

Theses and Dissertations

2012

Incentives for part-time faculty to participate in the shared governance process within the institution of California Community Colleges (CCC)

Kristen J. Huyck

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Huyck, Kristen J., "Incentives for part-time faculty to participate in the shared governance process within the institution of California Community Colleges (CCC)" (2012). *Theses and Dissertations*. 299.
<https://digitalcommons.pepperdine.edu/etd/299>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Pepperdine Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Pepperdine Digital Commons. For more information, please contact bailey.berry@pepperdine.edu.

Pepperdine University
Graduate School of Education and Psychology

INCENTIVES FOR PART-TIME FACULTY TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SHARED
GOVERNANCE PROCESS WITHIN THE INSTITUTION OF CALIFORNIA
COMMUNITY COLLEGES (CCC)

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

by

Kristen J. Huyck

September, 2012

Robert Barner, Ph.D. – Dissertation Chairperson

This dissertation, written by

Kristen J. Huyck

under the guidance of a Faculty Committee and approved by its members, has been submitted to and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Doctoral Committee:

Robert Barner, Ph.D., Chairperson

June Schmieder-Ramirez, Ph.D.

Farzin Madjidi, Ed.D.

© Copyright Kristen Huyck (2012)

All Rights Reserved

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
VITA	viii
ABSTRACT	x
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Background	3
Future of Shared Governance in California Community Colleges	5
Statement of Problem	5
Statement of Purpose	6
Research Questions	6
Significance of topic	7
Key Definitions	7
Assumptions	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Summary	10
Chapter 2: Literature Review	12
Community Colleges	12
History of the Institution of California Community College (CCC)	14
Shared Governance	19
History of Shared Governance	20
Assembly Bill 1725: Implementing Shared Governance in California Community Colleges	25
Governance Models	27
Summary of the Four Models of Shared Governance	35
Faculty Role in Shared Governance	35
Incentives/Motivation	36
Criticism of Shared Governance in American Colleges	39
Summary of the Discussion of Part-time Faculty	46
Current Challenges Facing California Community Colleges	46
Economic Crisis	47
Leadership Crisis	48
Part-time Faculty	49
Part-time Faculty Role's in Shared Governance	54
Conclusion	55

Chapter 3: Methodology	57
Theoretical Framework	57
Restatement of Research Questions.....	58
Description of the Research Methodology	59
Population	59
Process for Selection of Data Sources	59
Unit Analysis/ Sample	61
Data Gathering Instrument.....	61
Data Gathering Procedures	66
Description of Proposed Data Analysis Processes.....	67
Plans for IRB.....	68
Summary	68
Chapter 4: Research Findings	69
Response Rate	69
Findings for Each Research Question.....	70
Additional Findings	81
Summary.....	83
Chapter 5: Discussion	85
Brief Summary of Findings	86
Literature Review.....	87
Conclusion and Implications.....	92
Recommendation for Future Research.....	93
Policy Recommendations.....	96
Practitioner Recommendation.....	97
Final Summary.....	99
REFERENCES.....	100
APPENDIX A: Introductory Letter to be Included in Mailed Packet	120
APPENDIX B: Questionnaire.....	121
APPENDIX C: Informed Consent Form to Participate In a Research Study	126
APPENDIX D: Survey Questions: Correlation with the Research	128
APPENDIX E: Oral Instructions to be Provided Upon	
Face-to-Face Administration of Questionnaire.....	134

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Historical timeline of California Community Colleges.....	15
Table 2. Models of Shared Decision Making.....	28
Table 3. Frequency Counts for Selected Variables ($N = 34$).....	72
Table 4. Frequency Counts for Bodies of Shared Governance to which Respondent Has Been Elected or on which Respondent has Served while Employed as a Part-Time Faculty Member ($N = 34$).....	75
Table 5. Frequency Counts for Institutional Incentives Provided to Part-Time Faculty for Their Participation in the Shared Governance Process ($N = 34$).....	76
Table 6. Frequency Counts for Motivational Factors for Part-Time Faculty Who Serve or Have Served in a Shared Governance Position ($N = 34$).....	77
Table 7. Frequency Counts for Barriers for Part-Time Faculty to Serve on a Shared Governance Committee ($N = 34$).....	80

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Being a leader requires more than the efforts of one individual. This dissertation took the work, collaboration, and involvement of many and I would be remised to not thank each and every one of you. To my family, friends, and colleagues-- you were always there—many times even before I realized how much I needed you or before I asked. A special thanks to my mommy who always put up with my crazy and sometimes neurotic ideas and decisions as well as to my two personal lap warmers/paper shufflers/alarm clocks.

Closely tied to my dissertation process is my Pepperdine family. Christy, Dean and Mike—I honestly could not have done it without you.

Finally, this all could not have been possible without the guidance and support of my Chair, Dr. Robert Barner and committee members Dr. June Schmieder-Ramirez and Dr. Farzin Madjidi.

When one chapter closes, a new one begins.....

VITA

OBJECTIVE

To benefit an organization that can use a motivated, social science professional who offers a strong background in classroom instruction as well as practical experience in realm of political science.

EDUCATION

Pepperdine University, 2012

Ed.D. in Organization Leadership

Dissertation: *Incentives for Part-Time Faculty to Participate in the Shared Governance Process Within the Institution of California Community Colleges (CCC)*

Honors: 2009-2010 Chester H. McCall Endowed Scholarship

Grade point average: 3.95

California State University, Fullerton, 2006

M.A. in Political Science

Grade point average: 3.90

University of California, Santa Barbara, 2003

B.A. Honors in Political Science

Areas of Concentration: American government, sociology

AWARDS

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District:

Menifee Site Associate Faculty of the Year, 2011-2012

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, Menifee CA

2007- Current

Adjunct Instructor – Introduction to American Government

Articulates communication skills as lecturer dealing with individuals & groups in the discipline of political science. Broad knowledge of U.S. Government, state & local legislative affairs.

Certificated in online instruction (March 2008)

MiraCosta Community College District, Oceanside CA

2009- Current

Adjunct Instructor – Introduction to American Government & American History, 1900- Present; Political Ideologies; Internship

Mentor and advisor for students enrolled in the internship program

Anthem College Online

2010- Current

**Adjunct Instructor – Introduction to American Government & American History;
Introduction to Sociology**

Participant in redesign of course curriculum

RELATED EXPERIENCE

State of California, Legislative Branch

2008- Current

Field Representative for Assemblyman Kevin Jeffries

Serve as a liaison between Assembly member and constituent on an array of issues including emergency preparedness, infrastructure, water, environment and transportation. Maintain strong connections and relationships with local legislators, city officials, business leaders and local activists.

Assist constituents with problems and issues concerning state-agencies.

Communicate with local municipalities, elected officials, media outlets, community organizations, volunteers & residents

TMG Communications, Inc., Riverside, CA

2004-2008

Account manager

Manage accounts for public and private sector companies pertaining to public affairs/public relations, community outreach, grassroots organization, political campaigning, corporate imaging, fundraising, marketing, & large seminar style events. Effective communicator between company & City/State organizations, media outlets, & community.

Design/develop communication materials for companies, political candidates & events.

Extensive analysis & outreach to local community stakeholders.

PUBLICATIONS AND PAPERS

Leadership Style in Higher Education During Time of Fiscal Distress

2011 Hawaii International Conference on Education

Conference Presenter, Waikiki, HI

2011

MEMBERSHIPS

American Association of Political Consultants

2006

Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education

2009

PUENTE Mentor

2009

ELECTED POSITIONS

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, Menifee Site Council

2010

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, Executive Senate Council

2010

Mt. San Jacinto Community College District, Joint Hiring Committee

2010

ABSTRACT

The involvement of part-time faculty tends to be even lower than the engagement level of full-time faculty who partake in the system of shared governance in the California Community Colleges (CCC). During a time when state funds are diminishing, there is a projection of retirement for many community college leaders (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005), combined with a projected increase in the use of part-time faculty (Feldman & Turnley, 2004), the CCC system cannot afford to marginalize or discourage part-time faculty from serving in shared governance positions (Berret, 2007; Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Shinn, 2004).

A void exists in the academic research exploring the role of part-time faculty involvement in the shared governance process, specifically within the institution of CCCs. This quantitative study will contribute to the field of educational research and fill the void with the use of a descriptive survey targeted toward part-time faculty members serving in the elected position of the Academic Senate.

The purpose of this study is to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in CCCs in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system. A convenience purposeful sample was taken targeting faculty members who have served in an elected position of shared governance (Academic Senate) in one of the 112 CCCs. A survey was developed and employed where each question was followed with a selection of answers and an open-ended question.

The study concludes that: (a) part-time faculty who serve in an elected position of shared governance come from an array of disciplines and scheduled to teach courses during all times, face-to-face and online, (b) part-time faculty members frequently offered the opportunity to participate in the shared governance process, (c) not all elected positions of shared governance for part-time faculty include compensation, (d) “Goal internalization” presented the greatest motivation to serve, and (e) not having the benefit of tenure was part-time faculty’s greatest barrier in serving in the shared governance process.

Chapter 1: Introduction

With continuous cuts to the institution of community colleges in California (Scott, 2011), 50% of people in leadership positions in this system will be preparing for retirement in the next couple of years (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005) and approximately 40% of course sections will be taught by part-time faculty (Mahon, 2008). Given these circumstances, the system of shared governance find a way to adapt to the changing environment.

Unique to higher education (Berret, 2007), the concept of shared governance is defined as “the division of authority and decision-making responsibility between faculty and administration based on a distinct expertise” (Rhoades, 2005, p. 1). Shared governance essentially allows decisions of a college district to be made in a deliberative and collaborative fashion where various groups have representation in the process. Although shared governance has been practiced in colleges for decades (Corson, 1960), faculty involvement in the process was not formalized until the 1960s when the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) in collaboration with the American Council on Education (ACE), and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGBUC) issued the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (AAUP, ACE, & AGBUC, 1966).

In 1989, with the passage of California Assembly Bill 1725 (AB 1725), the door for full-time faculty participation in the shared governance process opened for members of the California Community Colleges (CCCs). In an attempt to solidify the system of shared governance, AB 1725 required all major decisions that impact the college to be made in collaboration between the administration, staff, and students (Faculty

Association of California Community Colleges, 1989). Major decisions include, but are not limited to, professional matters such as curriculum, degree requirement, and grading policies. Among the many benefits of shared governance, Lee and Zemke (1993) explain that faculty and administrators hold better attitudes towards students, faculty experience an increase in morale, and there tends to be a decline in faculty turnover. Furthermore, shared governance provides a tool needed to provide an overall effective learning environment (Halford, 1994).

The AAUP (2003b) explains the critical need for faculty participation in order to have a functional system of shared governance; however, faculty involvement tends to be low and is projected to only get worse as current leaders retire. According to Benton (1997), full-time faculty want to be engaged in the direction in which their college is heading, yet during annual elections, their participation in shared governance continues to be low in each college district. When full-time faculty members are not involved in the shared governance decision-making process, a level of tension is generated between faculty and administration (Lee & Zemke, 1993). In addition, despite the increase in numbers, part-time (also referred to as adjunct or contingent) faculty are the fastest growing group in the CCC system, but experience little inclusion in the shared governance process (Greisler, 2002). According to the Academic Senate of California Community Colleges (2002):

few part-time faculty participate in these processes [shared governance].

Recognizing the circumstances of part-time faculty, it is clear that without proactive leadership at the state and local Academic Senate levels, few part-time faculty will develop the needed background experience and collegial confidence

required to become a successful Senate delegate or Executive Committee member. (p. 12)

Coupled with the apathy of faculty members, even though all 112 community colleges in California have established a system of shared governance, the problem arises in the projected number of available positions of leadership. With approximately 50% of leadership in the institution preparing for retirement within the next few years (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005), another threat is presented to the system of shared governance. The need to backfill shared governance positions of leadership is increasingly apparent; however, the talent available to train the replacements is diminishing due to pending retirements and current hiring freezes. Despite the economic burden and constraints placed on the community college (2-year college) system, statistics indicate a deficiency in the number of available candidates who can fill the leadership positions (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). In order to uphold the shared governance process in the CCCs, it is essential to focus attention on the role of part-time faculty in the governance process.

Background

The CCCs are currently experiencing three factors that threaten the future of shared governance: (a) decrease in funding from the state, (b) increase in the leadership gap, and (c) projected increase in the use of part-time faculty.

Decrease of funding. Across California, newspaper headlines are discussing the current fiscal crises experienced in the state. The economic uncertainty in California is by no means a new trend for community colleges. However, after the public passed Proposition 13, which aimed to decrease property taxes in the late 1970s, the CCC has relied heavily on its funding from the state. According to Scott (2011), “These are

difficult times for California and there's no way to avoid the pain of budget cuts.

However, if our community colleges sustain reductions of this magnitude, we anticipate up to 350,000 students will be turned away next year" (p. 2).

Leadership gap. Another challenge being faced by CCCs is the foreseeable development of a leadership gap. According to an American Association of Community Colleges (AACC) study released in 2001, the leadership crisis in community colleges was recognized over a decade ago with the aging of presidents, administrators, and faculty (Schults, 2001). By 2012, statistics indicate that one-third of the administrators in the CCC will be eligible for retirement (McPhail-Naples, 2006). As retirement approaches for many of the administrators, the CCC as an institution does not have the means to backfill the expected vacancies (Schults, 2001), and as little as 8% of community college faculty have been exposed to leadership opportunities (McPhail-Naples, 2006; Outcalt, 2002).

Increased use of part-time faculty. Correlated with the fiscal challenges at the state and federal levels, the use of part-time faculty is becoming increasingly common (Gordon, 2002; Orr, 2010; Rifkin, 1998). Higher education is seeing an increase in the hiring of part-time faculty as means to reduce institutional operating costs (Mize, 1998). There has been a 376% increase in the use of part-time faculty appointments in higher educational institutions since the 1970s, 5 times the growth rate of full-time faculty (Schuster & Finkelstein, 2006). Most recently, in 2007, approximately 80% of community college faculty nationwide are serving in non-tenure track positions (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010). The percentage is expected to increase as the effect of the economic turbulent times trickle down into each CCC district.

Although both budget constraints and the increase in hiring of part-time faculty pose two separate issues, part-time faculty could be seen as prospects for filling leadership positions within the institution of shared governance. Commonly overlooked as a training opportunity for new community college leaders is the professional development provided to faculty members who partake in the shared governance process. During the shared decision making process for the college, all instructional issues are discussed thoroughly and solutions for moving the college forward are proposed (Pope & Miller, 2005).

Future of Shared Governance in California Community Colleges

The shared governance system in the CCCs is by no means flawless; however, the challenges may threaten the role of faculty (Benjamin & Carroll, 1998) and essentially the future of faculty involvement within the institution. Crellin (2010) explains that “shared governance is integral to the culture of the academy. It is part tradition, part tactic, and largely symbolic” (p.76). This study does not intend to advocate for or support the increase of part-time faculty involvement in the CCC system, but it does recognize the stress being placed on the concept of shared governance. Looking at the role of part-time faculty is just one of the many solutions that may protect the use of dual decision-making within higher education.

Statement of Problem

The involvement of part-time faculty tends to be even lower than the engagement level of full-time faculty who partake in the system of shared governance in the CCCs. Successful CCCs understand the importance of the strong leadership needed to sustain and grow. During a time when state funds are diminishing, there is a projection of

retirement for many community college leaders (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). Given this, as well as a projected increase in the use of part-time faculty (Feldman & Turnley, 2004), the CCC system cannot afford to marginalize or discourage part-time faculty from serving in shared governance positions (Berret, 2007; Feldman & Turnley, 2004; Shinn, 2004). Part-time faculty serve as a valuable resource in sustaining the CCC institution throughout the state.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in CCCs in order to make recommendations regarding what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system.

Research Questions

If one can examine the current participation of part-time faculty in the shared governance process at public CCCs, recommendations can be made regarding the incentives for future use by the CCC system. Using a descriptive design, this study sought responses to the following research questions:

1. What are the demographics characteristics of part-time faculty member who serve in shared governance?
2. Are part-time faculty included in the elected positions of the shared governance process?
3. What institutional incentives are provided to part-time faculty for their participation in the shared governance process?

