody knows they’ll say yes.”

In addition, it was suggested by a LAC participant that CTE faculty were probably “idealists” and that they were comprised of “different thinkers that were more visionary and philosophical” that would not care for “the details of that role” and would be “turned-off” from jobs like the senate president. It was also stated that “liberal arts and transfer disciplines care more about actual education whereas the technical educators would care more about job creation,” they go on to add that “tech people never say yes” when pressed to do a job, like liberal arts and transfer faculty do.

In contrast, the CTE faculty posited that perhaps CTE faculty dealt with technical issues and were “black and white” and that the political or “gray” area that encompasses the academic senate would prove problematic for them. In addition, CTE programs are mostly run by part-time or adjunct faculty that have full-time jobs in their industry. They are “professionals in their field who are doing this [teaching] on an adjunct basis so they wouldn’t take on the senate presidency” because of commitment outside of the college. What was interesting was the description and perception of a CTE faculty participant that had attended the statewide Academic Senate Plenary sessions during her term as academic senate president. She stated that the CTE academic senate presidents “don’t get a lot of ...wide acceptance” at the statewide level.

Half of the MCC participants were not surprised that only 12% of academic senate presidents came from CTE. Yet the participants offered differing explanations of why that was the case. LAC faculty, for the most part, felt that the LAC disciplines and its faculty were more prone to serve as senate presidents due to the nature of those disciplines. While faculty from the CTE disciplines posited that the low rate of senatorial service rate was due to the adjunct nature of those disciplines.

The majority of faculty participants at UCC were not surprised by the low presidency rate among CTE faculty. Four out of six CTE faculty and five out of six LAC faculty were not surprised. However, similar to the participants from MCC, participants did have differing explanations for why they thought that was the case.

Several interviewees posited that the academic requirements for LAC faculty better prepares them for the rigor of being an academic senate president. LAC faculty are required to have a graduate degree, whereas CTE faculty preparation is more technical. Nancy, a CTE participant from UCC, said that faculty from LAC disciplines would be more accustomed to the massive amount of reading required of an academic senate president. She thought, “Maybe there’s less they [CTE faculty] have to read.” Rachel (CTE) echoed Nancy’s (CTE) opinion and wondered if CTE faculty members “feel uncomfortable” because the experience you gain going through a Master’s degree program better prepares you for academic senate work. Helen (LAC) tenured-track participant described how some people could perceive that a faculty member would need “some kind of academic training to be able to analyze these affairs” although she did not agree with this, she could “see how people might perceive that to be the case.”

Others reflected on the social aspects of CTE versus LAC disciplines. Anna (CTE) stated that CTE faculty are not “people-people,” meaning that they were introverts and they “like to



work alone, their areas of interest are very narrow, they don't like to do things that involve a lot of words, and they do everything that's very cut and dry." Similarly, LAC faculty participant Matt also said that he felt most academic senate presidents came from the political science and English disciplines, as he put it, from groups where "guys who like to argue" come from. Paul (LAC) participant commented on how CTE faculty members do not like "things that do not get results and shared governance is not something where you get results." Violet a tenured-track CTE participant offered time demands as a reason why CTE faculty may be reluctant to run for academic senate president,

I would presume that professors who teach in CTE disciplines also work in those disciplines. They might find that they are less willing to commit to additional work at the [college] when they are already committed to work outside of the [college]."

Rachel (CTE) a tenured-track participant also identified that CTE faculty were likely to have careers outside of the college to keep relevant in their disciplines. Rachel added the time factor, "Number one, the technical education disciplines are probably more involved with the students and they have less time." Similarly, Paul (LAC) also indicated that CTE faculty mostly had to teach and "their involvement" in the classroom "holds and involves [CTE faculty] so greatly that... [CTE faculty] don't want to take on this responsibility."

When LAC participant responses were examined, participants came up with similar and differing reasons. Frank (LAC) described how different the teaching load requirements for CTE faculty were from traditional lecture courses. He said,

I see the amount of work that CTE faculty have to do. You know they have higher teaching loads, they have an 18-hour a week teaching load, and our Rad Tech

department, their faculty have 21-hour week teaching loads. So they don't have much time to get engaged.

Frank also observed that CTE faculty have "other responsibilities" that they have to meet such as Perkins reports and biannual advisory boards, and typically CTE faculty have to "constantly update [CTE] programs" and hustle for resources such as grants or donations. Therefore, CTE faculty members do not have the time to get involved and only a small percentage get involved. He added there is a "small fraction obviously statewide that get involved as senate leaders" as well. In addition, Wayne (LAC) also listed the duties of CTE faculty. He said that CTE faculty and CTE chairs have the duties of "recruiting students, the advisory boards, staying current in the industry, and some CTE faculty have active careers outside their teaching." As a result, CTE faculty do not have enough time, and the "dedication that they can put into shared governance is not as much" as other disciplines.

On the other hand, Matt (LAC) had an interesting perspective on the recruitment of CTE faculty. He said,

You recruit folks not to run for president, first you just recruit them to show up, and then the ones that are not elected...you make moves to have the CTE people in those jobs...so in that respect it breaks down the barriers.

In summary for UCC, faculty participants proposed five explanations as to why CTE has low rates of governance: (a) CTE faculty have less academic preparation than LAC faculty (less than a Master's degree), (b) CTE disciplines by nature do not lend themselves to this kind of work, as seen with LAC disciplines like Political Science, (c) most CTE faculty need to have professions outside of college to stay current and relevant in the industry, (d) CTE faculty are more involved with their students and programs and have less time for other college

commitments, and (e) the teaching load for CTE faculty is greater along with the requirements for their programs. These are all possible factors for the low percentage of CTE academic senate presidents in the state.

In comparison, LAC faculty participants from MCC linked the tendency to participate as senate president with the nature of that faculty's discipline. For example faculty from the LAC disciplines such as Political Science, were more prone to serve as senate presidents due to the nature of those disciplines. Similarly, both LAC and CTE faculty from UCC concurred with this perception. Faculty participants from both CTE and LAC disciplines at UCC identified CTE faculty with less than a Master's degree as more involved with their students and programs and have less time for college commitments, as factors contributing to the lower percentage rate of participation. On the other hand, LAC faculty participants from UCC felt that CTE faculty also have greater teaching load requirements in addition to the added requirements of keeping their programs up and running, Perkins reports, advisory committees, etc. Faculty from the CTE disciplines typically have careers outside of the college, limiting their availability to do senate work.

In closing, there is documented evidence in other research studies on community college faculty that clearly illustrate differences between the LAC and CTE disciplines. This chapter identified and presented data based on the responses from eighteen full-time community college faculty participants from two public California community colleges. This study looked into an area that has not necessarily been studied in order to identify and explore those differences and similarities and presented them in this dissertation. The study identified and examined several incentives and disincentives based on the perceptions of both LAC and CTE faculty participants and presented those findings in this chapter. As previously mentioned, these findings are all

possible factors and contributors for the low percentage of CTE academic senate presidents in the state.

## **CHAPTER FIVE**

### **Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations**

As previously mentioned in this study, there is limited empirical research data on community college faculty. In his literature review, “Faculty Involvement in Institutional Governance: A Literature Review,” Jones (2011) recommended for an increased scholarly attention to be paid on how academic disciplines affect faculty governance. The purpose of this study was to add to the research by providing empirical data on Career and Technical Education (CTE) and Liberal Arts (LAC) faculty perceptions regarding running for academic senate president and their perceptions of involvement within the shared governance process. This section contains the broad overview, review of the findings, implications and discussions, implications for practice, implications for research based on the findings described in chapter four, and the conclusion. The implications include suggestions for additional research studies to aid in reaching a better understanding in this area of inquiry.

#### **Overview of the Study**

Approximately 30% of the community college faculty teaching in the California community college system draws from the CTE disciplines. However, only 12% of CTE faculty members are academic senate presidents (ASCCC, 2011). As previously mentioned, there is limited empirical research data on community college faculty, pertaining to the opinions and perceptions concerning shared governance, especially CTE faculty opinions and perceptions (Townsend & Twombly, 2007).

The researcher chose the qualitative research design for the study because it was the most appropriate. The findings were inductively generated from the participants’ points of view/perceptions, which constituted as the essential data for the study. This process involved

multiple stages of data collection and analysis, along with the comparison of findings for both the LAC and CTE faculty and the two community college sites.

This study sought to address a critical gap in the research by identifying and exploring an often ignored phenomenon -- the differences between Liberal Arts (LAC) and Career and Technical Education (CTE) faculty's perceptions of their roles and functions related to their involvement in the academic senate, with a special focus on CTE disciplined full-time faculty member's perceptions of running for academic senate president. In addition, this study was to identify and explore the incentives and disincentives that may affect LAC and CTE faculty members' decision on whether to run for the position of academic senate president. The following research questions guided the study.

1. How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?
2. What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college's academic senate at their institution?
3. How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?
4. What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members' decisions on whether they should or should not run for academic senate president at their institution?

## **Review of Findings for Research Questions**

Each research question and brief summary of findings are presented in this section (refer to chapter four for detailed findings).

**Summary for research question one.** How do members of the California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty understand the shared governance process at their institutions? How effective do they feel the academic senate is within that process?

The researcher found no notable differences between the CTE and LAC faculty participants or between each college research site for this research question. California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty from both research sites share the same definition and understanding regarding the shared governance process at their institutions. The overall majority of the faculty at both research sites supported and valued shared governance. In addition, they all indicated that their current academic senate was effective within the shared governance process at their colleges and attributed this to the effective leadership of the current academic senate.

**Summary for research question two.** What are the perceptions of California public community college LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty in leadership participation within the college's academic senate, such as running for academic senate president, at their institution?

The researcher found no notable difference between the CTE and LAC faculty participants or between each college research site for this research question. Faculty participants from both colleges defined their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate, or by their membership/service on academic senate/shared governance committees, and nothing further beyond their participation on these committees. The work they

performed in these committees, such as “attend meetings” and “reporting” committee work was their purpose and function when it came to their engagement in the academic senate regarding shared governance.

**Summary for research question three.** How do LAC and CTE full-time tenured faculty define their role in shared governance in terms of their engagement in the academic senate?

The researcher found that the majority of faculty participants from both colleges who are or were currently serving as chair(s) of academic senate or shared governance committees had a higher level of interest in running for academic senate president. Therefore, there were no marked difference between these disciplines and colleges concerning the level of interest in running for academic senate president, for faculty participants that were already chairing committees.

**Summary for research question four.** What are the factors affecting LAC and CTE faculty members’ decisions on whether they should or should not run for academic senate president position at their institution?

The researcher identified the following incentives: (a) monetary motivations, (b) professional growth, (c) personal fulfillment, (d) sense of responsibility/service mentality, (e) power to influence, (f) recognition, and (g) mentorship/mentor program. Faculty participants from both college research sites shared some incentives. CTE participants typically identified sense of responsibility, support, personal fulfillment, recognition, and mentor/mentorship program. On the other hand, LAC participants identified professional growth, and power to influence more than did the CTE participants, and LAC and CTE faculty equally identified monetary incentives. Both LAC and CTE participants identified the same incentives; however,



they had differing perceptions of what those incentives represented to them personally. Faculty participants from both college research sites only shared two of the same incentives -- sense of responsibility/service mentality and monetary motivations.

In addition, the following disincentives were identified: (a) workload and responsibilities, (b) lack of support, (c) insufficient monetary motivations, (d) bureaucracy and dysfunction, (e) less time in the classroom, and (f) no mentorship/mentor program or pathway. A heavy workload, insufficient monetary motivations, and lack of support were the three disincentives identified by faculty participants from both college research sites. As previously mentioned, the researcher did not find marked differences between LAC and CTE participants' perceptions of disincentives. However, the disincentives themselves are noteworthy. Which is to say that faculty serve for their own personal reasons or incentives. However, faculty participants do not serve for the same reasons or disincentives, thereby making those disincentives potent.