4. How do part-time faculty become aware of the institutional incentives provided to them for their participation in the shared governance process?
5. What were the motivating factors and purpose for part-time faculty to participate in a shared governance position?
6. What are the greatest barriers and for part-time faculty to serve in a shared governance position?

Significance of topic

Part-time faculty members are the fastest growing group within CCCs, the largest system of higher education in the world (Collins, 2002). As the concern for sustaining a shared governance model increases, it is necessary to look at this often-overlooked population (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). There is an increase in the hiring of part-time faculty in the CCC system in order to accommodate the current constraints of dwindling funds. The growing body of part-time faculty is drastically underrepresented in the shared governance process implemented by state community colleges. While research has been conducted to explore the role of full-time faculty involved in the shared governance process (Baca, 1998; Benton, 1997; Birnbaum, 1991a; Collins, 1996; Flanigan, 1994; McPhail-Naples, 2006; Redmond, 2011), as well as the role of part-time faculty at the institution of community colleges (Antony & Valdez, 1998; Berret, 2007; Boord, 2010; Chandler, 2011; Jacoby, 2005; Orr, 2010; Washington, 2011), there is a gap in the literature addressing the role of part-time faculty in the shared governance system of community college systems.

Key Definitions

This study will utilize the following key definitions.

Academic Senate: Working on a representative basis, entities within the purview of shared governance that work to allow faculty a means to participate in the decision-making process (Gilmour, 1991; Pope & Miller, 2005). Typically elected by one's peers. Also referred to as faculty senate, staff senate, or councils.

American Association of University Professors (AAUP): An association with the purpose of upholding and advancing academic freedom and shared governance in the realm of higher education. In the 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, the AAUP specified guidelines developed for governing board, administrators, faculty, students, and other constituents of an institution to engage in the dialogue and share responsibility in the decision-making process regarding internal operations.

Community college: As referred to as “junior college” and “2-year college.”

California Community College (CCC): The largest institution of higher education in the world, employing more than 93,500 people and consisting of 112 community colleges in 72 separate districts (CCCs Chancellor's Office, 2010a).

Community College Reform Act of 1988 (AB 1725): Introduced in the California Assembly on March 5, 1987 by John Vasoncellos and co-authored by some of his colleagues came from the attempt to implement shared governance within the California Community College system. Governor George Deukejian signed AB 1725 on September 19, 1988.

Full-time faculty: Any faculty member, which includes both the “regular and contract faculty members teaching credit instruction” (California Education Code §87482.6, 2008). Also referred to as “full-timers” and simply, “full-time.”

Governance: The dual decision-making process involved in higher education that occurs between two entities: faculty and administration (Corson, 1960). Faculty have authority over curricula, instruction, classroom issues, and research, while administration has authority over operations of the institution, including finance, student affairs, public affairs, and physical structures.

Part-time faculty: Any faculty member who works for no more than 67% of the hours per week that is considered to be a full-time position in the institution of the CCCs (California Education Code § 87482.5, 2008). Also referred to as “part-timers” or “adjunct.”

Shared governance: Campus entities and stakeholder groups who work in a collegial manner to make decisions relating to college policies (Baca, 1998). Stakeholder groups include governing boards, administrators, classifieds, faculty and students (Kater & Levin, 2004). Also referred to as participatory governance, self-governance, and academic governance (Kater & Levin, 2004; Orr, 2010).

Assumptions

This study is based on two assumptions. The first assumption is that shared governance is the best form of decision-making process within the CCC system. As Winston Churchill explained, “Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time” (as cited in Elliott & Summerskill, 1957, p. 124). Thus, while shared governance is not perfect and includes challenges and setbacks, this study assumes that in a democratic educational society, it is the best form of decision-making process.

In addition, the study assumes that part-time faculty members do serve and partake in the shared governance process. The research reveals that part-time faculty are invited to serve, however, it is not confirmed that part-time faculty have taken advantage of the opportunity. Furthermore, the research design rests on the concept that if part-time faculty do not serve, with the right motivation and incentives, they would do so.

Limitations of the Study

Despite the researcher's attempt to create the best quantitative design possible, this study possesses some limitations, and there are inherent confines to quantitative research. Quantitative research is not best for dealing with unanticipated results (Liebscher, 1998). Complicated, multifaceted issues cannot be quantified easily in numeric form. The results of the study, which looks at a limited sample, may not necessarily be generalizable to the larger population.

Next, the study was conducted by a researcher who may be perceived as biased. During the time in which the study took place, the researcher was also serving as a part-time faculty at two CCCs. Furthermore, the researcher was an elected member of the Academic Senate and Site Council at one of the colleges at which she was employed at the time of the study. The researcher attempted to control for any possible bias via the full reporting of findings.

Summary

Limited funding from the state, a growing gap in participants to serve in leadership roles, and a movement to hire more part-time faculty members within CCCs all threaten the tradition of shared governance. Increased involvement in the shared governance process by part-time faculty within the CCC may not prove to be a solution

in ensuring the future viability of the shared decision process, but still presents a viable option that merits future exploration.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of part-time faculty at CCCs. The review of the literature is divided into four subsections: (a) a historical examination of community colleges, specifically in California; (b) an overview of shared governance and decision-making models; (c) a discussion of the challenges facing the CCC system; and finally, (d) an examination of part-time faculty, particularly their role in shared governance.

Community Colleges

Described as the “democracy’s colleges,” starting in 1901, 2-year colleges in the United States began to play an integral role in higher education’s equality movement. Not only do community colleges provide a path toward completing the first 2 years of undergraduate work, they also provide professional training and guidance towards expanding on an array of diverse interests. University of California and California State Universities are the first components of the plan; community colleges are the last piece of the California higher education equation, providing academic and vocational instruction and allowing students to complete lower division courses or obtain a certificate or credential (University of California: Office of the President, 2009). Essentially, the community college system supplies the glue that binds higher education together (Griffith & Connor, 1994).

When the national expansion of the 2-year system took place in the 1960s, the institution once serving as a means to a technical degree had become a system much larger than once intended. In a recession, the increase in enrollment at the community college level continues to grow (Leonhardt, 2010; Mandel & LeVine, 2009).

Focusing specifically in California, the growth in matriculated students within the community college system has led to an increase in hiring part-time faculty. During the development of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education, the ratio of full-time to part-time faculty in the public junior college system was less than 1 to 20 (Master Plan Survey Team, 1998). At the time of conception, part-time instructors were reserved for night programs, standalone courses for adult learners, or occasional substitutes for full-time tenured faculty (Academic Senate for California, Community Colleges, 2002). After November 1967, the California legislative body established the permanent classification of part-time faculty as temporary employees and through the implementation of Education Code §133337.5, referred to as “the 60% law,” part-time faculty of adult and community college courses were classified as “temporary” if they taught less than 60% of what regular full-time instructors taught (Academic Senate for California, Community Colleges, 2002).

Similar to the growth of enrollment in community college on the national level, the CCC is facing enrollment pressures in addition to recessionary setbacks. Increased enrollment in CCCs has also been caused by students who have filtered out of the University of California system as a result of fee increases and a more stringent selection process by the California State University system (Doyle, 2008; Wilcox, 2009). Community colleges are no longer about doing more with less; rather, it is a matter of altering the CCC and making the unthinkable happen by accommodating students that other California public higher education institutions cannot.

History of the Institution of California Community College (CCC)

After the American Civil War, the 13th and 14th grades in public education were developed and later established in the form of junior colleges (Baca, 1998). As presented in Table 1, the first community colleges were established in Illinois and California during the turn of the 20th century and into the early 1900s (Vaughn, 2001). In California specifically, the first postgraduate courses of study were established and authorized by the state legislature. Through the 1917 legislative enactment of the “Junior College Act,” the purview of these postgraduate courses was expanded to encompass industries like the economy of the household, industrial arts, agriculture, and commerce. In 1921, the state legislature approved the development of community college districts. Similar to local kindergarten through 12th grade school districts, the junior college districts were overseen by community members elected to trustee positions. Each school district was then accountable to the State Department of Education (Community College League of California, n.d.).

The junior college system was established in the early 1900s, however, it was not until after World War II when the institution underwent a great deal of growth due to the passage of the GI bill. The expansion of the system gave testament to the prevalence of American higher education; however, the expansion was not without its challenges. There was great concern that the state would not be able to meet the goal of providing a college experience to residents in a cost-effective manner (Community College League of California, n.d.).

Table 1

Historical timeline of California Community Colleges

1907	First “postgraduate courses of study” authorized to high schools by the California and Illinois State Legislatures.
1917	Junior College Act: expands the mission of higher education to include trade studies like mechanical arts, household economy, agriculture and commerce.
1921	State legislature authorized the creation of junior college districts.
1932	38 Junior Colleges established in the state, jumping to 50 in 1950 and 56 by 1960.
1944	GI Bill increased college enrollments.
1950	50 Junior Colleges established in the state.
1960	Master Plan for Higher Education to ensure a place in the system of higher education for all California residents; banned tuition for community colleges.
1967	Legislation passed creating the Chancellor’s Office and Board of Governors.
1978	Proposition 13 passed.
1988	Assembly Bill (AB) 1725: The Community College Reform Act of 1988 implemented.
2011	California Community Colleges (CCC) is the largest institution of higher education in world.

Until the 1950s, CCCs were connected to the state’s public K-12 public education system (Baca, 1998; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

However, in 1960, the Board of Regents, the California State Board of Education, and the state legislature collaborated to establish the original Master Plan for California’s Higher Education and set out to accomplish four goals (University of California: Office of the

President, 2009). The first goal was to create a system that would uphold quality and allow access to higher education for all students. In order to make this notion a reality, the plan banned tuition, as it was based on the idea that public higher education should be free to students (just like K-12 primary and secondary education); thus, it was determined that California residents should not pay tuition, by law (Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education, 1960).

The second goal set out to generate a cohesive and rational system to include universities and colleges in California. With this, colleges would be less likely to engage in competition and could work collaboratively to provide a universal system of higher education that would be attractive to all kinds of students. In connection to the second mission, the master plan presented a framework for higher education in California and encouraged the three segments (University of California universities, state colleges, and community colleges) to reach excellence within their respective realms. The mission of the University of California schools is to become the state's primary research institutions, whereas state schools are to provide undergraduate education and graduate research for students in pursuit of a higher degree.

Community colleges (formerly recognized as junior colleges) are the last piece of the higher education equation; their task is to provide academic and vocational instruction, allowing students to complete lower division courses or obtain a certificate or credential (University of California: Office of the President, 2009). The Master Plan established a 17-member Community College Board of Governors and aligned the institution of the community college with higher education, rather than K-12 (Baca, 1998; CCCs Chancellor's Office, 2010a; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the

Chancellor, 1998). Members of the Board of Governors are each selected by the governor and work as liaisons in dealing with both the state and federal government. The power possessed by the Board of Governors extends its power to appoint the chancellor of state community colleges (CCC's Chancellor's Office, 2010a).

As California's Master Plan for Higher Education took a progressive look at the growth of the system of higher education within the state, it could not anticipate the effects that would be caused by the passage of Proposition 13. Staying true to their title, CCCs were largely controlled by their respective communities prior to 1978 (Baca, 1998; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). With this, students were required to be local residents, the college's elected governing boards were members of the community, and most of the funding from the colleges was generated from local property taxes (Baca, 1998). However, once the voter-driven Proposition 13 was initiated, the CCC system would undergo a great deal of change. Proposition 13, also known as the Jarvis-Gann initiative, was a "ballot measure that cut property taxes and significantly reduced revenues for local government" (Gerston & Christensen, 2007, p. 164). Although Proposition 13 was successful in reducing local taxes by 57%, the modified tax structure caused many local government entities, one being community colleges, to become reliant on the state for funding (Gerston & Christensen, 2007). Going from receiving approximately 40% of its funding from the state before the passage of Proposition 13, CCCs were forced to increase their dependence so that almost 70% of their funds were derived from the state (California Higher Education Policy Center, 1997).

Proposition 13 has and continues to have a crippling effect on the CCC system in that it constrains the funding source for the institution. In California, as addressed in the Master Plan for High Education, community colleges were based on the conceptualization that higher education should be free for all residents. Within the state, economic deficiencies have forced the system of higher education to abandon the ideal of tuition-free education. In the early 1990s unit fees at the CCCs equated to \$13 per unit but currently are \$36 per unit (Gordon, 2002).

Following the passage of Proposition 13 in 1978, the California State legislature passed several pieces of legislation that opened up the community college district and allowed a “free flow” (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). Free flow allows “students to attend the college of their choice rather than the colleges of their district” (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998, p. 2). Some have equated the “free flow” of students with as a need to diminish the role of the local governing board, since the community college was no longer providing services to a particular region, but instead to the students of the state.

Between 1978 and 1986, the California State legislature took an active and micromanagement role with issues dealing with the state. During these 8 years, more than 1,750 state statutes were added, amended, and repealed in regards to community colleges. The actions of the legislature resulted in a decrease of \$30 million appropriated for vocational and recreational courses and, for the first time in its history, community colleges were required to charge tuition (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

As the funding source for the CCC system changed, trustees, presidents, and system leaders approached the state legislature as a means to develop and implement a statutory solution to governance (Baca, 1998). Essentially, the Master Plan for Higher Education was in need of revisions. Through the efforts of all parties involved, the legislature passed AB1725: The Community College Reform Act of 1988 which established the role of community colleges in California.

Today, as the largest institution of higher education throughout the world, the CCC system employs more than 93,500 people and offers courses to an increasing 2.9 million students annually (CCC's Chancellor's Office, 2010a). The institution of community colleges in California is made up of 112 schools in 72 districts (CCC's Chancellor's Office, 2010a). The CCC system provides a higher education at an affordable price and is geographically manageable for students (Orr, 2010).

Shared Governance

Unique to higher education, the concept of shared governance is defined as “the division of authority and decision-making responsibility between faculty and administration based on a distinct expertise” (Rhoades, 2005, p. 1). According to Birnbaum (1991a), shared governance has four functions: (a) contribution from faculty to the institution, (b) acting as a forum for debate, (c) joint understanding and buy-in of institutional goals and (d) commitment to professional ethics.

According to Benton (1997), full-time faculty want to be engaged in the direction in which their college is heading. When full-time faculty become involved in shared governance, they lend their experience as experts in academic matters (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010). Additionally, through their participation in the decision-making process, the level

of tension between faculty and administration is decreased (Lee & Zemke, 1993). In addition to providing a voice to the faculty, shared governance also acts as a training ground for future leadership within higher education (Pope & Miller, 2005).

History of Shared Governance

According to the AAUP (1995), shared governance is:

merely a structure that allocates authority, and authority needs to be exercised if even the most appropriate allocated of it is to have its intended effects. Faculty members must be willing to participate in the decision making process over which a sound governance system gives authority. (p. 188)

Throughout history, because of their expertise, professional standing, and intellectual competence, faculty have been involved in the decision-making process at colleges and universities (Corson, 1960). However, the degree of faculty opinion and involvement has been a continuous path of progression.

In her dissertation, Locke (2004) established four notable eras of shared governance: (a) the medieval university, (b) early American higher education, (c) early 20th century, and (d) post World War I.

The medieval university. Based on ideals established the 8th century and originating in northern France, the concept of academic governance initially focused mainly on academic freedom and self-governance (Metzger, 1989). As the perception of teaching evolved, so has the role of self-governance. During the Middle Ages, teaching at a university was a respected position, and the occupation remained self-governed with a general lack of oversight (Duryea, 1984). In the Medieval university, students typically

controlled the tuition costs and curriculum, while the faculty “was the controlling wheel of the institution” (Cohen & Brawer, 1982, p. 110).

Early American higher education. Institutions of higher education in the United States began in the mid-1600s with the establishment of Harvard in 1636 and William and Mary College in 1693 (Locke, 2004). Both universities followed the English model where there was an external entity to oversee the actions of the college, a faculty elected leader, and a legislative entity put in place by the faculty. In 1701, Yale University, with an entirely external board that governed the institution, created the model of governance for the American University. At the time, it was common for the state legislatures to farm out governing authority over the college to board of control: boards (Duryea, 1984; Locke, 2004). According to Clark (1964), governing boards are used as a means to bring public accountability and professional sovereignty to academia. In addition, outside boards governing higher education uphold the American creed of democracy and capitalism through the promotion of citizen involvement (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973). Notwithstanding the strong presence of external boards, faculty (even junior members) had a presence in the decision-making of the college (Duryea, 1984).