Further, faculty participants from both colleges identified: (a) that faculty from the LAC disciplines, such as Political Science, were more prone to serve as senate presidents due to the nature of those disciplines, (b) CTE faculty with less than a Master's degree were not as likely to serve, (c) CTE faculty are more involved with their students and programs and have less time for college commitments, (e) CTE faculty have a greater teaching load requirement, (f) the requirements for keeping CTE programs up and running, such as Perkins reports, advisory committees, etc., (g) CTE faculty typically have professions outside of the college, and (h) sometimes some CTE programs are run by adjuncts, who have careers outside of the college. These are all possible factors identified by the faculty participants for the low percentage of CTE academic senate presidents in the state.

## **Overview of the Study Limitations**

Several limitations of the study deserve attention. First, the researcher was unable to obtain permission from both of the initial community colleges intended for the study. Therefore, two other colleges were identified and subsequent permission was granted for the study. Secondly, at one of alternate colleges, MCC, the researcher was able to conduct only six interviews. The six Metropolitan faculty participants were equally distributed between the LAC and CTE disciplines, so there was equal representation for each category. Still the small sample size did not allow for a richness of interview data.

Eighteen faculty participants from two California community colleges participated in the study. Therefore, due to the relative small number of participants, there was not enough data to disaggregate the CTE and LAC disciplines to yield quality data. The researcher therefore, only disaggregated the data into the two categories of CTE and LAC. For detailed information regarding the limitations of the study, please refer to chapter three.

## **Implications and Discussions**

As mentioned in chapter two, although the state has mandated that California community college faculty be involved in shared governance, there was no consistency in the application of a shared governance process across all the community colleges (Wagoner, Levin & Kater, 2010; White, 1998). This had an effect on how community college faculty perceived shared governance within their institutions and their participation. The American Federation of Teachers (2006) defined shared governance as, “the set of practices under which college faculty and staff participate in significant decisions concerning the operation of their institutions.” The faculty participants at both colleges shared the same definition and understanding regarding the shared governance process at their institutions. The majority supported and valued the idea of shared

governance as a form of “democracy” through their academic senate in which “faculty have a voice” and are a part of the decision-making process at their campus. This is very similar to the findings of Tierney and Minor (2003) who found that most faculty from universities strongly supported shared governance. Although the interview protocol did not include a Likert scale to determine just how much the faculty participants supported or valued shared governance, they still acknowledged that it was needed and that it did have value to them.

Scholars engaged in research on faculty opinions about shared governance have focused on two primary areas: faculty beliefs about the importance of shared governance and faculty opinions about their level of involvement in governance (Jones, 2011). Concerning the first area, the researcher found the faculty participants stressed that the effectiveness of their academic senate was dependent upon the effectiveness of its leaders, specifically the academic senate president. As mentioned in chapter one, the definition for the term “effective” for this research study was defined in accordance with Title 5, §53200; for which "effective participation" means that affected parties must be afforded opportunity to review and comment upon recommendations, proposals, etc.; having given due and reasonable consideration to those comments (ASCCC, 2012). According to the faculty participants, the experience and knowledge level of the academic senate president and officers, as well as administration’s value and respect for the role that the academic senate has within the shared governance process, were determining factors in the senate’s effectiveness. Kater and Levin found that “institutions with strong academic senates...have structures that support ongoing faculty participation in institutional decision-making” (2004, p.3); this was also true for the two college sites. Five faculty participants at MCC and four faculty participants from UCC indicated that they felt they did not have a voice in the decision-making process with their previous academic senate leadership.

MCC faculty participants indicated that their academic structure, modeled after the Statewide Academic Senate model, was not being utilized and was one of the biggest reasons why they felt they were excluded from the process. Additionally, some of the faculty participants questioned the value that their administration placed on the academic senate and shared governance process at their college. Both of the research sites findings were similar to those of Tierney and Minor, where almost half the university faculty in their study did not believe that faculty senates were highly valued in their institutions (2003).

In regards to faculty opinions about their level of involvement in governance, the participants viewed any committee membership as their participation within the shared governance structure. The work they performed in these committees, such as “attending meetings and reporting” committee work out to their constituencies was their purpose and function when it came to their engagement in the academic senate and shared governance process. Five faculty from MCC and nine faculty from UCC responded that their current academic senate and its leaders were effective.

The literature review revealed several possible faculty disincentives: a perceived increase in workload, a perception of the leadership role, insufficient or inadequate incentives or rewards, insufficient or inadequate training, and perceptions of inadequacy. This supports the finding from the study, where the faculty participants identified near identical disincentives: (a) workload and responsibilities, (b) lack of support, (c) insufficient monetary motivations, (d) bureaucracy and dysfunction, (e) less time in the classroom, and (f) no mentorship/mentor program or pathway. It is true, community college faculty have accepted an increasing role in managing their college (Kater & Levin, 2005), there has been an increase in duties that effects their workload, such as chairing departments/divisions, academic senate and shared governance committees (Levin et al,

2006; Murray, 2010; Townsend & Twombly, 2007; Wagoner et al, 2010). Primarily, because of the increased workload, time commitment, and insufficient monetary compensation most colleges have challenges with recruiting faculty to serve on academic senate and shared governance committees, especially chairing them, or becoming the academic senate president. The disincentive of increased workload was the most cited by the faculty participants.

In addition, the findings support Wagoner et al (2010) argument that the concept of shared governance in community colleges may not have constituted advancement in joint decision-making so much as increased faculty work and responsibility. The majority of the work that community college faculty perform is teaching an average of fifteen academic units per semester (Townsend & Rosser, 2007). In comparison, the teaching load of some CTE faculty at UCC was as high as 18 to 21-academic units. Therefore, this disincentive has a much larger impact on CTE faculty that teach a higher weekly load than traditional or average loads seen with LAC disciplines. CTE faculty have to balance more elements, more demands and pressures, than do academic transfer faculty (Grubb et al, 1999). They have “other responsibilities” such as Perkins reports, advisory boards, recruitment of students, staying current/relevant in their industry, and they have to “constantly update [CTE] programs” and hustle for resources such as grants or donations. Therefore, the findings are in support of Grubb and Wagoner et al where the expansion of work responsibilities and the enlargement of curricula has affected faculty work load and thus participation in governance (1999; 2010).