Contrary to high faculty involvement in shared governing, Cohen and Brawer (1982) claim the 19th century was a time period of strong centralization of higher education in the United States. During this time, the shared process of decision-making was weakened (Cohen & Brawer, 1982) as the role and influence of the president increased (Kaufman, 1984). As a result, faculty began to organize into departments and administrative positions such as deans and department chairs (Locke, 2004).

Early 20th century. As the institution of higher education entered into the turn of 20th century, conflict between the professionalism and specialization of faculty (Clark, 1964) coupled with the complexities of the expanded institution became evident (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973). In addition, college instruction in the United States started to shift and experience a decrease in prestige, creating an increase in control from elected officials and corporations (Baca, 1998).

During the first part of the 20th century, a Columbian psychologist by the name of J. McKeen Cattell started a movement that advocated for new ways to govern in academia (Baca, 1998). Cattell's efforts resulted in a reduction of power from the president's office and advocated for the implementation of a shared decision-making process between faculty and administration, often referred to as collegial governance (Metzger, 1989).

Post World War I. After World War I, attention began to shift to the need for academic freedom and faculty control regarding academic issues (Locke, 2004). Edel (1990) explains that the need for greater faculty involvement in the decision-making process was a product of what was occurring in the greater political arena: the threat of fascism. The 1930s was filled with fear of the spread of fascism and decline of democratic values. Edel explains:

the idea of rule by the people as against rule by the elected representatives of the people was a matter of serious debate. The official view was that rule was best carried out by leaders...For the public to take part in ruling was to invite "mobocracy." (p. 26).

In response, the need to defend democracy was on the rise, which led to an increased need for of democracy within the institution of American higher education (Edel, 1990).

In 1940, the AAUP strived towards academic freedom and tenure, though it was not until the 1960s when AAUP, in collaboration with the ACE and the AGBUC, developed and issued the *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* (AAUP et al., 1966). This document identified and developed guidelines that opened the dialogue and shared responsibilities in the decision-making process for various actors and entities to include: the governing board, administrators, students, faculty, and other constituents (AAUP, 2003b). The *Statement* encouraged involvement by all stakeholders, stating “the colleges and universities of the United States have reached a stage calling for appropriately shared responsibility and cooperative action among the component of the academic institution” (AAUP et al., 1966, p. 1.). The various components involved were to include the governing boards, administration, students, and faculty (Kater & Levin, 2004). AAUP’s principles were not intended to place absolute control in the hands of the faculty, but rather balance the power (Richardson, 1999). AAUP’s *Statement*, in conjunction with the *Faculty Participation in Academic Governance* released by the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE) and the National Education Association (NAE), set the stage for open discussion (Baca, 1989).

The 1960s saw great advancement in establishing shared governance; however, both economic and academic conditions slowed the progress during the early 1970s (Schuster & Miller, 1989). The 1970s ushered in a pivotal turning point for shared governance and intuitional decision-making. With increased involvement from both the state and federal governments and the increase in influence of outside stakeholders, the

concept of faculty unionization began to spread (Kater & Levin, 2004). Meanwhile, this decade witnessed a shift in student demographics, an expansion of services provided by the college, and increased intervention of external agencies (Baldrige, 1971; Corson, 1960; Kater & Levin, 2004).

As the 1980s approached, higher education underwent a period of growth and prosperity (Kater & Levin, 2004). Literature and research expanded on the system of shared governance in higher education and organizational theory became prevalent. In addition, the institution of higher education started to place greater emphasis on collaborations and consensus, which could only occur with participation by all stakeholders (Kater & Levin, 2004). In 1986 a study commissioned by Foothill-DeAnza Community College District looked at the leadership in community college governance (Fryer & Lovas, 1991). The research found bureaucratic, collegial, political and anarchical leadership models being used in most community colleges; most presidents were advocating for policy upholding greater shared decision-making (Orr, 2010).

Shared governance emerged into the institution of higher education in California in 1989 with the signing and implementation of AB 1725, which established the legal governing authority between the state board and local governing board within California's higher education system. In addition, AB 1725 increased the governance responsibilities of the faculty, as well as ensuring administration involvement and faculty participation (Kater & Levin, 2004).

Assembly Bill 1725: Implementing Shared Governance in California Community Colleges

As mentioned previously, the fiscally uncertain economy of the 1970s led voters in California to drive and pass the public initiative Proposition 13. Tax-based support for community colleges started to decrease because of the limited and slow growth of tax generation and revenue (Baca, 1998). As the state assumed much of the fiscal responsibility of the community college system, a greater need to control the colleges also arose (Baca, 1998; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). Shifts from the state legislature and governor resulted in statewide layoffs of faculty, administrators, and staff; elimination of summer school; and decreased support budgets (Rivera, 2011).

The state completed a reevaluation of its Master Plan for Higher Education in 1988, resulting in the passage and implementation of AB 1725, which accomplished two things: increase the professionalization of community college faculty (Academic Senate for CCCs, 2002) and strengthen the governance roles of the Academic Senate in each community college (Academic Senate for CCCs, 2002; Locke, 2004). The faculty hiring process evolved by moving from the credential system used in K-12 education to hiring individuals on the basis of achievement of minimum qualifications set by the Board of Education (Academic Senate for CCCs, 2002). AB 1725 called for many actions that would increase the role of Academic Senates. For example, Academic Senates were responsible for the quality of faculty hired.

As former Chancellor of the CCCs, Nussbaum (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998) states that AB 1725 “delineated the respective powers of

the Board of Governors and local boards, not unlike how our nation's Constitution specified the role of federal and state government" (p. 7). However, not ignoring the progress that the reform made, the shared governance structure was embedded with some of the same weaknesses inherent in the Articles of Confederation. Just as the Articles of Confederation accommodated each state's reluctance to give up autonomy to the federal government, the governing boards within each district were unwilling to yield power to the system board. Part of the reason for this relationship was the lack of trust established between the district and state (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

The specific models of shared governance will later be addressed in greater detail, however, relevant to the discussion of AB 1725, in his research, Howell (1997) found that post implementation of AB 1725, shared governance models at the community college level utilized a mixed model form of decision-making (bureaucratic, collegial and political), unlike the frequently sustained bureaucratic model used before AB 1725. In fact, the bureaucratic model was used less frequently than the others once AB 1725 was applied. Howell also found that AB 1725 was working as intended and provided a means for shared governance.

As Nussbaum explains, "Without a doubt, AB 1725 ushered in a new era of 'shared governance' for the community colleges...constituents now have explicit legal rights" (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998, p. 8). However, shared governance in higher education continues to face many challenges, some anticipated and some unforeseen. "Increasing board activism, declining resources, increasing enrollments, more governmental intervention, globalization, public distrust

and inquiry into the nature of academic governance” (Kater & Levin, 2004, p. 5) are all factors that test the resilience of the shared governance decision-making body.

Governance Models

The foundation of the United States government is based on the concept of popular sovereignty, which places ultimate political control in the hands of the people. Although a number of theories have been created to describe and explain American democracy, scholars have established three main concepts: elite theory, majoritarian theory, and pluralism. In elite theory, group decisions are made according to the interests of a small group of individuals: the educated and wealthy. In contrast, majoritarianism, also described as democracy for all, explains that all constituents in a democracy hold a position in the decision-making process and the government should follow the directive of the majority. Finally, pluralism views democracy as a conflict between interest groups. Decisions are reached through negotiation between competing constituent groups (Schmidt, Shelley, & Bardes, 2009).

When examining the shared governance process, which is the implementation of democracy at the institutional level, it is essential to understand the governance framework and administrative process (Baldrige, 1971). Parallel to the three theories of democracies in American, Baldrige (1971), in his book, *Academic Governance*, addresses three governance models that can be found at the epicenter of each institutional governance theory. The three models – bureaucracy, collegial, and political – are described in Table 2 (Baldrige, 1971).

Table 2

Models of Shared Decision Making

	Bureaucratic	Collegial	Political
Characteristics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Positions of leadership are appointed as opposed to elected -Security of tenure -Rank is present and respected -Organization exists through state charter -Hierarchical -Governed by formal written policy and procedures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Emphasizes professional authority of faculty rather chain-in-command -Process of consensus building 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Decisions made through the involvement of interest groups -Embraces conflict and negotiation
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Sufficient when dealing with large entities -Fixed salaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based on the process of consensus building -Exclusive participation in the decision-making process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Addresses policy development -Fluidity of the organization
Challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Does not address informal power structure -Fails to address process, change and policy development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Creates confusion -Does not address the presence of conflict; therefore not practical -Requires participation of all stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Constant division and formation of groups which could potentially decrease collaboration -Decisions are made by a few due to lack of interest
Theory of democracy	Elite theory	Majoritarianism theory	Pluralism

Bureaucratic model. Comparable to the elite theory of American democracy, the bureaucratic model places decision-making in the hands of individuals higher in the institution and follows a top-down manner of decision-making. Frequently found in kindergarten to 12th grade schools, as well as community colleges, the bureaucratic model places authority in the hands of the individuals at the top and delegates tasks

downward (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010; Howell, 1997). In his extensive studies of organizations, German sociologist Max Weber characterized the bureaucratic model as rational in nature, hierarchical with impersonal authority, specialized in the grouping of individuals according to their area of competencies, and using many rules and regulations (Weber, Henderson, & Parsons, 1947). Furthermore, in the bureaucratic model instituted in higher education, positions are appointed rather than elected, salaries are fixed, and rank is upheld and respected (Baldrige, 1974; Locke, 2004).

Weber et al. (1947) argued that as institutions (both private and public) become more complex and laden with increased demands, the formation of bureaucracies is inevitable. Applying Weber et al.'s theory, Birnbaum (1991b) points out how, as the institution of higher education grew, it became more departmentalized and work specialization became a major factor in the bureaucratic model. Relationships within a college were made according to position rather than personality, and decisions were made in a top-down function, with the president of the university being at the top (Baldrige, 1974).

During the time in which AB 1725 introduced shared governance into the CCC system, a national higher education ideological shift occurred. Higher education was encouraged to incorporate corporate models and uphold managerial tactics, thus exaggerating the bureaucratic hierarchy (Birnbaum, 2000; Collins, 2002). The introduction of such managerial models such as management by objective, total quality management, continuous quality improvement, and business process re-engineering into the community college system solidified the use of the bureaucratic model that disregarded faculty governance (Birnbaum, 2000). More attention was placed on

accountability, inputs, and outputs such that the mere concept of shared governance and faculty participation was neglected.

Furthermore, at the community college level, when administrators frequently come from secondary schools, the private sector, or programs that focus on higher education leadership, where a top-down structure is typically implemented, the bureaucratic model is commonly used. In such cases, administrators can dominate the decision-making process; however, it is essential that power be delegated to faculty on academic matters in order to maintain a system of shared governance (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010).

While the bureaucratic model sufficiently addresses the sheer size of higher education, particularly at the CCC level, it faces some challenges. According to Clark (1964), “academic man is a special kind of professional man, a type characterized by a particularly high need for autonomy” (p. 271). The need and preference for independence can pose challenges for management in that faculty may not feel the need to follow specific rules and regulations (Clark, 1964). Locke (2004) adds that the bureaucratic model, which is laden with rules and procedures, does not accommodate change, policy development, or process. The bureaucratic model, though at times slow in making decisions and inefficient if the proper amount of information is not presented (Berrett, 2007), is the most commonly used model in higher education (Baldrige, 1974; McMillen, 2002; Zusman, 2005).

Collegial model. As the bureaucratic model still remains in use within the CCCs, according to the AAUP et al.’s 1966 *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, the collegial and political models are more advantageous to the decision-

making process. The collegial model, rather than being hierarchical in structure, is an informal decision-making model based on consensus building and community (Baldrige, 1974; Berdahl, 1991; Millett, 1977). Analogous to the majoritarian theory of American democracy, in the collegial model, all constituents are viewed as equals and presented with the same opportunities for task delegation (Baldrige, 1974). In order to resolve impersonal rules embedded in the bureaucratic model, the collegial form of decision-making empowers the stakeholder to partake in a multidirectional, non-hierarchical structure for making decisions (Baldrige, 1974; Jenkins & Jensen, 2010).

Similar to the bureaucratic model, the collegial model possesses its own share of drawbacks. The collegial model, while seeking to be all-inclusive, can slow the decision-making process when trying to reach a consensus (Warters, 2000). This model, though conceptually ideal in that it allows everyone to sit at the table when making a decision, often times will not work due to lack of involvement from constituents (Millett, 1977). Theoretically ideal for the shared governance process, the collegial model, in order to be implemented properly, must involve participants from each constituent group, which can be a nearly impossible task (Jenkins & Jensen, 2010; Millett, 1977). In his book *Academic Governance*, Baldrige (1971) explains that “full participation of the members of the academic community—especially the faculty” is necessary in practicing the collegial model (p. 5). Faculty can see the collegial model as more focused on consensus rather than as a means for addressing conflict (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978). As a way to correct the flaws present in the bureaucratic model, the collegial model avoids the concept of conflict before all the facts and information have been revealed (Baldrige, 1974; Locke, 2004). The AAUP encourages the collegial model of shared governance in

its identified areas for evaluation of a successful practice: (a) institutional communication; (b) understanding the role of the Board, President and faculty; (c) ensuring joint decision making occurs; and (d) the need to assess the structural arrangement for governance (Romo, 1998).

Political model. Developed at New York University, the political model was established as the middle ground between the fully hierarchical decision-making process encompassed in the bureaucratic model, and the complete consensus process of the collegial model (Baldrige, 1971). As in the pluralistic model of democracy, the political model makes decisions that are focused around compromise regarding conflict in the institution (Baldrige, 1971, 1974; Bolman & Deal, 2008). Conflict is normal and expected in the institution of higher education; it can be managed under the political model through bargaining, exercising of influence, and negotiation (Baldrige, 1974; Warters, 2000). When a political model is presented, full-time faculty, who come with their own agendas, can neutralize the political pressures experienced by administrators who often hold political allegiance to the trustees (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010).

Comparable to the pluralistic form of democracy, the institution is made up of groups formulated around one specific topic. The constituent groups change according to the issue being discussed. For example, tenured faculty might be in opposition to or conflict with the administrators regarding one issue, however, when facing another topic, all employees with a social science degree, regardless of their status as faculty or administration, may join together as a united force. Instead of avoiding conflict, the political model of shared governance accepts the differences found in groups and works to negotiate the best solution (Warters, 2000).

Allowing decisions to be made through compromise, negotiation, and coalition building can establish a foundation for deliberation and discussion (Birnbaum, 1991a). However, the political model of shared governance has one of the same criticisms as the bureaucratic and collegial model: the increased time needed to make a decision (Hobbs, 1975). In addition, the division generated over each issue could infringe on the college's collaborative environment (McMillen, 2002).

Furthermore, the political model makes a significant assumption in believing all actors involved in the decision-making process are rational in their choices. In addition, within the political model of governance, decisions are made by a few due to the lack of interest expressed by the many, which could potentially lead to an increased impact by external groups (Locke, 2004). External groups wield greater influence in the political model because they are stable and not continuously changing, whereas the actors involved in the political model limit their role to issues of interest, which can change depending on the environment.

Organized anarchy model. As the models of institutional governance become outdated there has been a call to revise its structure. In 1972, Cohen and March's (1996) "organized anarchy" theory was added to the models of shared governance. Organized anarchy is made up of four characteristics: (a) ambiguity of purpose, (b) ambiguity of power, (c) ambiguity of experience, and (d) ambiguity of success (Cohen & March, 1986). Organized anarchy can be looked at as a collection of ideas with no formal structure in the decision-making process (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972).

Ambiguity of purpose is the first characteristic of organized anarchy; it addresses the vague definition and goals of higher education (Cohen & March, 1986). The next trait

is ambiguity of power, which addresses the dissemination of power. Cohen and March (1996) explain:

Their [college presidents'] power to accomplish things depends heavily on what they want to accomplish, that the use of formal authority is limited by other formal authority, that the acceptance of authority is not automatic, that the necessary details of organizational life confuse power,... and that their colleagues seems to delight in complaining simultaneously about presidential weakness and presidential willfulness. (p. 386)

In summary, even the power of the college president experiences limitations in the policy implementation process.

The third attribute of the organized anarchy model is ambiguity of experience. Decision-making and policy implementation are influenced by a variety of factors. Therefore, it is possible that the outcome of one decision may yield one experience, though the same decision made at a later time could produce another result (Locke, 2004). Lastly, the organized anarchy model is distinguished by the ambiguity of success. Unlike the private industry, where success is determined by salary or promotion, in higher education, success is related to a variety of factors equated with achievement (Cohen & March, 1986).

Parallel to the previously discussed models (bureaucratic, collegial, and political), the organized anarchy model of decision-making has its own set of limitations. The concept of ambiguity can present some complications in that nothing is defined and everything has the potential to change (Locke, 2004).

Summary of the Four Models of Shared Governance

As the model of shared governance has evolved, so has the decision-making process. Where the bureaucratic model falls on one extreme of the spectrum, being that decisions are made by a select few in roles of authority, the collegial model falls to the other extreme. The collegial model is all-inclusive, involving all participants and focusing on reaching a consensus among the group. Meanwhile, the political and organized anarchy models fall in the middle of the continuum. The political model focuses on the role of interest groups and facing conflict with negotiation. Finally, the organized anarchy model, ambiguous in nature, presents a model that is undefined and changes with every decision made.

Faculty Role in Shared Governance

Much of the literature on shared governance addresses the history, structure, and benefits and challenges of the process of shared governance. However, looking at the faculty themselves is essential. During their accreditation reviews of schools and colleges, the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) specifically looks for the institutional presence of shared governance and the school/college's incorporation of the process (Western Association of Schools and Colleges [WASC], 2009). The following section will examine the faculty members who partake in the decision-making process and incentives and or motivation that led them to become involved.

Faculty member participation. The way a faculty member sees his/her role and involvement in the shared governance process will be a factor in determining if he/she wants to get involved in the system. In 1998, Piland and Bublitz looked at faculty members' perceptions of shared governance, particularly if demographics such as campus

size, gender, discipline, and experience on the senate made a difference. Their study revealed that faculty members see shared governance as a means of fostering cooperation and collaboration, rather than total control by one group. In addition, faculty observe their role in shared governance as having a significant impact on curriculum, hiring, and evaluations. Experience in serving on the academic senate allowed faculty to have an increased sense of cooperation and respect for administration (Piland & Bublitz, 1998). Going against prior research (Flanigan, 1994; Nussbaum, 1995), Piland and Bublitz found that faculty generally disagree with the statement, “shared governance translates to a more adversarial, rather than partnership relationship between faculty and the administration” (p. 106).

Faculty members do not get involved in the shared decision-making process of their colleges as a means to obtain leadership positions. However, the training and knowledge they obtain while serving on the Academic Senate renders them prime candidates for positions of leadership (Pope & Miller, 2005).

Incentives/Motivation

Defined as the “process that accounts for an individual’s intensity, direct and persistence of effort toward attaining a goal” (Robbins, Judge, & Campbell, 2010, p. 175), motivation is essentially the relationship between need, drive, and incentive (Tella, Ayeni, & Popoola, 2007). Research on motivation dates back to Maslow’s (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, which explains that every human has a hierarchy of five needs: psychological, safety, social, esteem, and self-actualization. In 1959, in his Two-Factor Theory (Motivation-Hygiene Theory), Herzberg theorized how the attitudes an individual holds towards his/her work will determine his/her success or failure. Essentially,

Herzberg hypothesized that intrinsic factors relate to job satisfaction while extrinsic factors relate to job dissatisfaction.

Goal internalization, intrinsic processes, and extrinsic rewards are three motivating factors for faculty when looking to take on a leadership role. Goal internalization addresses the commitment and affiliation a faculty member has toward the organization or institution (McPhail-Naples, 2006). Intrinsic motivation, often referred to as *inner drive*, occurs despite the absence of external factors, addressing self-concept and social identity (DeCharms, 1968). Finally, extrinsic motivation includes promotions and pay increases. To capture an individual's motivation, it is necessary to understand the environment in which he/she is functioning (Leonard, Beauvais, & Scholl, 1999).

Goal internalization. Goal internalization occurs when individuals embrace the attitudes and behavior of an organization and adopt those beliefs into their personal value system (Kelman, 1958). When individuals internalize the goals of the institution, they are able to see past their personal satisfaction and pleasure and look at the needs and requirements of the organization (Etzioni, 1961).

Similarly, Maslow (1954) explains the highest level of need for man to achieve is self-actualization, which is the desire to pursue one's own interest. Through involvement in shared governance, people are able to achieve self-actualization because they are able to see their potential and power within the institution of the college. Furthermore, they demonstrate their ability to focus on problems greater than themselves. When citizens take an active role in the decision-making process, they become better citizens. Their growth as individuals is achieved through their governmental participation (Conway, 1985). Furthermore, in Locke's (1968) Goal-setting Theory, goals provide a source of

work motivation and produce a higher level of job performance. Therefore, if a faculty member internalizes the goals of the community college, motivation to seek a role in shared governance will accompany the desire to see the goal become a reality.

Intrinsic motivation. According to Maslow's (1954) hierarchy of needs, when an individual has met his/her basic need for food, shelter, and security, he/she can then strive to achieve belonging and self-esteem. Intrinsic motivators are the inner drives that push one to take action. In McClelland's (1961) Theory of Needs, motivation can be explained by three subconscious needs: achievement, power, and affiliation. Achievement is the personal desire to excel, learn, or strive for success, while power is the desire for increased responsibility. Finally, affiliation is the development of interpersonal relationships and recognition and praise from peers and superiors (McClelland, 1961).

From the research, teachers prefer intrinsic rewards like flexibility and variety, mental challenges, and autonomy, as opposed to extrinsic motivators like rewards and raises (Alenzi & Salem, 2007). Academic senate positions are normally elected ones, leading participants to be classified as political leaders within the college. Maslow (1954) explains that political leaders are often motivated by the need for the intrinsic reward of self-esteem because of the many psychic rewards it brings.

Extrinsic motivations. Situational factors and the environment must be examined when trying to understand and explain the motivation faculty must have to enter a leadership role at the community college level. Extrinsic incentives for faculty members to serve in a position of shared governance include one's desire to control the agenda of topics being discussed and addressed, fondness for the institution, passion for student involvement, civil engagement, and welfare of academia (Pope & Miller, 2005).

Within the CCC system, Collins (2002) argues how the lack of funds distributed from the state leads to an increase in disinterested faculty. If participants in the shared governance process were to be well compensated for their role, a greater number of constituents would partake in the process. Contradicting Collins' theory with the belief that money is not an incentive for faculty participation in shared governance, McPhail-Naples (2006) explains that extrinsic rewards may not be enough of a motivating factor to encourage participants to move outside their comfort zone and into a position of shared governance. In his Cognitive Evaluation Theory, DeCharms (1968) asserts that the distribution of extrinsic rewards after an intrinsic reward will decrease the overall level of motivation. Therefore, even though many districts do not have the fiscal ability to pay for part-time faculty involvement in shared governance, the use of extrinsic rewards can be an effective motivator.

Without the involvement of the faculty, the shared governance system in academia would flounder. Understanding the motivational factors behind faculty involvement in the shared decision-making process will strengthen the concept of the system and secure its existence.

Criticism of Shared Governance in American Colleges

Traditional democratic theory "assumes that citizens in a democratic state [like shared governance within the community college system] are interested in and participate in politics, are knowledgeable about the process of government and the proposed alternative solutions to public problems" (Conway, 1985 p.2). Shared governance receives some of the same criticisms as democracy. This literature review would be remiss if it neglected to mention the flaws embedded into the concept of shared

governance. As Winston Churchill explained, “Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time” (as cited in Elliott & Summerskill, 1957, p. 124).

Dating back to 1918, prior to the formal implementation of a system of shared governance, the involvement of faculty in the decision-making process at American universities did not come without resistance and reproach. In his book, *The Higher Learning in America*, Veblen (1957) suggests the administration’s inclusion of faculty is simply an exercise in deception. Veblen asserts that administration allows faculty involvement just enough to give off the perception that faculty have a role in governance, and faculty do not complain because they are satisfied with teaching. Much of the criticism around shared governance focuses on the notion that such a utopian idea works “far more effectively on paper than in actual practice” (Guffey & Rampp, 1997, p. 17). “It’s almost gotten to the point that people don’t want to use the term ‘shared governance’ anymore because it implies something that may not exist” says John D. Walda (as cited in Leatherman, 1998, p. A8), former president of Indiana University’s Board of Trustees and a member of the Board of Directors of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. From the review of the literature, criticisms about shared governance include: (a) uninterested participants, (b) uninformed participants, (c) barriers to implementation, and (d) delayed decisions and outcome.

Uninterested participants. As the move towards an inclusive decision-making process in higher education continues, specifically in community colleges, the function and effectiveness of shared governance has been questioned in relation to limited faculty involvement (Leatherman, 1998). Shared governance is not easy and requires a

commitment from all stakeholders in order to be valuable (Berret, 2007; Jenkins & Jenson, 2010). Nussbaum argues that the importance of stakeholder involvement in shared governance is necessary to uphold democratic values (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). When constituents are not involved or informed, it sets the stage for faculty unions and other organization to exert “far too much influence on the local boards, thus creating roadblocks for invocation and change” (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor 1998, p. 3).

When constituents are not involved in the shared governance process, the pathway is clear for a few to dominate the agenda and direction of the college (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (2001) warns how “many governing boards, faculty members, and chief executives believe that internal governance arrangements have become so cumbersome that timely decisions are difficult to make, and small factions often are able to impede the decision-making process” (p. 3). Lack of trust among the various stakeholders impedes progress and hinders the shared governance process (Guffey & Rampp, 1997). When trust among the constituents is not present, a greater emphasis is made on the concept of *us/them* (Flanigan, 1994; Nussbaum, 1995).

Just as faculty can be uninterested in taking a role in shared governance, administrators can lack a commitment to shared governance at the community college level (Flanigan, 1994). In order for shared governance to succeed, all stakeholders must make a commitment. Without participation and involvement, the system is weakened as a result of lack of trust and communication (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

Naysayers of shared governance point to the lack of interest from community college participants as a means to present a case for the ineffectiveness of the process. However, as discussed by classical democratic theorists, low levels of political participation provide for stability within the governance (Lipset, 1963) and low levels of involvement equate to participant satisfaction with the process and outputs (Conway, 1985). To conclude, in describing a rational person, Downs (1957) claims he “moves towards his goals in a way, which to the best of his knowledge, uses the least possible input of scarce resources per unit of valued output” (p. 5). Therefore, it may be in a participant’s best interest to avoid involvement in the shared governance process.

Uninformed participants. Another weakness found in the shared governance process is the lack of experience and information possessed by the participants who have chosen to take an active role (Alenzi & Salem, 2007). Longin (2002) claims that this deficit in understanding can weaken the institution of the college, especially when trying to lead change. When decision makers are unqualified or lacking in knowledge, it can result in poor-quality decisions (Alenzi & Salem, 2007). Furthermore, as pointed out by James Madison in the Federalist Papers, passion and emotion may drive one’s decision rather than rationality and weighing of the evidence (Hamilton, Madison, Jay, Rossiter, & Kesler, 2003).

Collins (2002) explains that the participation of uneducated stakeholders in the shared governance system in California stems from the actions of the state. Due to California’s economic uncertainty, the community college system districts did not receive the needed funding that was intended to accompany the implementation of AB 1725 (Collins, 2002). The lack of funds led to a void in professional development for faculty

and administrators regarding the purpose, function, and process of shared governance. When faculty are not knowledgeable of the opportunities of their involvement in the shared governance process, they are unable to become engaged (Campbell, 2003).

Conversely, some have expressed concern about the constituencies being too informed and only taking a role in the shared governance process as a means to promote their personal agendas, instead of looking out for what is good for the institution as a whole (Collins, 2002; Flanigan, 1994; Nussbaum, 1995). Flanigan (1994) elaborates by stating that “special interest groups of administrators, faculty, and classified staff...have a tendency to focus more on their needs than on the global needs of the college community” (p. 10).

Barriers to part-time faculty involvement in shared governance. Another shortcoming apparent in the system of shared governance is the various forms of barriers impeding the involvement of part-time faculty. Barriers that inhibit part-time faculty involvement in the shared governance process include: no due process protection, not being available to attend meetings, a belief that the process is ineffective, and overall lack of support from the college.

One of the main attractions for the hiring of part-time faculty in community colleges is the notion that they are not tied into a contract. However, part-time faculty teach without the protection of due process. Knowing they do not have the benefit of tenure, part-time faculty may avoid sensitive subjects (Bradley, 2004) or may be vulnerable to pressures of institutional retaliation (Collins, 2002). Furthermore, part-time faculty may feel greater pressure to conform to the thoughts and beliefs of the administration.

The second barrier for involvement of part-time faculty in shared governance is their availability. The flexibility of part-time faculty can also restrict their time on campus. Part-time faculty are typically “paid for specific classes they teach and are often on campus only for those scheduled class meetings, rushing off to teach the next course at another campus or to another job entirely” (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006, p. 8). Furthermore, because part-time faculty are used to teach courses that full-time instructors are unable to teach, part-time faculty can be on campus at odd times and unable to attend scheduled shared governance meetings (Dedman & Pearch, 2004; Fulton, 2000).

Furthermore, the negative perception part-time faculty may have towards the shared governance process may present another form of barrier. As previously mentioned, shared governance has received its fair share of criticism for being an ineffective process. Some have described shared governance as being complicated and cumbersome (Gumport, 2000). Furthermore, lack of communication can impede the progress and effectiveness of the shared governance process. Communication is a needed skill. “Any form of shared governance decision-making depends heavily on effective organizational communication. Good shared governance requires much more communicating down and communicating across the organizational structure” (Lovas, Kanter, & Jackman, 1994, p. 13).

Deliberation, a principle often associated with American values, is the concept of citizen participation in the governance process, which is interrelated with communication. Promoting and encouraging discussion from all stakeholders on issues involving the institution may also result in delays in the decision-making process (Alenzi & Salem,

2007). “In the current environment, many trustees argue there is a need for speed, and the traditional concept of shared governance has not kept up” (Leatherman, 1998, p. A8).

Shared governance presents a collaborative system for making decisions. However, the CCC struggles with fiscal uncertainty. There is a great need to make quick decisions. The process is not viewed as inclusive because through a need to respond quickly to external forces, such as fiscal pressure, the administration has focused on a centralized decision-making process (Gumport, 2000).

In California, by taking a strong role, the legislature weakens the system of shared governance because the community colleges do not have the power to implement a policy change (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998). As Nussbaum asks, “how empowered would you feel if I gave you three hundred pages of statutes directing your every activity on how I wanted you to run the college?” (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998, p. 4). Unlike the University of California or California State Universities, where the legislature has taken a broad authoritative role, with the CCC system, the state takes a specific and directive approach. Because state law controls many matters regarding the CCC system, specific policy changes cannot occur without legislative involvement (Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

The final barrier is lack of support from the college for part-time faculty to participate in the shared governance process. Part-timers may not get support from the college and have a limited voice through the possible suppression of voting rights (Kozeracki, 2002). Furthermore, lack of respect can also impede the involvement of part-time faculty in the system of shared governance (Wilson, 1999).

Summary of the Discussion of Part-time Faculty

As Kerr, Gade, Kawaoka, and Ebrary (1994) assert, “No generalizations about higher education are true except this one: No generalization about higher education is true, since each campus has its own heritage, its own setting, its own course of future development” (p. 41). Shared governance is no exception in that it is not uniform from college to college (Locke, 2004). Though differences and challenges may threaten the usefulness of shared governance in academic institutions, the tradition of higher education views the role of faculty as highly significant (Benjamin & Carroll, 1998).