As mentioned in chapter two, the California Community College Leadership Institute survey results provided potential incentives and disincentives. Participants indicated a widespread notion that faculty leaders are overworked and that there was very little concrete support in terms of adequate release time given at their institutions. Those findings also coincide

with the results of this study-- the majority of faculty participants from both colleges identified the lack of sufficient monetary compensation as a disincentive to running for academic senate president. Faculty participants commented on the workload and responsibilities/duties of the academic senate president position and the insufficient amount release time.

Williams, Gore, Broches, and Lotoski (1987) found that most faculty members did not believe there were sufficient incentives or rewards for faculty to participate in shared governance. However, the literature review revealed sufficient release time, proper training and support from the institution, mentoring programs, and increased recognition of faculty contributions, as possible incentives regarding participation in shared governance. This too, supports the finding from the study, the faculty participants identified very similar, if not exactly the same, following incentives (a) monetary motivations, (b) professional growth, (c) personal fulfilment, (d) sense of responsibility/service mentality, (e) power to influence, (f) recognition, and (g) mentorship/mentor program.

The California Community College Leadership Institute participants indicated they favored local leadership mentoring and programs as the best means of preparing faculty for leadership positions (“Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community Colleges,” 2000). The study also identified having a mentor/mentorship program as an incentive and a lack of mentorship as a disincentive. At UCC, one CTE faculty participant felt that having a mentorship program would be an incentive for those who are considering running for academic senate president. Again, CTE faculty come from industry where training and training programs are a constant for employees, and may expect this type of formal training or mentoring, before attempting to take on a position or role. At UCC, not having a mentor/mentorship program or pathway was identified as a disincentive by two CTE faculty.

CTE education is often viewed as a terminal form of education and there is strong evidence that supports the view that CTE faculty perceive themselves as having a lower status at their institutions (Levin et al, 2006; Shulock & Offenstein, 2012; Townsend & Twombly; Wagoner, 2004). Additional research has shown that CTE faculty report that they feel their programs and efforts are undervalued, this is due partly to inadequate provisions and disproportionate cuts to programs, and the general low priority of CTE education (Grubb et al, 1999; Shulock & Offenstein, 2012; Townsend & Twombly, 2007). The majority of CTE faculty participants from this study were not as confident as LAC faculty that their discipline or discipline expertise was valued. One participant identified why he thought some faculty from an undervalued discipline, would get more involved or run for academic senate president. He stated,

I think there are some people who get into shared governance because in a way they feel like they can protect their department. It's much easier to tell someone by e-mail that you have to cut half their classes than it is to have to do it looking at them in the eye and telling them face-to-face. And so, if you are at the table, if you're in the room, if you're part of the discussions, I think, you may in fact be more protected.

However, this perceived lower status could potentially be a disincentive as much as an incentive. An 1985 qualitative study of 76 community college faculty members across three states found that at least some vocational (CTE) faculty did not feel empowered at their institutions and that there is some hierarchical distinctions not only between CTE and academic transfer faculty, but also within the ranks of CTE faculty as well (Seidman, 1985). This is reflected in a participant's remarks on discipline specific values based on monetary incentives for the college,

Yeah, we're not a liberal arts academic transfer discipline, but we are under the umbrella of [states his CTE discipline] and in some respects they do value [discipline] because we do bring in a lot of money, so they really can't discount us too much. But if you're a department like [CTE discipline], I can see how that might be the case.

Another disincentive identified dealt with the qualifications of two-year community college faculty in vocational and technical fields which may require less than a Master's degree, when combined with work experience in the teaching field (Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges, 2012) may exacerbate this perception. This was also supported by the study where faculty participants identified that some of the CTE disciplines do not require a Master's degree and perhaps this made those CTE faculty "feel uncomfortable" because they lacked the academic experience which better prepares one for academic senate work.

In chapter two the researcher proposed the hypothesis, CTE faculty do not participate in faculty leadership roles, such as academic senate president, as much as the LAC faculty, because of the disconnection that CTE faculty have with their institutions outside of their own specific programs. The findings supported this hypothesis. One faculty participant posed the idea that professors who teach in CTE disciplines also work in those disciplines, therefore are more committed to their industry and as a result have less available time to devote to shared governance.

The study did not support the literature pertaining to the possible disincentive of the perception of the role of academic senate president. Hubble stated in his article, "Thankless but Vital: The Role of the Faculty Senate Chair," "large portions of faculty do not see the senate as



an important governance body ... but a necessary form of university service” (2010, p. 147).

Nowhere in the findings from this study, did the participants’ responses reflect this perception.

Overall, besides the previous identified incentives and disincentives, faculty participants identified additional specific disincentives concerning CTE faculty involvement. They were (a) less rigorous academic preparation (less than a Master’s degree) in some CTE programs, (b) CTE disciplines do not lend themselves to “people” work, unlike the social studies LAC disciplines, (c) most CTE faculty have professions outside their college, (d) CTE faculty are more involved with their students and programs and have less time of other college commitments, and (e) the teaching load for CTE faculty is greater along with the requirements for their programs. These are all possible factors for the low percentage of CTE academic senate presidents in the state.

### **Implications for Practice**

In the researcher’s efforts to contribute to the body of knowledge, and to begin to fill the gap in the research that exists and to improve faculty participation, specifically CTE faculty participation in the academic senate and shared governance process, the researcher has agreed to share the findings with both research sites. In addition, the researcher will conduct a presentation on the findings at another California community college.

Several implications can be drawn from the above section. Community college administrators and academic senates are going to have to take an initiative and evaluate those incentives and disincentives that contribute to CTE and LAC faculty taking on active roles within their colleges. In addition, colleges need to evaluate which incentives are most likely going to assist the institution in recruiting faculty participation. The Statewide Academic Senate along with college senates also need to evaluate the disincentive and incentives of recruiting

more CTE and LAC faculty, specifically focusing on the workload requirements versus the reassigned or release time for the academic senate president position, because this disincentive was particularly stressed by the participants. Lastly, the Statewide Academic Senate together with local senates need to create a mentorship program for academic senate presidents, along with gathering suggestions for developing a pathway for potential faculty, to use as a recruitment tool.