Current Challenges Facing California Community Colleges

Not specific to CCCs or even the institution of higher education, the challenge of outside fiscal pressure and the projected leadership gap are of great concern to many colleges. The first concern, which is most pressing for many industries, is the effect and pressures caused by the economy. According to the National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), a private, nonprofit, and nonpartisan research firm founded in 1920 whose main focus is to explain the workings of the economy, the United States entered into its current recession in December 2007 (National Bureau of Economic Research [NBER], 2008). However, the effects of the current economic uncertainty are expected to extrapolate out and cause pressure for years, even after the recovery (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2010). The second challenge experienced by CCCs is the gap in leadership. As the economic constraints being placed on the CCCs are forcing a reduction in employment, the future will likely be negatively impacted because people will not be trained, experienced, or well positioned to serve in positions of leadership.

Economic Crisis

The modern institution of higher education, and specifically the CCC, has been confronted with a gamut of concerns ranging from technological advances, to student attitudes, to competition from private institutions (Grieve & Worden, 2000). However, similar to many other sectors of the United States economy, CCCs are experiencing, and will continue to undergo, great strain as a result of the struggling economy. Typically, in times of fiscal crisis, many patrons go back to school in pursuit of a higher education. However, unlike most businesses that strive for an increase in demand, the institution of higher education has limited, and now scarce, resources. When the economy slows down, the amount of funds from taxes decreases because the sale of goods declines, in addition to the reduction of property values. Public higher education depends on government funding, specifically funds collected through taxation. With the decrease of funding, public higher education is faced with the challenge of sustaining the institution with fewer resources (Huyck, 2011). During the 2009-2010 school year, the CCC system had no alternative but to turn away approximately 140,000 students (CCC's Chancellor's Office, 2010b).

During a time of fiscal deficit, the public institution of higher education typically undergoes great pressure to make changes. However, the product they produce, educated citizens, is of greater value to society than ever before. Dealing with diminishing funds caused by a decrease in property taxes, cuts in state and federal funding, attenuating endowments, and limited educational donations, schools are forced to maintain the same amount of service with fewer resources. Some colleges have undergone harsh deficits,

forcing them to pull from financial reserves. No prediction of change or relief appears in sight for the near future (Masterson, 2008).

Periods of economic instability are by no means a new phenomenon for the institution of higher education. Aside from the Depression of the 1930s, the United States has undergone a period of economic recession approximately every ten years, near the end of each decade (Breneman, 2008). Now, in the current recession, which started in 2007, it is imperative to review the past in order to adapt and prepare for the future.

Leadership Crisis

The leadership crisis in community colleges was recognized over a decade ago with the aging of presidents, administrators, and faculty (Vaughn, 2001). By 2012, statistics indicate that one-third of the administrators in the CCC will be eligible for retirement (McPhail-Naples, 2006). As retirement approaches for many of the administrators, the CCC as an institution does not have the means to backfill the expected vacancies (Schults, 2001). As little as 8% of community college faculty have been exposed to leadership opportunities (McPhail-Naples, 2006; Outcalt, 2002), making them inadequate leaders for their institutions.

Coupled with the aging of college administration, the tenure duration for a president serving a CCC has decreased. In California, the average community college president serves for 4.4 years as opposed to his/her national counterpart who averages 7.5 years (Community College League of California, 2001).

In order to decrease the leadership gap, it has been argued that development programs for faculty should be implemented and joined with the support of the administration. In order for a faculty development training to be successful,

administrative support is a necessity (Murray, 2002). In 2010, Orr looked at how administrators perceive the role of part-time faculty within the CCC system of shared governance. Looking at 300 participants from 86 different colleges, Orr found that administrators see the importance of the involvement of the part-time faculty. While part-time faculty are frequently not compensated for their involvement in the shared governance process, administrators view their contributions positively and as important.

To meet growing leadership demands, CCCs need to look at candidates who are already in the system and possess leadership potential. As a means to motivate current faculty, the college institution should see what forms of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can be applied to facilitate the development of leadership competencies of current faculty. Professional development needs to focus on preparing faculty both for teaching and administrative training (McPhail-Naples, 2006). The involvement of faculty is critical to the leadership of community colleges.

CCCs have already started to implement part-time faculty largely as a means to decrease overhead, thus meeting the demands of fiscally challenging times. Part-time faculty may also be a necessary group to examine when looking to backfill the growing amount of leadership positions projected to become available in the next decade.

Part-time Faculty

In order to determine if adjunct faculty are a viable pool of potential candidates for leadership roles in the CCC system, four traits that define successful leaders in the 2-year college system will be reviewed: (a) attitude, (b) practical experience/“real world” experience, (c) diversity, and (d) flexibility (Cooper & Pagotto, 2003; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005).

Attitude/satisfaction. Evidence supports the theory of positive psychology playing an integral role in one's performance (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003; Luthans, Avolio, Norman, & Avey, 2008). When a faculty member is satisfied with his/her employment, he/she has a higher work performance than colleagues who are dissatisfied. Overall, part-time faculty are more satisfied with the demands and rewards associated with their job (Benjamin & Carroll, 1998). The higher satisfaction rates motivate part-timers to be more committed than their full-time colleagues and less likely to leave their jobs for other opportunities (Antony & Valdez, 1998). Looking at one case study, a survey completed by adjunct faculty at Houston Community College, results indicated part time faculty's interest and desire for greater involvement within the college (Brams, 1983). The high correlation among positive attitude, job satisfaction, and desire for college involvement could all be applied towards positive leadership at the college.

High satisfaction rates also correlate with positive attitudes. Positivity is often a trait pursued in a candidate because positive leadership behaviors generate and encourage positive followers (Hannah, Woolfolk, & Lord, 2009). When a faculty member expresses satisfaction with his/her job, he/she appears positive and optimistic in his/her daily interactions. The psychology behind an adjunct's positive perspective can be carried into a leadership role as well.

The reason behind the positive attitude of part-timers is still contested. Some researchers attribute their optimistic attitude to the part-timers' desire to secure a full-time position. A case study of one school found that approximately 55% of adjunct faculty desire full-time employment (Jacoby, 2005). However, though a strong desire for

advancement exists, the research did not explore whether part-timers were interested in roles of leadership or a full-time instructional position.

Contrary to case studies revealing high job satisfaction by part-time instructors in higher education (specifically the community college system), some research studies reveal negative attitudes and a lack of commitment. Adjunct faculty have an increased probability of feeling disconnected from the district, leading to inappropriate comments and actions, such as leaving during the middle of the quarter/semester (Wilson, 1999). The lack of commitment to the college can also increase a part-timer's tendency to be dissatisfied with his/her work performance and may be responsible for limiting his/her desire to pursue a position of leadership.

Experience. According to Fulton-Calkins and Milling's (2005) article entitled *Community-college Leadership: An Art to Be Practiced: 2010 and Beyond*, nine crucial leadership traits are necessary for leaders in the community college system. Of these traits, one critical to success is for leaders to "learn from the past while embracing the future" (p. 235). Basically, if a leader like Julius Caesar had been more flexible in ruling his empire, his reign may have not ended with his assassination (Gardner, 1990). Leaders need to acknowledge what worked in the past and avoid making the same mistakes while thinking creatively for new solutions such as how to better serve diverse student populations (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). Since upwards of 90% of adjunct faculty come from *real world* experience and might be better equipped to embrace technology, increasing globalization, and the business culture (Kelly, 1990), they may be better suited to embrace a leadership role. At a 2-year college, part-timers bring practical and

professional experience that could translate into applying new approaches when the college is faced with growing challenges.

To claim all part-time faculty members are viable candidates for community college leadership would be an overgeneralization. However, when one of the requirements for leadership is an experienced educational background, part-time faculty should not be overlooked. According to a survey conducted at Fullerton Community College, although full-time faculty possessed an overall higher education background than their adjunct colleagues, a higher percentage of part-timers had obtained a doctoral degree than full-time faculty (Kelly, 1990).

Practical experience is often viewed as an attribute that increases one's effectiveness and skill in the classroom. However, experience may come at a cost. It may act as a disservice to the student if the faculty member lacks the ability to teach the subject. Part-time faculty in general may not possess fluency in teaching pedagogies or being in a classroom. Unlike universities, 2-year colleges are teaching institutions and are not research-based (Christenson, 2008). The students who attend community colleges come from diverse backgrounds and are at different levels of education; some possess more extensive knowledge and others need more focus and remediation (Sandy, Gonzales, & Hilmer, 2006). The central focus for an instructor at the community college level is to teach, not to conduct research. In California, in addition to a bachelor's degree, a teaching credential is required for all instructors in the public K-12 system. During the credential courses, an aspiring teacher is presented with various teaching and learning styles, skills, and tactics to apply in the classroom. However, to teach at a CCC, the only degree required is a master's degree. Essentially, instructors at the community college

level can enter a classroom with very little – even no – teaching experience. While part-time faculty may offer practical and educational insight, they may not have the necessary teaching capabilities to deliver that insight to students.

Diversity. As the demographics in the United States continue to evolve, the population being served by the community college system will continue to change. During the 2008-2009 academic year, CCC student demographics consisted of: 8% African American, 30% Hispanic, 16% Asian (to include Filipino and Pacific Islander), and 54% female (CCC's Chancellor's Office, 2009).

As the diversity of the student body continues to expand within the CCC system, it is imperative to hire leadership that reflects this diversity (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005). Not only are the adjunct faculty members within the community college system diverse in work experience, but also they often come from diverse gender and ethnic backgrounds. In looking at the variance in demographics of the adjunct faculty employed by the CCC system, 5% are African American, 9% Hispanic, 8% Asian, and 73% are female (Lopez, 2004). While the ratios of the CCC student body are not congruent with the demographics of adjunct faculty within the system, there is still much diversity that makes up the adjunct faculty populace who can be viable candidates for potential leadership positions.

Flexibility. With the student enrollment at a community college constantly fluctuating, the need for part-time instructors is pressing. As the demand increases, community colleges have a pool of faculty ready and willing to teach. In contrast, if student matriculation drops, the community college district can easily adjust and not renew the semester-long contracts for part-time faculty (McGuire, 1993). Because there

is no need to have contracts longer than the semester/quarter, adjunct faculty allow administrators to easily add or delete courses virtually days before and after classes start, depending on what resources are needed, while maintaining low tuition costs (Antony & Valdez, 1998). Working in an environment with diminishing financial resources, the flexibility of part-time faculty offers the community college system an alternative means to deliver the same product at a discounted rate (Avakian, 1995).

The difference between an adequate leader and an exemplary leader is in one's ability to adapt to change (Collins, 2002). Adjunct faculty are highly conditioned to adjust, which is an indicator they may have an increased capacity to become great leaders. With the constant flexibility a part-timer must demonstrate, considering there is no contractual agreement for employment, they are prepared to adapt to any last minute changes in class schedules, course loads, and other issues. Being able to alter one's teaching plans is a trait possessed by exceptional leaders because it reveals their ability to adapt and move forward (McShane & Glinow, 2005).

Part-time Faculty Role's in Shared Governance

The need to increase the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process by no means comes with unanimous agreement and support. However, the discussion is relevant and needs to be had because of the vast increase in the use of part-time faculty. The AAUP claims that the hiring of part-time and non-tenured full-time faculty can be detrimental to the shared governance process if this population is not allowed to participate in the decision-making process (Collins, 1996).

Part-time faculty, who may possess the same knowledge and expertise in their subject area as full-time faculty, are posed with additional challenges when trying to

participate in the shared governance process, such as limited access to information and time constraints. First, contingent faculty are politically vulnerable because they are not protected with tenure (Bradley, 2004; Collins, 2002). With that, part-time faculty hold allegiance to the administration in hopes of being offered a full-time position (Jenkins & Jenson, 2010). Second, part-time faculty may hold positions spread out over several employers. The flexibility needed to be present for meetings may pose a challenge.

Nevertheless, as the number of part-time faculty increases, so does the need to examine the group's involvement in shared governance. In her 2007 study, Berret examined the participation of part-time faculty in shared governance at private universities in Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The study revealed the (a) role and value part-time faculty play in the shared governance process, (b) desire by part-time faculty to participate in the shared governance process, (c) frequent neglect of part-time involvement in the shared governance process, and (d) frequent lack of compensation for part-time faculty involvement in the shared decision-making process.

Although Berret (2007) was looking at private 4-year institutions of higher education on the east coast, a great deal of her findings can be applied to the part-time faculty at CCCs. In fact, due to the gaps in research, additional research must be conducted as a means to better understand the demographics and motivations of part-time faculty, a growing segment of the CCC staff community.

Conclusion

As history has revealed, the concept of shared governance has been embedded in higher education for centuries. The involvement of faculty members and stakeholders within the academic community has been a concept deemed worth striving for. While the

concept of shared governance undergoes criticism, the research suggests that the ideal should not be abandoned for a variety of salient reasons.

Although there was great discussion of the implementation of shared governance in the CCC systems in the 1980s, leading to the passage of AB 1725, and then some studies done afterwards to review the effect, there is a gap in the literature focusing on the role of the faculty members with the unique CCC system. Furthermore, during a time when CCCs throughout the state are under a great deal of pressure to perform with limited funds and increased enrollment, the ideal of shared governance is under considerable strain. As a means to embrace the tightened budget, many colleges have started to increase their use of part-time faculty. Times of fiscal crisis place additional pressure on all actors involved, and while shared governance is not at the heart of the problem, colleges can use this time to reorganize and accommodate to the decreased funds while bettering the institution. Therefore, the need exists to examine a new pool of potential shared governance leaders: part-time faculty in the CCCs.

Chapter 3: Methodology

Despite the decrease in state funding, leadership gap, and increased use of part-time faculty, this study will contribute to sustaining the future of shared governance and faculty involvement in CCCs by looking at a potential population of adjunct faculty who could rise into positions of leadership. The purpose of this study was to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process, specifically the academic senate in CCCs, in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist, thereby potentially increasing the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system.

A void exists in the academic research exploring the role of part-time faculty involvement in the shared governance process, specifically within the institution of CCCs. This quantitative study will contribute to the field of educational research and fill the void with the use of a descriptive survey targeted toward part-time faculty members serving in the elected position of the Academic Senate.

Theoretical Framework

To properly frame this study it is important to recognize previous theories regarding motivation. Theorists have been looking at motivation for over 50 years and presented models that have been tested and validated. Three theories were used as the foundational framework for this study: Maslow's (1954) Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's (1959) Two-Factor Theory, and McClelland's (1961) Theory of Needs. All three theorists address various forms of motivational incentives. Furthermore, summarizing the three theories, McPhail-Naples (2006) expands by saying the three motivating factors for

faculty participation in leadership are goal internalization, intrinsic processes, and extrinsic rewards.

Applying the concept of motivation and participation factors, Berret (2007) looked at the role of contingent faculty in shared governance at independent 4-year colleges. Berret's study was completed as a means to support the AAUP's (2003a) *Statement on Contingent Appointments and the Academic Profession* that called for the inclusion of part-time faculty involvement in the shared governance process. Since CCCs are public institutions and structured differently than private schools, this research sought to expand on the academic knowledge focusing on part-time faculty within the confines of a public 2-year college.

Restatement of Research Questions

Due to the limited nature of research completed on the topic, a survey instrument was designed to specifically address the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of part-time faculty members who serve in shared governance?
2. Are part-time faculty included in the elected positions of the shared governance process?
3. What institutional incentives are provided to part-time faculty for their participation in the shared governance process?
4. How do part-time faculty become aware of the institutional incentives provided to them for their participation in the shared governance process?
5. What were the motivating factors and purpose for part-time faculty to participate in a shared governance position?

6. What are the greatest barriers to part-time faculty serving in shared governance positions?

Description of the Research Methodology

This study took a quantitative approach to explain the phenomenon of part-time faculty involved within the Academic Senate, a system of shared governance in CCCs. Quantitative research involves the collection of “numerical data that are analyzed using mathematically based methods (in particular statistics)” (Muijs, 2004, p. 1). The research questions were specific and inquired about measurable data. The data were collected using questions and responses in an unbiased/objective approach (Creswell, 2005). Benefits of quantitative research include the ability to look at a small sample and make inferences about a specified population. This research sought to describe trends in a large population of part-time faculty who could potentially serve in positions of shared governance at CCCs, therefore a quantitative survey design was most appropriate.

Population

According to Creswell (2005), the population is the large group of people in which the study is trying to identify characteristics, behaviors, or trends in attitudes or opinion. The population of this study includes faculty members who have served in an elected position of shared governance (Academic Senate) in one of the 112 community colleges in California. The respondents invited to participate in the survey either serve or have served on the Academic Senate at their respective community college districts.

Process for Selection of Data Sources

A purposeful sample was used in this study as the researcher deliberately selected participants based on several relevant characteristics. According to Creswell (2007), a

purposeful sample is obtained when “the inquirer selects individuals and sites for study because they can purposefully inform an understanding of the research problem and central phenomenon in the study” (p. 125). A random sample was not appropriate because of the specific criteria and small population of potential participants. The criteria for selection included:

1. Part-time faculty member serving in a position on the Academic Senate at one of California 112 community college district,
2. Part-time faculty member who has served in a position on the Academic Senate at one of California’s 112 community college district, or
3. Full-time faculty member who served on the Academic Senate as a part-time faculty member at one of California’s 112 community college districts.

The convenience purposeful sample was taken at the Academic Senate for CCCs’ Spring Plenary Session in San Francisco as it was a meeting of target sample participants. The survey instrument was personally distributed at the April 19-21, 2012 conference where Academic Senate members from the state’s 112 college districts were present. A reasonable effort was made during the 3 days to obtain 30 respondents (equating to an approximate 27% response rate from the community colleges in the state).

During the conference, only 11 surveys were completed and collected due to the conference’s low attendance by part-time faculty members who serve/have served in an elected position of shared governance. As a result, the goal of 30 completed questionnaires was not met at that time. On April 25, 2012, packets including an introductory letter (Appendix A), questionnaire with instructions (Appendix B), two consent forms (one for the participant and one to be returned to the researcher; Appendix

C), and a return envelope were mailed to 111 identified part-time faculty members (names of the respondents who previously completed the questionnaire were removed to avoid duplication of the responses) serving on their respective colleges' Academic Senates. Of the 111 questionnaires mailed, 23 participants (21.5%) completed the survey and 4 packets were returned as undeliverable.

Unit Analysis/ Sample

Whereas the population in this study is part-time faculty members who have served or currently serve in an elected position in their respective colleges' shared governance, the sample was the small group who received the survey (Creswell, 2005). The target sample included faculty members holding an elected position as opposed to an appointed one as a means to control for interviewing factors. Zukin (2006) explains there is a difference between political and civil engagement, thus possibly confusing the motivations and incentives of those who decide to become involved in the shared governance process. Political engagement, which includes running for an elected office in the Academic Senate, occurs when an individual actively pursues a leadership position by engaging in the electoral process. Meanwhile, civil engagement would include volunteering for a committee or taking an active role within the college.

Data Gathering Instrument

A survey instrument was designed for the specific purpose of this study due to the limited amount available academic research completed on the subject matter. For respondents to easily identify the survey (Appendix B), the questions were formatted vertically and printed on 8.5 x 11 goldenrod colored paper. The questionnaire included instructions to the participants and was accompanied by verbal directions upon

distribution. As the most common method used in educational research, the pencil-and-paper questionnaire is familiar to users and allows participants to complete the survey at their own convenience (though they are encouraged to complete it on the spot). To control for the disadvantages of the pencil-and-paper survey, the survey was designed to be short, not taking up too much of the respondents' time, and thereby potentially increasing the response rate (Muijs, 2004).

Survey questions. The researcher developed and implemented a survey instrument designed for use in this study in order to contribute to the field of research at large. The questions developed for the survey instrument were divided into five sections. Each question was followed by a selection of answers and an open-ended question. There were many advantages of using this type of inquiry. First, the instrument was created based on information gathered in the review of the literature, thus establishing content validity. Second, the instrument provided a simple yet direct way for respondents to complete the survey. The list of potential respondents decreased the response time needed to spend on the survey questions because respondents would not have to derive their own answers; thereby increasing the level of completion and decreasing the number of unreported responses. Finally, the list of responses simplified coding and tabulation of the data.

The survey also included a demographic portion organized into three sections: background, academic/professional background, and instructional responsibilities (Berret, 2007). Background characteristics include gender and age, provided a greater understanding of the demographic makeup of the faculty, and were used for comparative statistical analysis. The academic and professional background section included questions

on the number of years and sections taught. These questions served the purpose of gaining a greater understanding of the experience of each participant within the CCCs. The last section addressed the instructional responsibility and workload of each respondent. Questions in this section looked at the discipline taught, number and type of sections, and number of institutions by which they were employed. These questions provided a greater understanding of the participants' involvement in the college for which they may have served as an Academic Senator.

Pilot study. A pilot study was conducted prior to the distribution of the survey in order to minimize any potential problems (Muijs, 2004). Participants in the field study were asked to respond to the following criteria of the proposed survey: (a) understandable instructions, (b) clear wording, (c) adequate answers, (d) sufficient details, (e) length, and (f) convenience. The survey was electronically mailed to five people: four college professors (one part-time at a public 4-year university and the other full-time at a 4-year private university) and well as on person not in academia (an engineer). Participants in the pilot study were not selected out of the target population in order to avoid further limiting the size of this already specific group.

In addition to the review conducted by the participants in the pilot study, the survey instrument was reviewed by methodology professional, Dr. Tom Granoff. Each participant examined the survey's content and provided either written or verbal feedback. A 100% response rate was received from the pilot study group.

The feedback gathered from the pilot study prompted several revisions to the survey instrument. On question 1, an "other" category was included in the case that an elected position in shared governance was not listed. The options included under

question four were reworded to make the responses more personalized. For example, “not on campus” was corrected to read “I am not on campus aside from my instruction time.” A change was also made to one of the responses in question three; where it once read “See past personal needs and look at the needs of the institution,” it was changed to read “Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs.”

The demographic portion of the survey underwent the greatest amount of discussion and alteration. The pilot study led to the inclusion of numbering the demographic questions from one to nine. Furthermore, rather than listing ranges for nominal questions such as age and number of years at respective college, the question was subsequently presented as open-ended. Lastly, several questions that included the word “class” were replaced with “course sections” in order to eliminate the confusion between the topic of courses (English 101, 102, etc.) and number of sections taught in a given span of 3 years.

Validity of data gathering instrument. According to McMillan and Schumacher (2010), validity is “a judgment of the appropriateness of a measure for specific inferences or decisions that result from the scores generated” (p. 173). Validity is used to ensure the intended measurement is actually being measured (Muijs, 2004). Because such factors as motivations, incentives, and barriers are abstract concepts, the survey instrument measured these concepts indirectly; however, it was still necessary to ensure that the right measurement system has been developed. To increase the validity of the survey an extensive literature review was conducted and reviewed by an expert panel.

To increase the survey’s content validity, the literature reviewed was used to create the survey questions. Content validity refers to the notion that the proper

terminology is being used to measure the research variables (Muijs, 2004). An extensive amount of research was done on the subject and applied in the development of each survey question. Appendix D displays all the survey questions and indicated how each question was grounded in the research. Once the questionnaire was created, it was reviewed by an expert panel, which included of three experts, all of whom were employed by an institution of higher education and held doctoral degrees.

Reliability of data gathering instrument. Validity of the survey instrument seeks to ensure that the proper element is being studied, whereas reliability refers to the “consistence of measurement—the extent to which the results are similar over different forms of the same instrument or occasion of data collection” (McMillan & Schumacher, 2010, p. 179). There are two components of reliability: repeated measurement and internal consistency (Muijs, 2004). The test-retest (the same participant takes the same measurement in the same conditions) method examines the ability of a survey instrument to produce the same measurement at different times.

The second form of reliability is internal consistency, which seeks to determine if the results and constructs being measured by the survey are correct. To test the reliability a pilot study was conducted. The previously discussed pilot study included faculty members employed as part-time and full-time faculty members at public and private 4-year universities as well as a one non-faculty participant. Their review and feedback increased the survey’s ability to test for the motivating factors, incentives, and barriers for faculty involvement within shared governance. While the faculty who participated in the pilot study were not employed at CCCs, their colleges of employment had a similar shared governance structure. Changes were made to the original survey questions based

on the feedback from pilot study participants in order to validate the survey. The pilot study increased the face validity of the instrument because the respondents judged its the appearance (Muijs, 2004). Comments from the pilot study were carefully reviewed, as some of the respondents were not familiar with the background of the research.

The survey instrument used in this study should have 100% reliability unless participants were being deceptive in their responses. Test-retest reliability was not necessary for the demographic question. If a person explains that he/she is a man on one day, he/she is highly likely to remain a man at a later date and time. Furthermore, questions 1-4 are subjective and because the survey is examining the same situation, there is an anticipated high level of reliability; the situation is not expected to change quickly.

Data Gathering Procedures

From Thursday, April 19, 2012 to Saturday, April 21, 2012, hard copies of the survey instrument were distributed with a brief introduction by the researcher/conference employee (Appendix E), the purpose of the study, and instructions for questionnaire completion. At this time, respondents were assured of the protection of their personal identity and the identity of their colleges. Respondents were asked to complete and return the survey at that time, or at the very latest by the end of the conference. Upon completion of the survey, respondents were given a \$2 lottery ticket as a small token of gratitude for their participation in the study.

After reasonable efforts were made to gather data at the Spring Academic Senate for CCCs' Plenary Session, there was a need for additional data collection. The survey was mailed to part-time faculty members currently holding an elected position in the shared governance process in 1 of the 112 California Community Colleges. The survey

was mailed in an oversized envelope and included: an introduction letter (Appendix A), informed consent form to participate in a research study (Appendix C), the survey (Appendix B), and a prepaid envelope in which to return the survey. The envelopes and questionnaire were coded only to provide the incentive, a \$2 lottery ticket.

The introductory letter included in the packet and mailed to all part-time faculty serving in an elected position of shared governance within the CCC identified the study as being conducted to complete a doctoral dissertation and included a statement of purpose of the study. Participation was recognized as voluntary. The participants' anonymity was also assured in the letter.

All survey responses collected, both at the conference and through mail, were entered into an Excel datasheet. To uphold the confidentiality of the respondent, each individual was assigned a number. The data and survey responses were both stored in a secure server.

Description of Proposed Data Analysis Processes

Descriptive research methodology was used to identify the incentives, motivation, and barriers for part-time faculty involvement in the Academic Senate in CCCs.

Descriptive research includes the collection of data used to describe an event and follows with the organization, tabulation, and description of the data collection (Glass & Hopkins, 1984). When conducting descriptive analysis, measures of central tendency (scores or values that represent the entire distribution) were run. Measures of central tendency include the mean, medium, and mode (Creswell, 2012).

Once the data were collected, the responses were assigned numeric codes and tabulated. Next, a variable and value labels were generated (Creswell, 2012). Research

questions 2-6 looked at the participants' attitudes towards shared governances.

Meanwhile, descriptive research methodology was used to identify the demographics.

Plans for IRB

All procedures regarding the protection of human subjects were followed according to Pepperdine University's Intuitional Review Board (IRB) guidelines in order to minimize risk to the study's participants. This study met the requirements for exemption under the federal regulations that govern the protections of human subjects, specifically, section 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2). Records from the survey and coding sheets will be stored in a cabinet for 5 years; all other records were destroyed after the completion of the study.

Summary

Through the distribution of the survey questionnaire, this study aimed to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process, specifically the academic senate in CCCs. From the findings, recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist can be made and potentially increase the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system.

Chapter 4: Research Findings

The purpose of this study was to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC shared governance process to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers decrease the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system. This study sought the participation of the 112 institutions within the CCC system. Though not representative of all 112 institutions, a purposive sample was collected, and 34 part-time community college faculty members serving (or who had served) in an elected position in their respective colleges' shared governance systems participated in the study.

The questionnaire designed for the research was divided into five sections, each addressing one of the research questions. Three of the questions provided a selection of answers and were followed with an open-ended question to allow the respondents the opportunity to expand on their responses. Finally, the questionnaire concluded with a demographic portion organized into three sections: background, academic/professional background, and instructional responsibilities.

Quantitative data analysis (descriptive statistics) was employed to determine the mean and standard deviation of the responses. Frequency distribution tables were created and included to display the frequency of the sample's selected responses. Spearman rank-ordered correlations, rather than Pearson product-moment correlations, were utilized to examine the relationships between the independent and dependent variables.

Response Rate

The questionnaire was distributed using two techniques. The first distribution occurred during the Academic Senate for CCCs' annual Spring Plenary session in San

Francisco, which took place from Thursday, April 19, 2012 to Saturday, April 21, 2012. At the plenary session, hard copies of the survey instrument were distributed, along with brief instructions by the researcher, the purpose of the study, and instructions for questionnaire completion. At that time, 11 surveys were collected. Due to the conference's low attendance by part-time faculty members who serve/have served in an elected position of shared governance, the goal of 30 completed questionnaires was not met at that time.

On April 25, 2012, packets including an introductory letter, questionnaire with instructions, two consent forms (one for the participant and one to be returned to the researcher), and a return envelope were mailed to 111 identified part-time faculty members (names of the respondents who previously completed the questionnaire were removed to avoid duplication of the responses) serving on their respective colleges' Academic Senate. Of the 111 questionnaires mailed, 23 participants (21.5%) completed the survey and 4 packets were returned as undeliverable.

Findings for Each Research Question

Research question 1. Research Question 1 asked, "What are the demographic characteristics of part-time faculty members who serve in shared governance?" To address this question, Table 3 displays the frequency counts for the selected variables. Of the participants, approximately 56% were female and 44% male. The participants in this study ranged in age from 29-69 years old ($M = 52.41$, $SD = 10.44$). The number of years in which each participant worked as a part-time faculty member within the community college system ranged from 2-36 years ($M = 15.01$, $SD = 9.60$). The education of faculty members ranged from a bachelor's degree (5.9%) to a doctoral degree (20.6%), however

most common was a master's degree (73.5%). Participants represented a broad base of disciplines, with the social sciences and "other" being most common (23.5% each). The "other" discipline category included write-in responses of counseling, health education, and mathematics. The majority (61.8%) of the faculty members teach/taught at 1-2 institutions while serving on the Academic Senate, 67.6% worked a part-time day schedule, and 64.7% worked a part-time evening schedule. Of the 34 participants, 64.7% ($n=22$) were currently seeking full-time employment. Meanwhile, 6 participants (17.6%) taught online courses. Face-to-face courses, most common among the participants surveyed ($n=23$), ranged from 4-63 sections during a 3-year span with 44.1% of the participants teaching between 9-27 courses face-to-face.

Research question 2. In response to Research Question 2, "Are part-time faculty included in the elected positions of the shared governance process?" the survey directly asked respondents to indicate all bodies of shared governance to which they have been elected or on which they have served while employed as a part-time faculty member. Table 4 displays the frequency counts for the bodies of shared governance to which the respondents have been elected or on which they have served while employed as part-time faculty members. The frequency counts were based on the total number of respondents ($N=34$). Of the responses, 94.1% ($n=32$) indicated their elected participation in a CCC Academic Senate while employed as a part-time faculty member. "Other" responses were given by 38.2% of the participants. When asked to indicate the name of "Other" entities in which the participant has participated, frequent responses included the "faculty union."