Lastly, according to the findings, there is a strong possibility that CTE faculty may not be participating in leadership positions, specifically running for academic senate president because they have outside interests (i.e., professional jobs), or may lack certain academic skills, or have perceptions of lower status and having little value within the institution. CTE programs by design require CTE faculty to work, generally, more weekly hours than required by most LAC faculty, (i.e., 15-hour vs. 18 to 21-hour weekly load). The Statewide Academic Senate would need to evaluate the differential weekly workload requirements, outside or professional commitments, academic skills, perceptions of value and status for CTE faculty to determine what kind of impact these factors have on CTE faculty participation.

### **Implications for Future Research**

The limitations of this study provide other researchers a window for further research into this important area. The study encompassed only two campuses with fewer than 20 participants. Even though the findings of the study add to and generally agree with the previous literature and research, the researcher was not able to interview CTE faculty from the trades and services category. More research is needed to identify the incentives and disincentives for trades and services faculty, as they have the lowest academic senate president participation percentage.

Another area for future research can be the study of effective mentorship and pathways for leadership positions. In addition, determining what the average teaching load for CTE disciplines are and which CTE disciplines have the highest teaching loads, along with their participation percentages within the college system would add to the research. Is this teaching load a determining factor for certain CTE discipline participation?

## **Conclusion**

Research has shown that CTE faculty sometimes view their discipline as having lower status within the community college than LAC faculty who teach transfer-level courses (Grubb et al, 1999; Levin et al, 2007; Shulock & Offenstien, 2012 Wagoner, 2004). Is there a difference between LAC and CTE faculty's perceptions of value within their institution and their involvement in shared governance? The researcher confirmed that the CTE participants in this study did indeed have differing perceptions of value within their institutions. The majority of the CTE participants did not feel as though the academic senate really valued their discipline or expertise. Lori's response epitomizes the struggle that most of the CTE participants identified with,

It's almost like you have to be loud or argumentative or, be strong, just to get things across. That's where I don't know the value, how do you measure the value? Like, will they listen? Yeah. Will they act on it? That's questionable, depends on how forceful you are...do you have to be there every time to fight for it...when there has to be a fight, is that really [being] valued?

In stark contrast, the majority of LAC participants did believe that the academic senate valued their discipline and discipline expertise. Faculty from the LAC programs, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and physical and biological sciences, represent

approximately 70% of the LAC faculty in California community colleges. They also account for approximately 88% of academic senate presidents. How much does their expectation of value influence their willingness to participate in college administrative duties such as academic senate president? The majority of participants that expressed an interest in running for academic senate president all indicated that their discipline and discipline expertise were indeed valued.

Interestingly, CTE participant Mandy indicated that her discipline and discipline expertise were valued, but she also added, “I’m also very forceful about my discipline, [so] yeah I believe it gets valued.”

The perception of value that CTE participants acknowledged may be one of the links to the low academic senate president participation. Though CTE participants represent almost 30% of CTE faculty in California community colleges, only 12% of academic senate presidents are from the CTE discipline. We have seen in other research on community college faculty that there are differences between LAC and CTE faculty. This study examined an area that has not necessarily been studied to see what the differences and similarities between LAC and CTE faculty. The study identified that LAC and CTE participants do share similarities when it comes to the identification and perceptions of the disincentives. Although, LAC and CTE participants identified the same incentives, they had differing perceptions of the meaning or motivation behind them. The study revealed that more attention needs to be focused toward these issues if community colleges want to expand faculty participation in shared governance leadership positions from all representative disciplines. If these areas are not thoroughly explored and addressed, there will be a continued lack of participation from faculty, especially CTE faculty.

## **Appendix**

University of California, Los Angeles

## **Consent to Participate in Research**

### *California Community College Faculty Perceptions on Shared Governance*

*Maria Elena Clinton, MA in Industrial and Technology Studies, CSULA; BVE in Vocational Education, CSULA; AA in Aviation, Antelope Valley College, from the Educational Leadership Program at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) are conducting a research study.*

You were selected as a possible participant in this study because *you are a California community college full-time tenured faculty member at college X*. Your participation in this research study is voluntary.

#### **Why is this study being done?**

The purpose of this study is to address a critical gap in research related to identifying the incentives and/or disincentives that affect community college full-time tenured faculty members' decision on whether or not to apply for shared governance leadership roles. In addition, the study will focus on the perceived attitudes that community college full-time tenured faculty have about their roles and functions, as it relates to shared governance, within the institution.

#### **What will happen if I take part in this research study?**

If you volunteer to participate in this study, the researcher will ask you to do the following:

- *Be available for a 40-50 minute interview at a date, time, and location that the participant agrees to.*
- *Be available to review transcripts (by phone, email or meeting) of interview to ensure accuracy of the content.*
- *If additional clarification is needed by the researcher following the interview, a brief (10 minute) phone call will be made to the participant.*
- *the participant Interview questions will be related to faculty perceptions of shared governance, and their role(s) and value within their community college.*

#### **How long will I be in the research study?**

Participation will take a total of about *40-50 minutes for the interview, and another possible 1 hour to review transcripts and /or answer clarification questions*

#### **Are there any potential risks or discomforts that I can expect from this study?**

- *There are no anticipated risks or discomforts.*

#### **Are there any potential benefits if I participate?**

You may benefit from the study ...*you will not directly benefit from the study.*  
The results of the research may ...*benefit community colleges in the recruitment of faculty to serve in shared governance leadership roles.*

**What other choices do I have if I choose not to participate?**

*IMPORTANT NOTE: This section is required ONLY for research that:*

- *includes treatment (e.g., behavioral therapy) and/or*
- *recruits participants from student subject pools.*

*IF RESEARCH INCLUDES TREATMENT: Please describe any appropriate alternative therapeutic, diagnostic, or preventive procedures that should be considered before the subjects decide whether or not to participate in the study. If applicable, explain why these procedures are being withheld. If there are no efficacious alternatives, state that an alternative is not to participate in the study.*

*IF RESEARCH RECRUITS PARTICIPANTS FROM STUDENT SUBJECT POOLS: Describe the alternatives to participating in the research study (e.g., to write a paper or participate in another research study to receive course credit). This section should reflect the alternatives that were approved by the UCLA IRB as part of the IRB protocol for the subject pool(s). Please contact the persons responsible for administration of the subject pool(s) if you have any questions about the approved alternatives.*

**Will I be paid for participating?**

- You will receive ... *a chance to win an Ipad mini.*
- The Ipad mini will be raffled; all interview participants will be included in the raffle.

**Will information about me and my participation be kept confidential?**

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can identify you will remain confidential. It will be disclosed only with your permission or as required by law. Confidentiality will be maintained by means of ...

- All participants and college sites will be coded to ensure confidentiality.
- All files (electronic and paper) will be kept in a locked filing cabinet and computers will be password protected.
- Only the researcher will have access to the data.

### **What are my rights if I take part in this study?**

- You can choose whether or not you want to be in this study, and you may withdraw your consent and discontinue participation at any time.
- Whatever decision you make, there will be no penalty to you, and no loss of benefits to which you were otherwise entitled.
- You may refuse to answer any questions that you do not want to answer and still remain in the study.

### **Who can I contact if I have questions about this study?**

- **The research team:**

If you have any questions, comments or concerns about the research, you can talk to the one of the researchers. Please contact:

*Maria Elena Clinton*  
*mclinton@avc.edu*  
*661-435-4411*

- **UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program (OHRPP):**

If you have questions about your rights while taking part in this study, or you have concerns or suggestions and you want to talk to someone other than the researchers about the study, please call the OHRPP at (310) 825-7122 or write to:

UCLA Office of the Human Research Protection Program  
11000 Kinross Avenue, Suite 211, Box 951694  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1694

*You will be given a copy of this information to keep for your records.*

### **SIGNATURE OF STUDY PARTICIPANT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Participant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

### **SIGNATURE OF PERSON OBTAINING CONSENT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Name of Person Obtaining Consent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Contact Number

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Person Obtaining Consent

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



University of California, Los Angeles

**Interview Protocol**

*California Community College Faculty Perceptions on Shared Governance*

Participant Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Site Code: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Interview Length 40-50 minutes

Ask permission to record the interview. "May I record this interview?"

Interview Introductions:

Hello, I am a student in the Educational Leadership Program at UCLA. I am conducting research. The purpose of this study is to address a critical gap in research related to identifying the incentives and/or disincentives that affect community college full-time tenured faculty members' decision on whether or not to apply for shared governance leadership roles. In addition, the study will focus on the perceived attitudes that community college full-time tenured faculty have about their roles and functions, as it relates to shared governance, within the institution.

Verify that the participant has signed the UCLA consent form.

The interview will consist of some open-ended questions; follow up questions, and an opportunity for you to share your thoughts. I will be taking notes as well as the recordings, please do not feel that I am ignoring by not keeping constant eye contact.

Please feel free to share any information, which you feel would be helpful to the study.

Ask, "Do you have any questions before we begin?"

Questions:

*Be cognizant of participants/your body language and facial expressions*

Warm-up :

1. What is your discipline?
2. How long have you been an instructor in the community college educational system?
3. What is your educational background/certifications and/or work experience background? (CTE faculty).

Questions that address Research Question #1

*Be cognizant of participants/your body language and facial expressions*

4. How do you see your role and function at your college?
  - a. What is your primary role and function?
  - b. Do you have other roles? Committee chair? What are they?
  - c. In what ways do you think your college sees your role as?

Questions that address Research Question #1 and #2

*Be cognizant of participants/your body language and facial expressions*

5. Can you please define shared governance?
6. What is the value of shared governance for a faculty member?
  - a. How would you define your role or function in shared governance at your college?
7. What are your perceptions on shared governance?
  - a. Can you describe what influences this perception?

Questions that address Research Question #2 and #3

*Be cognizant of participants/your body language and facial expressions*

8. How does your college promote shared governance?
  - a. How does this effect your perception of shared governance?
9. What shared governance committees have your chaired?
  - a. Why or Why not?
  - b. Can you give examples of disincentives to serving as an academic senate president?
  - c. Can you give examples of incentives to serving as an academic senate president?
10. Do you feel as if your college values your discipline regarding shared governance?
  - a. In what ways?

## **Email Document**

Dear Colleagues:

As partial completion of a doctoral degree at University of California, Los Angeles, this research is the first to conduct comparisons on California community college academic transfer and career technical faculty. The results can be used to inform discussion on faculty participation that involves shared governance as well as training/development programs.

The study will take approximately 40-50 minutes that involves participants being interviewed at their desired locations.

Please indicate your willingness to participate in this study by replying to this email; please include your contact information, office hours, and your discipline.

**I know how busy you are, and truly appreciate your help!**

Respectfully,

Maria Clinton  
Assistant Professor  
Antelope Valley College

## **Document Summary Form**

Site:

Document:

Date received or picked up:

Name or description of document:

Event or contact, if any, with which the document is associated:

Date:

Significance or importance of document:

Brief summary of contents:

**IF DOCUMENT IS CENTRAL OR CRUCIAL TO A PARTICULAR CONTACT**  
(e.g., a meeting agenda, newspaper clipping discussed in an interview), make a copy and include with write-up. Otherwise put in document file.

## Participant Contact Summary Form

Type of Contact:

Site: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Coded: \_\_\_\_\_

Meeting: \_\_\_\_\_ Place: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Place: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1. What were the main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?

2. Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each target questions

Question	Information

3. Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting or important in this contact?

Pick out the most salient points in the contact. Number in order on this sheet and note page number on which point appears. Number point in text of write-up. Attach theme or aspect to each point in CAPITALS. Invent themes where no existing ones apply and asterisk those. Comments may also be included in double parentheses.