Table 3

Frequency Counts for Selected Variables (N = 34)

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Gender	Male	15	44.1
	Female	19	55.9
Age ^a	29-39	4	11.8
	40-49	9	26.4
	50-59	11	32.4
	60-69	10	29.4
Years employed as part-time faculty within the CCC system ^b	Less than 5 years	2	5.9
	5-9	11	32.4
	10-14	7	20.6
	15-19	5	14.7
	20-36	9	26.4
Level of Education	Bachelor's	2	5.9
	Master's	25	73.5
	Doctorate	7	20.6

^a Age: $M = 52.41$, $SD = 10.44$.^b Years: $M = 15.01$, $SD = 9.60$.*(table continues)*

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Primary Discipline (Subject area) ^c	Art	0	0
	Business	5	13.9
	Career and technical	4	11.1
	English	5	13.9
	Science	2	5.6
	Physical education	2	5.6
	Social studies	8	22.2
	Health sciences	1	2.7
	Other	9	25
Number of institutions taught at in the past 3 years ^d	1	11	32.4
	2	10	29.4
	3	5	14.7
Full-time day schedule	Yes	4	11.8
	No	30	88.2
Part-time day schedule	Yes	23	67.6
	No	11	32.4
Full-time evening schedule	Yes	2	5.9
	No	32	94.1
Part-time evening schedule	Yes	22	67.7
	No	12	35.3

^c Some participants indicated two disciplines

^d Number of Institutions: $M = 2.41$, $SD = 1.42$

(table continues)

Variable	Category	<i>n</i>	%
Seeking full-time faculty position	Yes	22	67.7
	No	12	35.3
Number of online sections taught in the past 3 years	None	28	82.4
	1-5	3	8.8
	6-25	3	8.8
Number of hybrid sections taught in the past 3 years	None	26	76.5
	1-8	5	14.7
Number of face-to-face sections taught in the past 3 years	None	11	32.4
	1-9	5	14.7
	10-19	10	29.4
	20-63	8	23.5
Total number of course sections taught in the past 3 years	None	10	29.4
	1-9	2	5.9
	10-19	10	29.4
	20-29	5	14.7
	30-39	4	11.8
	40-63	3	8.8

Table 4

Frequency Counts for Bodies of Shared Governance to which Respondent Has Been Elected or on which Respondent has Served while Employed as a Part-Time Faculty Member (N = 34)

Rating	<i>n</i>	%
Academic Senate (“Senate”)	32	94.1
Other	13	38.2
Executive Committee	3	8.8
Executive Senate	3	8.8
Site Council	2	5.9
Faculty Advisory Board	2	5.9
Executive Council	2	5.9

Research question 3. Research Question 3 focused on what institutional incentives are provided to part-time faculty for their participation in the shared governance process. Of the responses provided, 29.4% of the participants ($n=10$) indicated receiving a stipend for their service. However, the size of the stipend ranged from \$50 per meeting to \$1,200 per year, with a mean of \$1,000 annually. Hourly compensation and continuing education credit (Flex hours) were each indicated by 3 respondents (8.8%) as forms of institutional incentives for part-time faculty members’ service in the shared governance process (see Table 5).

Table 5

Frequency Counts for Institutional Incentives Provided to Part-Time Faculty for Their Participation in the Shared Governance Process (N = 34)

Response	<i>n</i>	%
Stipend	10	29.4
Hourly compensation	3	8.8
Continuing education credit (Flex hours)	3	8.8
Release time/Reassignment time	2	5.9
Continuing education reimbursement	0	0.0

Research question 4. Related to Research Question 3 (incentives provided to faculty), Research Question 4 explored how the opportunity for shared governance involvement and incentives were communicated to part-time faculty. Essentially, this question explored how the respondents became aware of institutional incentives provided for participating in the shared governance process. Of the 25 responses provided to this open-ended question, 7 responses (28%) referenced electronic mail, whereas 14 respondents (56%) discussed how they became informed or were directly contacted by a colleague at the college. The remaining participants explained how they personally sought out the opportunity to serve in a shared governance position.

Research question 5. In response to Research Question 5, “What were the motivating factors for part-time faculty who serve or have served in shared governance positions?” respondents were asked to check all the possible motivations that pertained to their involvement in an elected position of shared governance within the CCC system. The category of “Goal internalization” yielded the greatest number of responses. Over 70% of the respondents recognized “Commitment you have/had towards your school”

($n=29$, 85.3%), “Involvement in institutional planning” ($n=25$, 73.5%) and “Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs” ($n=25$, 73.5%) as motivating factors (see Table 6).

Table 6

Frequency Counts for Motivational Factors for Part-Time Faculty Who Serve or Have Served in a Shared Governance Position (N = 34)

Response	<i>n</i>	%
Commitment you have/had towards school	29	85.3
Involvement in institutional planning	25	73.5
Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs	25	73.5
Training opportunity/ A joint understanding on educational or institutional goals	23	67.6
Build relationships	23	67.6
General welfare of academia	21	61.8
Learn new skills	21	61.8
See beyond personal needs to look at the needs of the institution	19	55.9
Achieve self-actualization through governmental participation	14	41.2
Passion for student involvement	13	38.2
Increased responsibility	13	38.2
Job recognition by peers, subordinates or management	13	38.2
Recognition, honor, autonomy, career development and helping others	12	35.3
Career advancement	10	29.4
Increase probability of gaining full-time employment	9	26.5
Other factors	5	14.7
Control the agenda/forum for debate for institutional issues and policies	4	11.8

When asked to elaborate on the top two or three motivating factors that contributed to their desire to run for and serve in an elected shared governance position as

part-time faculty members, respondents provided an additional discussion of “Goal internalization” motivations. The following quotes incorporated in this section are taken directly from the unidentified respondents. One respondent wrote, “I can’t complain about the negative things about any institution and expect change. I believe if I get involved I can make some impression that will lead to necessary changes.” Another participant explained, “The only motivation to serve...for part time faculty is just a desire to participate and a desire to try and make things better.” One participant referred to the Academic Senate as the “life blood of the college” where change can be introduced and initiated. Respondents displayed a willingness to be involved in the greater goals of the college. One participant voiced this sentiment thusly:

The system has provided me a great career. I believe as a professional I have the responsibility to give back. I have always thought that teaching goes beyond the classroom. By serving as a Senator I have the opportunity to work with the administration as well as my peers and try to share my experiences.

“Training opportunities/A joint understanding on educational or institutional goals” was also included in the five most frequent responses ($n= 23$. 67.7%), however when asked to elaborate his/her response, many participants discussed training opportunities as a motivating factor. For example, one respondent wrote “I saw my participation as an excellent way to learn new skills and receive training that would better prepare me.” Another expanded by stating, “I feel as though I would gain an invaluable wealth or knowledge in regards to institutional planning, and educational achievement.”

Finally, “Build relationships” was the only extrinsic factor found in the top five responses. Twenty-three respondents (67.7%) indicated relationship building as a

motivating factor to serve. One respondent shared, “I am also interested in building relationships within the district outside of my department” (see Table 6).

Research question 6. In response to Research Question 6, “What are the greatest barriers to part-time faculty serving in shared governance positions?” respondents were asked to indicate, from a list of barriers, the ones that were applicable to their experience. The most frequent response (earning 20% more responses than the next most frequent response), “I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me vulnerable to retaliation,” was indicated by 79.4% ($n=27$) of the respondents (see Table 7). When asked to discuss their top two to three barriers, one participant explained:

Being a part time employee you do run the risk of ticking somebody off if you are not careful of what you say in a Senate meeting. The meetings are public and the college administrators often attend. You do have to worry about what you say if you want to get classes in the next term, however I have not witnessed any issues take place.

Another unidentified respondent from the study shared “Sometimes it is possible to say the wrong thing and then all of a sudden you got an ‘invisible’ pink slip.”

In addition, many respondents mentioned the barrier of availability. “Not being on campus aside from my instruction time” and “external obligations (family, other employment, etc.)” were both recognized by 19 respondents (55.9% each). Meanwhile, “I am on campus at odd times-not when shared governance meetings take place” was indicated as a barrier by 17 (50%) respondents. Participants elaborated by explaining, “Availability is one of the main issues. Since most PT [part-time] instructors have to

teach at more than one school to make ends meet, not many are available at the designated meeting days/times.”

Table 7

Frequency Counts for Barriers for Part-Time Faculty to Serve on a Shared Governance Committee (N = 34)

Response	<i>n</i>	%
I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me vulnerable to retaliation	27	79.4
I am not on campus aside from my instruction time	19	55.9
Lack of respect for part-time faculty from the college	19	55.9
External obligation (family, other employment, etc.)	17	50.0
I am on campus as odd times- not when shared governance meetings take place	16	47.1
No voice in decision making	15	44.1
Do not feel connected to the college; disconnected	13	38.2
Lack of support and staff development	12	35.3
I do not have enough available time	11	32.4
Avoid the risk of addressing sensitive subjects	11	32.4
Poor communication within the college so I do not know how to get involved	8	23.5
Limited authority of governance bodies	7	20.6
Other	6	17.7
Shared governance is too cumbersome thus impeding decisions from being made quickly	4	11.8
I choose to not be involved with day-to-day activities of the college	3	8.8
The shared governance process is too complicated	3	8.8

The barrier of “Lack of respect for part-time faculty from the college” was identified by 19 respondents (55.9%). One participant wrote: “There is a 2-class system at this school,” whereas another explained, “It has been quite hard to gain a voice and respect but I am working on it!” All the options included on the questionnaire under “Ineffective process” were indicated by 25% or less of the respondents. “Poor communication within the college so I do not know how to” was endorsed by 8 participants (see Table 7).

Additional Findings

As an additional exploratory set of analyses, the 45 dependent variables were correlated with the 14 independent variables using Spearman rank-ordered correlations. Spearman rank-ordered correlations were used rather than the more common Pearson product-moment correlation due to the relatively small sample size ($N = 34$).

Cohen (1988) suggested some guidelines for interpreting the strength of linear correlations. He suggested that a weak correlation typically had an absolute value of $r = .10$ (about 1% of the variance explained), a moderate correlation typically had an absolute value of $r = .30$ (about 9% of the variance explained) and a strong correlation typically had an absolute value of $r = .50$ (about 25% of the variance explained). With this sample size of $N = 155$, a trivial correlation of $r = .16$ (accounting for only 2.6% of the variance) is significant at the $p < .05$ level. Also, given 630 correlations, one would expect 32 correlations (5% of the total number) to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) simply due to random fluctuations in the data (Muijs, 2004). Therefore, for the sake of parsimony, this chapter will primarily highlight correlations that were of at least

moderate strength to minimize the potential of numerous Type I errors stemming from interpreting and drawing conclusions based on potentially spurious correlations.

For the 630 resulting correlations (45 dependent variables with 14 independent variables), 52 were of moderate strength based on Cohen's (1988) guidelines, and 13 had coefficients of at least $|r_s = .40|$. However, the data in this analysis were collected from a non-random sample. As such, the inferences or generalizations from these data have limited generalizability. The 13 correlations are as follows:

1. Respondents who had a part-time day schedule were less likely to be on the Executive Committee ($r_s = -.45, p = .008$);
2. Older respondents were less likely to participate for career advancement reasons ($r_s = -.41, p = .02$);
3. Those with more years of community college experience were less likely to participate for career advancement reasons ($r_s = -.45, p = .008$);
4. Respondents who had a part-time day schedule were less likely to be involved in institutional planning ($r_s = -.42, p = .02$);
5. Respondents who taught more face-to-face courses were more likely to be involved in institutional planning ($r_s = -.41, p = .02$);
6. Female respondents were more likely to be motivated by the intrinsic factor of a training opportunity/a joint understanding on educational or institutional goals ($r_s = .53, p = .001$);
7. Respondents with more years of experience were less likely to participate to increase the probability of gaining full-time employment ($r_s = -.46, p = .007$);

8. Those with a part-time evening schedule were less likely to be motivated by the intrinsic factor of a training opportunity/a joint understanding on educational or institutional goals ($r_s = -.51, p = .002$);
9. Those who taught more face-to-face courses were less likely to participate to “learn new skills” ($r_s = -.52, p = .002$);
10. Those who taught more total courses were less likely to participate to “learn new skills” ($r_s = -.46, p = .006$);
11. Those with a higher terminal degree were more likely to cite not having enough time as a barrier to participation ($r_s = .44, p = .01$);
12. Respondents with a part-time evening schedule were less likely to consider complications with shared governance to be a barrier ($r_s = -.42, p = .01$); and
13. Respondents with more years of experience were more likely to consider “lack of support and staff development” to be a barrier ($r_s = .43, p = .01$).

Summary

In summary, part-time faculty who are serving or who have served in an elected position within the shared governance body of the CCC system come from an array of disciplines, work both day and night, and teach both face-to-face and online courses. The desire to pursue a full-time position was split among the participants surveyed. Meanwhile, respondents frequently cited the Academic Senate as their chosen form of involvement. Only 50% of the respondents indicated that they were motivated to serve in their elected position because of institutional incentive; a stipend was the most common form of incentive reported. Participants found out about how to serve in their respective colleges through electronic mail, a colleague, or an administrator. The category of “Goal

internalization” yielded the greatest number of responses when looking at motivating factors. Over 70% of the respondents indicated that “Commitment you have/had towards your school” ($n=29$, 85.3%), “Involvement in institutional planning” ($n=25$, 73.5%) and “Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs” ($n=25$, 73.5%) were motivating factors. Finally, “I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me vulnerable to retaliation” was indicated by 79.4% ($n=27$) of the respondents as being the greatest barrier to part-time faculty serving in an elected position within shared governance.

In the final chapter, these findings will be compared to the literature, conclusions and implications will be drawn, and a series of recommendations will be offered.

Chapter 5: Discussion

During a period of constant financial cuts to the institution of community colleges in California (Scott, 2011), 50% of people in leadership positions within the same system will be preparing for retirement (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006; Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005) and approximately 40% of course sections will be taught by part-time faculty (Mahon, 2008). Given these circumstances, in order to sustain itself, the system of shared governance must find a way to adapt to the changing environment.

This study examined the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC shared governance process as a means to make recommendations regarding what incentives and motivations encourage participation in the CCCs' shared governance process and what institutional barriers decrease the involvement of part-time faculty. By examining the current participation of part-time faculty in the shared governance process at public CCCs, recommendations can be made regarding the incentives for future use by the CCC system. Using a descriptive design, this study sought to address the following research questions:

1. What are the demographic characteristics of part-time faculty members who serve in shared governance?
2. Are part-time faculty included in the elected positions of the shared governance process?
3. What institutional incentives are provided to part-time faculty for their participation in the shared governance process?
4. How do part-time faculty become aware of the institutional incentives provided to them for their participation in the shared governance process?

5. What were the motivating factors and purpose for part-time faculty to participate in a shared governance position?
6. What are the greatest barriers to part-time faculty serving in shared governance positions?

This chapter will present a comparison of the study's findings with the findings from the literature. Implications from the research and recommendations for moving forward will also be presented. The areas in which the findings concur with the literature will be presented, followed by a discussion of how the findings diverge from the literature. Using the established research coupled with the findings from this study, the implications will address how the leadership gap in the CCC system can potentially be filled with the population of part-time faculty. Finally, recommendations for future research, policy implementation, and practitioner utilization will be given.

Brief Summary of Findings

From the participant responses given in this study, part-time faculty serving or who have served in an elected position in the shared governance body of the CCC system come from an array of disciplines, work during the days and evenings, and teach traditional face-to-face as well as online courses. The desire to pursue a full-time position was split among the participants surveyed. Only 50% of the respondents indicated that they were motivated to serve in their elected position because of institutional incentive; a stipend was the most common form of incentive reported. Participants found out about serving in their respective colleges through electronic mail and through a colleague or administrator. The category of "Goal internalization" yielded the greatest number of responses in terms of motivating factors. "I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me

vulnerable to retaliation” was indicated by 79.4% ($n=27$) of the respondents (see Table 7) as the greatest barrier to part-time faculty serving in an elected shared governance position.

Literature Review

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of part-time faculty at CCCs. The study applied a four-dimensional lens to the role of part-time faculty within the CCC system. First, a historical examination of community colleges, specifically in California, was presented in order to understand the evolution of the institution. Second, the researcher conducted an overview of the models used within the shared governance and decision-making bodies and explored the role faculty plays in the institution. The third lens involved a discussion of the impending financial challenges facing the CCC system related to the widening leadership gap. The fourth and final lens included an examination of part-time faculty, particularly their role in shared governance.

Literature that concurs with the findings. In many ways, the findings of this study are consistent with the literature regarding the incentives (Herzberg, 1959; Rowley, 1996), motivations (Birnbaum, 1991b; Conway, 1985; Duncan-Hall, 1993; Etzioni, 1961; Herzberg, 1959; Jacoby, 2005; Maslow, 1954; McKeachie, 1997; McPhail-Naples, 2006; Pope & Miller, 2005; Rousseau & Cole, 1950; Rowley, 1996) and barriers experienced by part-time faculty serving in elected positions of shared governance (Association of Governing Board of Universities & Colleges, 2001; Bradley, 2004; Collins, 2002; Curtis & Jacobe, 2006; Dedman & Pearch, 2004; Flanigan, 1994; Fulton, 2000; Green, 2007; Gumport, 2000; Kozeracki, 2002; Lovas et al., 1994; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998; Wilson, 1999). However, there were also some

discrepancies between this research and the literature on motivation (Alenzi & Salem; 2007; Rowley, 1996) and discussion of barriers (Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2001; Guffey & Rampp, 1997; Gumport, 2000; Lovas et al., 1994; Nussbaum, 1995; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998; Veblen, 1957).