Page	Salient Points	Themes/Aspects

## Wagoner's Disaggregate Taxonomy

### 1) Academic

Art History and Appreciation	141	Academic
Music History and Appreciation	149	Academic
Communications Research	183	Academic
Other Communications	190	Academic
English, General	291	Academic
Composition and Creative Writing	292	Academic
American Literature	293	Academic
English Literature	294	Academic
Linguistics	295	Academic
Speech, Debate and Forensics	296	Academic
English as a Second Language	297	Academic
English, Other	300	Academic
Chinese	311	Academic
French	312	Academic
German	313	Academic
Italian	314	Academic
Latin	315	Academic
Japanese	316	Academic
Other Asian	317	Academic
Russian or Other Slavic	318	Academic
Spanish	319	Academic
Other Foreign Languages	320	Academic
Library and Archival Sciences	380	Academic
Mathematics/Statistics	390	Academic
Biochemistry	391	Academic
Biology	392	Academic
Botany	393	Academic
Genetics	394	Academic
Immunology	395	Academic
Microbiology	396	Academic
Physiology	397	Academic
Zoology	398	Academic
Biological Sciences, Other	400	Academic
Astronomy	411	Academic
Chemistry	412	Academic
Physics	413	Academic
Earth, Atmosphere, and Oceanographic	414	Academic
Physical Sciences, Other	420	Academic
Philosophy	440	Academic
Religion	441	Academic
Theology	442	Academic
Physical Education	470	Academic

Social Sciences, General	541	Academic
Anthropology	542	Academic
Archeology	543	Academic
Area and Ethnic Studies	544	Academic
Demography	545	Academic
Geography	547	Academic
History	548	Academic
International Relations	549	Academic
Political Science and Government	550	Academic
Sociology	551	Academic
Other Social Sciences	560	Academic

## 2) New Economy

Agribusiness and Agricultural Production	101	New economy+
Agricultural, Animal, Food and Plant Science	102	New economy+
Renewable Natural Resources	103	New economy+
Banking and Finance	162	New Economy+
Communication Technologies	184	New economy+
Computer and Information Sciences	201	New economy+
Computer Programming	202	New economy+
Data Processing	203	New economy+
Systems Analysis	204	New economy+
Other Computer Science	210	New economy+
Allied Health Technologies	331	New economy+
Science Technologies	530	New economy+

## 3) Professional

Architecture and Environmental Design	121	Professional+
City, Community, and Regional Planning	122	Professional+
Land Use Management & Reclamation	124	Professional+
Other Arch. and Environmental Design	130	Professional+
Design	144	Professional+
Film Arts	146	Professional+
Accounting	161	Professional+
Business Administration and Management	163	Professional+
Human Resources Development	165	Professional+
Organizational Behavior	166	Professional+
Marketing and Distribution	167	Professional+
Other Business	170	Professional+
Engineering, General	261	Professional+
Civil Engineering	262	Professional+
Electrical and Communication Engineering	263	Professional+

Mechanical Engineering	264	Professional+
Chemical Engineering	265	Professional+
Other Engineering	270	Professional+
Engineering-Related Technologies	280	Professional+
Dentistry	332	Professional+
Health Services Administration	333	Professional+
Medicine, including Psychiatry	334	Professional+
Nursing	335	Professional+
Pharmacy	336	Professional+
Public Health	337	Professional+
Veterinary Medicine	338	Professional+
Other Health Sciences	340	Professional+
Law	370	Professional+
Psychology	510	Professional+
Public Affairs	520	Professional+
Economics	546	Professional+?

#### **4) Old Economy**

Other Agriculture	110	Old-
Interior Design	123	Old-
Crafts	142	Old-
Dance	143	Old-/Academic
Dramatic Arts	145	Old-/Academic
Fine Arts	147	Old-/Academic
Music	148	Old-/Academic
Other Visual and Performing Arts	150	Old-
Business Administrative Support	164	Old or Service-
Advertising	181	Old-
Broadcasting and Journalism	182	Old-
Home Economics	350	Old-
Industrial Arts	360	Old-
Carpentry	601	Old-
Electrician	602	Old-
Plumbing	603	Old-
Other Construction Trades	610	Old-
Electrical Repair	641	Old-
Heating, Air Conditioning, and Refrigeration	642	Old-
Vehicle Mechanics and Repairers	643	Old-
Other Mechanics and Repairers	644	Old-
Drafting	661	Old-
Graphic and Print Communications	662	Old-
Leatherworking and Upholstering	663	Old-
Precision Metal Work	664	Old-
Woodworking	665	Old-



Other Precision Production Work	670	Old-
Air Transportation	681	Old-
Land Vehicle and Equip Operation	682	Old-
Water Transportation	683	Old-
Other Transportation and Moving	690	Old-

## **5) Service**

Parks and Recreation	430	Service-
Protective Services	500	Service-
Personal Services	621	Service-
Other Consumer Services	630	Service-

## **6) Teacher Education**

Pre-Elementary	241	Professional+
Elementary	242	Professional+
Secondary	243	Professional+
Adult and Continuing	244	Professional+
Other General Teacher Education Programs	245	Professional+
Teacher Ed in Specific Subjects	250	Professional+

## **7) Other Education**

Education, General	221	Academic
Basic Skills	222	Academic
Bilingual/Cross-cultural Education	223	Academic
Education Evaluation and Research	226	Academic
Educational Psychology	227	Academic
Higher Education	228	Academic
Other Education	231	Academic
Curriculum and Instruction	224	Professional+
Education Administration	225	Professional+
Special Education	229	Professional+
Student Counseling	230	Professional+

## References

- Academic Senate for California Community Colleges. (2011). *College directory*. Retrieved from [http://www.asccc.org/college\\_directory](http://www.asccc.org/college_directory).
- American Federation of Teachers. (2006). *Shared governance in colleges and universities: A statement by higher education program and policy council*. Retrieved from [www.aft.org/pubs-reports/higher\\_ed/shared\\_governance.pdf](http://www.aft.org/pubs-reports/higher_ed/shared_governance.pdf).
- Benjamin, E. (1998). Variations in the characteristics of part time faculty by general fields of instruction and research. In D. W. (Ed.), *The growing use of part-time faculty: Understanding causes and effects*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- California Community Colleges' Chancellor's Office. (2012). *Minimum Qualifications for Faculty and Administrators in California Community Colleges*. Retrieved from [http://www.faccc.org/images/MinimumQualifications12\\_14.pdf](http://www.faccc.org/images/MinimumQualifications12_14.pdf)
- California Community Colleges Student Success Task Force. (2011). *Advances student success in the California community colleges: Recommendations of the California community colleges student task force*. Retrieved from [http://www.californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/executive/studentsuccesstaskforce/sstf\\_final\\_report\\_1-17-12\\_print.pdf](http://www.californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/portals/0/executive/studentsuccesstaskforce/sstf_final_report_1-17-12_print.pdf).
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, A. M. (2008). *The American community college* (5th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Collins, L. (2002). Shared governance in California community colleges. *Academe*, 88(4), 36-40.
- Cowen, A. M. (2003). *The American community college* (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Department of Education. (2011). "Pathways to Prosperity" Report from the Harvard Graduate School of Education Pathways to Prosperity Project. Retrieved from Ed.gov: <http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/new-cte-secretary-duncans-remarks-career-and-technical-education>
- Dougherty, K. J. (1994). *The contradictory college: Conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Frye, J. (1994). Educational paradigms in the professional literature of the community college. In J. S. (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, Vol. X (pp. 181-224). New York: Agathon Press.

- Gall, M. D. (2007). *Educational research: An introduction*. Boston: A & B Publications.
- Gerber, L. (2001). Inextricably linked: Shared governance and academic freedom. *Academe*, 87(3), 22-24.
- Grubb, W. N. (1999). *Honored but invisible: An inside look at teaching in community colleges*. New York: Routledge.
- Grubb, W. N. (2005). Is the tech vs. liberal arts debate out-of-date? Two views. *Community College Week*, 4-5.
- Hollinger, D. A. (2001). Faculty governance, the University of California, and the future of academe. *Academe*, 87(3), 30-33.
- Hubbell, L. (2010). Thankless but vital: The role of the faculty senate chair. *Thought & Action*, 147-152.
- Jones, W. (2011). Faculty involvement in institutional governance: A literature review. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, 117-133.
- Kater, S. &. (2004). Shared governance in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29:1, 1-23.
- Keeton, M. (1971). *Shared authority on campus*. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Kuh, G. D. (1991). It's about time: Using qualitative methods in student life studies. *Journal of College Student Development*, 32, 397-405.
- Levin, J. S. (2006). *Community college faculty*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lumina Foundation for Education. (2009). A stronger nation through higher education. *Lumina Foundation for Education*, 1-128.
- McCarthy, C. (2003). Learning on the job: Moving from faculty to administration. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 39-49.
- Meeting New Leadership Challenges in the Community Colleges. (2000). Claremont: Claremont Graduate University.
- Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative Research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B. (1994). *An expanded sourcebook qualitative data analysis* (2 ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

- Miller, M. (2002). Faculty governance units and their leaders: A national profile. *The NEA Almanac of Higher Education*, 51-58.
- Mortimer, K. P. (1978). *Sharing authority effectively*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Murray, J. P. (2010). *Preparing to hire the best in the perfect storm*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (1997, October 14). *1993 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF-93): Methodology Report*. Retrieved from NCES: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=97467>.
- National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2006). *The condition of education 2006*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006071.pdf>.
- Partnership for Community College Leadership. (2000). *Meeting new leadership challenges in the community colleges*. Claremont: Claremont Graduate University.
- Piland, W. E. (2003). In-house leadership development: Placing the colleges squarely in the middle. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 93-99.
- Rosenthal, R. E. (2008). *Those who would not serve: Factors influencing community college faculty members' interest in applying for administrative positions*. Davis: University of California, Davis.
- Seidman, E. (1985). *In the words of the faculty*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Shulock, N. &. (2012). *Career opportunities: Career technical education and the college completion agenda. Part I*. Sacramento: California State University, Sacramento.
- Shulock, N. (2002). California community colleges' leadership challenge: A view from the field. *Institute for Higher Education Leadership & Policy*, 1-20.
- Simplicio, J. (2006). Shared governance: An analysis of power on modern university campus from the perspective of an administrator. *Education*, 126(4), 6.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- State Board of Education. (1960). *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975*. Retrieved from <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/MasterPlan1960.pdf>
- Strauss, A. &. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Strauss, A. &. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques* (2 ed.). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

- Thaxter, L. &. (1999). Community college faculty involvement in decision-making. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 23, 655-674.
- Tierney, W. &. (2003). *Challenges for governance: A report by the Center for Higher Education Policy*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Townsend, B. K. (2007). *Community college faculty: Overlooked and Undervalued*. San Francisco: Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- Townsend, B. K. (2007). Workload issues and measures of faculty productivity. *Thought and Action*, 23, 1-14.
- Twombly, S. &. (2008). Community college faculty: What we need to know. *Community College Review*, 5-24.
- Underwood, J. C. (1999). Past, present, and future variations in community college organizational structure. *Community College Review*, 26(4), 39-60.
- Valadez, J. R. (2001). Job satisfaction and commitment of two-year college part-time faculty. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 97-108.
- Wagoner, R. L. (2004). *The contradictory faculty: Part-time faculty at community colleges*. Tucson: University of Arizona.
- Wagoner, R. L. (2010). Reconstructing US community college faculty: Mobilizing professional expertise. In T. S. L. Henrickson, *Learning and Work and the Politics of Working Life: Global Transformations and Collective Identities in Teaching, Nursing and Social Work* (pp. 87-106). London: Routledge.
- Weisman, I. M. (2007). The community college presidency: 2006. *American Association of Community Colleges*, 1-12. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED499825.pdf>
- White, K. (1998). Shared governance in California. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 19-29.
- Wild, L. E. (2003). Stress factors and community college deans: The stresses of their role identified. *Community College Review*, 31.
- Williams, D. G. (1987). One faculty's perceptions of its governance role. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 629-657.
- Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative research from start to finish*. New York: Guilford Press.