Part-time faculty and shared governance. As Kerr et al. (1994) assert, “No generalizations about higher education are true except this one: No generalization about higher education is true, since each campus has its own heritage, its own setting, its own course of future development” (p. 41). Similarly, no generalization about part-time faculty members can be made. The participants exhibited a vast diversity in age, number of years teaching in the CCC system, highest level of degree achieved, discipline, number of institutions at which they had been employed, scheduling, types of sections taught, and desire for a full-time position. One would be remiss to make generalizations about all part-time faculty in CCC or even part-time faculty serving in positions of shared governance based on findings yielded from this diverse group.

While it is difficult to make generalizations about part-time faculty, this study supports previous research indicating that part-time faculty are presented with the opportunity to participate in positions of shared governance (Berret, 2007; Kawaguchi, 2012; Piland & Bublitz, 1998). Over 90% of the respondents indicated their role in the Academic Senate and or 38.2% in “Other” entities of shared governance such as the curriculum and hiring committee as well as the faculty union.

Incentives. Rowley (1996) explains that financial incentives are not as important to faculty because they are hired on a fixed salary. Only 21 (61.8%) of the participants in

this study responded to question 2, which addressed the institutional incentives provided to part-time faculty for participation in shared governance. Many respondents left this question blank or wrote in “none.” This finding indicates part-time faculty members’ desire to serve in a position of shared governance in spite of a financial incentive. Conversely, among 261 recently surveyed part-time faculty members, compensation or stipend for participation was revealed as an incentive (Kawaguchi, 2012). The discrepancy between Kawaguchi’s (2012) research literature and the findings of this study could be explained by the variance of participants: part-time faculty in general in comparison to part-time faculty who have served in an elected position of shared governance.

Motivation. Supported by the work of Etzioni (1961), Locke (1968), and Maslow (1954), when an individual internalizes the goal of his/her respective college, he/she will have a greater motivation to see the goal achieved. Of the participants in this study, goal internalization yielded the greatest percentage of the responses to question 3, which asked respondents to indicate their motivation to serve in a position of shared governance. The top three responses – “involvement in institutional planning,” “commitment you have/had toward your school” and “willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs” – were all indicated as motivating factor by at least 74% of the respondents. By understanding goal internalization as a key motivating factor to serve in shared governance, colleges could use this knowledge to attract greater participation.

Barriers. Coinciding with the literature (Bradley, 2004; Collins, 2002), this study reaffirmed the lack of tenure as one of the greatest barriers to part-time faculty serving in a position of shared governance. Part-time faculty are employed without the protection of

due process, therefore they are vulnerable to the pressure of institutional retaliation. The barriers of availability (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006; Dedman & Pearch, 2004; Fulton, 2000) and lack of support from the college (Kozeracki, 2002; Wilson, 1999) were both indicated by the participants in this study as barriers to part-time faculty seeking a position in shared governance.

Literature that does not concur with the findings. Much of the literature on part-time faculty and their incentives, motivation, and barriers related to serving in elected positions of shared governance was reaffirmed by the participants involved in this study. However, some discrepancies arose when looking at intrinsic vs. extrinsic motivation and during the discussion of the perceived ineffectiveness of shared governance.

Motivation. While much of the literature on motivation was mirrored in the findings of this study, there was some variance. Supported by the literature in the development of this study's survey, the response from participants when asked to indicate various motivating factors behind their desire to serve in a position of shared governance was not identical to the literature. Alenzi and Salem (2007) and Rowley (1996) explain that higher education faculty members are motivated by intrinsic over extrinsic rewards. Therefore, one would expect interest in one's work, recognition, honor, autonomy, career development, and encouraging other part-time faculty members' involvement to be more important than the extrinsic factors of building relationships, controlling the agenda, passion for student involvement, seeing beyond personal needs, general welfare of academia, and increasing the probability of gaining full-time employment. However, when averaging the results of all the motivating factors within each category, intrinsic

factors yielded 45.1% endorsement, whereas extrinsic factors yielded 43.6%. The fact that intrinsic factors yielded a slightly higher percentage than extrinsic factors does not present a clear indication that faculty experience greater motivation from intrinsic rewards rather than extrinsic. The lowest scoring motivation, “control the agenda/forum, for debate for institutional issues and policies,” fell under extrinsic factors and was endorsed by 11.8% of the participants. If this motivation were removed from the average of extrinsic factors, extrinsic factors would surpass the intrinsic factors.

One possible explanation for this discrepancy is the ambiguity of the motivating factors (intrinsic vs. extrinsic). For example, building relationships, which is classified on the survey as an extrinsic factor that comes from the organization, can also be considered an intrinsic motivator. Affiliation, which could be viewed by some as building relationships, could also be understood as an intrinsic factor (McClelland, 1961). Likewise, the survey classified “job recognition by peers, subordinates or management” as an intrinsic motivator. However, this motivating factor could also be considered extrinsic if the participants assumed the recognition was associated with an award (e.g., a plaque, a parking spot, or a cash gift). Without proper explanation, several of the motivating factors included in the survey could be included in both the intrinsic and extrinsic groupings.

Barriers. The literature refers to the concept that shared governance, in some scenarios, is an ineffective process (Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2001; Guffey & Rampp, 1997; Gumpert, 2000; Lovas et al., 1994; Nussbaum, 1995; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998; Veblen, 1957). However, the participants in this study did not indicate “ineffective process” as a major

barrier. Of all categories included on the survey – “no protection of due process,” “availability,” “ineffective process” and “part-time faculty not being supported by the college” – “ineffective process” was endorsed by 24% or less of the respondents. The barrier of “shared governance process is too complicated” was only endorsed by 8.8% of the respondents.

The variance between the literature and these results could be explained by the fact that only part-time faculty members who currently or formally served in an elected position of shared governance completed the survey. Current and former members of shared governance overcame the perceived barriers in order to be elected to a position on the Academic Senate. Therefore, participants in this study must have believed in the effectiveness of shared governance process, thus skewing their responses.

Conclusion and Implications

As the fastest growing group within the CCC, part-time faculty members have received a great deal of attention from not only individual colleges, but also the statewide system. To sustain the shared governance model, which essentially allows decisions of a college district to be made in a deliberative and collaborative fashion where faculty groups have representation in the process, it was necessary to look at the often-overlooked population of part-time faculty (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Shared governance fosters better attitudes toward students by faculty and administration, and increases faculty morale while decreasing faculty turnover (Lee & Zemke, 1993; Miles, Miller, & Anderson, 1997). Furthermore, the involvement of faculty in shared governance is critical (AAUP, 2003b), fosters greater collaboration (Piland & Bublitz, 1998) and helps raise the overall effectiveness of the college. If the CCC system fails to involve part-time

faculty in the decisions that affect them, it may lose talent and experience deterioration in faculty morale (Gollattscheck, 1985; Nussbaum & CCCs, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor, 1998).

The CCC system has begun to hire increasing numbers of part-time faculty in order to accommodate the current economic constraints and dwindling funding from the state. Coupled with the anticipated leadership gap generated by the large number of retiring faculty, administrators, and presidents (Fulton-Calkins & Milling, 2005), the incorporation of part-time faculty members into the system is critical. However, the growing body of part-time faculty is drastically underrepresented in the current established model of shared governance implemented by state community colleges.

This research is significant because it attempts to decrease the gap in literature addressing the role, incentives, motivation, and barriers of part-time faculty in the CCC system's shared governance process. By obtaining a better understanding of part-time faculty and their role in shared governance, recommendations can be made and actions can be taken both at the institutional and college level to address the state-imposed fiscal constraints and the widening leadership gap occurring in the CCC system.

Recommendation for Future Research

Given the amount of published literature on the subject, it is clear that the CCC system is experiencing an increase in the use of part-time faculty (Gordon, 2002; Orr, 2010; Rifkin, 1998) and undergoing a leadership gap as a result of its lack of ability to fill positions as individuals retire (McPhail-Naples, 2006; Schults, 2001). However, there is still a gap in the literature on the role of part-time faculty in the shared governance process.

Future research questions. Future research should explore the following questions:

1. Is serving on the Academic Senate a valid form of preparation for part-time faculty who wish to serve in leadership positions in the CCC system? The groundwork behind this study was the theory that part-time faculty could gain knowledge about the functioning of the institution from their experience serving in shared governance and would essentially become better qualified to fill vacant leadership positions (Birnbaum, 1991a; Pope & Miller, 2005). However, this study did not explore whether the Academic Senate is in fact beneficial to aspiring and potential leaders.
2. How do part-time faculty members learn about the incentives of and motivations for serving in an elected shared governance position? This study asked participants to respond to an open-ended question about how they learned about the opportunity to serve on the Academic Senate as well as to indicate any institutional incentives to serve. However, the research did not inquire about how part-time faculty became informed about these incentives. Did the faculty member know about the potential for a stipend before running for office or once he/she was elected?
3. What are incentives, motivations, and barriers perceived by part-time faculty who serve in elected shared governance position in community colleges in states other than California? This research solely looked at the part-time faculty in the CCC system; however, community colleges across the United States are all experiencing fiscal constraints and pressures. The phenomenon

under investigation is not limited to California; part-time faculty in other states are being used more frequently while the leadership gap continues to expand.

4. What are the incentives, motivations, and barriers perceived by part-time faculty who serve in elected shared governance positions within California universities? Related to the aforementioned recommended research question, additional studies are encouraged to look at part-time faculty within the other institutions in California's higher educational system (private and public universities).

Methodological enhancement. In order to enhance future studies that focus on part-time faculty serving in the CCC system and expand on the knowledge focused on part-time faculty who have served or are serving in an elected position of shared governance, the following methodological enhancements are recommended:

1. Expand the sample pool to look at various entities within shared governance. The shared governance process is vast in the numerous levels of committees and groups within the CCC system. For future research, it is recommended to include and focus on part-time faculty members who serve at the faculty union level in addition to other forms of shared governance committees. Several respondents indicated their position in various bodies, however the target pool focused mainly on Academic Senate members.
2. Introduce a qualitative component. Future studies should incorporate either a focus group or one-on-one interviews with part-time faculty members who currently serve or formerly served in an elected position of shared governance.

By doing so, the researcher could ask participants to explain their responses in greater detail, thus allowing the research to look deeper into their responses.

Policy Recommendations

Given the results of the literature review and the current study, several recommendations can be made at the macro level: the institution of the CCC system. First, to address a prominent barrier preventing part-time faculty members from serving in an elected position in the shared governance process, the CCC needs to consider granting tenure to long-term, part-time faculty: a strategy endorsed by the AAUP (2010). This recommendation carries no additional costs and is institutionally plausible, since tenure can be awarded to both full-time and part-time faculty members. If granted tenure, long-serving part-time faculty members could participate in shared governance without the fear of institutional retaliation and no longer avoid addressing sensitive subjects (Collins, 2002). While granting tenure to part-time faculty is presented as a plausible solution, in reality with the diminishing resources, lack of will to embrace part-time faculty, possible limited commitment from part-time faculty, there would be much resistance to such a proposal.

Second, further research could explore best practices for part-time faculty involved in the shared governance process in the CCC system. Research of this nature would shed lights on the incentives, motivations, and barriers experienced by part-time faculty who formerly served or currently serve in an elected position of shared governance, and could be instrumental in establishing a plan to recruit more part-time faculty members. By including more part-time faculty into the inner workings of shared

governance at the colleges, they could gain additional knowledge, potentially serve as a viable solution in filling the leadership gap, and sustain the shared governance process.

CCCs are experiencing vast pressures in response to the state's budget cuts (Scott, 2011). With this decrease in funds comes the need to look for inexpensive or free alternatives. By implementing both the policy recommendations of granting long-term part-time faculty tenure and the development of a best practices model for attracting additional part-time faculty to serve in the shared governance process, the CCC system can address economic constraints while simultaneously addressing the issue of the leadership gap (McPhail-Naples, 2006).

Practitioner Recommendation

As the policy recommendations focus on the institutional level of the CCC system, the practitioner recommendations address changes that can occur within individual colleges, on the micro level. Given the implications of the research and literature review, the following recommendations are for individual colleges trying to implement improvements and positively harness the increased use of part-time faculty in the shared governance process. First, as revealed in this study and supported by the literature, part-time faculty members are often motivated to pursue an elected position in the shared governance process as a means to achieve goal-internalization (Duncan-Hall, 1993, Etzioni, 1961; McPhail-Naples, 2006). The shared governance process would cease to exist if faculty did not choose to become involved on their own. Therefore, individual colleges should consider targeting part-time faculty and promote the opportunity conferred by serving in an elected position of shared governance. Indeed, such positions offer involvement in the institutional planning process, a venue to contribute to the

greater needs of the college, and a means to act on one's commitment towards one's college. Poor communication is a barrier for part-time faculty involvement in the shared governance process (Flanigan, 1994; Lovas et al., 1994); therefore if the benefits of service were properly promoted, part-time faculty would have a greater probability of serving.

In addition to communicating the motivating factors of goal internalization gained when serving in an elected position of shared governance, colleges need to consider the development and implementation of a shared governance mentoring program. As indicated in this study, part-time faculty members became aware of the opportunity to serve in a shared governance position through their colleagues (both full and part-time faculty) and college administrators. The mentoring program would act as a means to communicate with and integrate new part-time faculty into the shared governance process, college, and larger academic community. The mentor could coordinate with the mentee to ensure his/her motivating factors are achieved, thus securing the mentee's role in shared governance.

Although community colleges in California are controlled by the state, several actions can be taken at the local college level to cope with budget cuts, increase use of part-time faculty, and close the leadership gap. Individual colleges and leaders in each school are encouraged to communicate the motivating rewards one gains while in a leadership position in the shared governance process, as well as explore, develop, and implement mentoring programs that will invite a greater number of part-time faculty members to participate in shared governance.

Final Summary

During a time when community colleges are faced with the challenge of decreasing funds coupled with a lack of individuals to enter into vacated leadership positions, this study examined the role, incentives, motivations, and barriers experienced by part-time faculty serving in an elected position within the CCC shared governance system. Comparing the research and findings from the study, recommendations were presented for future research as well as system-wide and college-specific changes. In order to sustain the concept of shared governance within the system of community colleges, additional dialogue needs to occur on how to increase the inclusion of part-time faculty in the system.

REFERENCES

- Academic Senate for California, Community Colleges. (2002). *Part-time faculty: A principled perspective*. Retrieved from <http://faculty.rcc.edu/ptfaculty/Documents/Part-Time.pdf>
- Alenzi, F. Q., & Salem, M. L. (2007). *Career preference among universities' faculty: Literature review*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED497697.pdf>
- Almond, G., & Verba, S. (1989). *The civic culture revisited*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- American Association of University Professors. (1995). Policy documents and reports. 8th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (2003a). *Statement on contingent appointments and the academic profession*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/conting-stmt.htm?PF=1>
- American Association of University Professors. (2003b). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of University Professors. (2010). *Tenure and teaching-intensive appointments*. Washington, DC: Author.
- American Association of University Professors, American Council on Education, & Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.

- Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges. (2001). *Statement on institutional governance and governing in the public trust*. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges.
- Antony, J. S., & Valdez, J. R. (1998, November 5-8). *An exploration of the job satisfaction of American part-time college faculty*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Miami, FL. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED427597.pdf>. (ED497697)
- Avakian, A. N. (1995). Conflicting demands for adjunct faculty. *Community College Journal*, 65(6), 34-36. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/62758130?accountid=13159>
- Baca, J. M. (1998). *A history of California community college governance and trustees' perceptions of the faculty role in district and college (shared) governance* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 9931866).
- Baldrige, J. V. (1971). *Academic governance; research on institutional politics and decision making*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Baldrige, J. V. (1974). *Alternative models of governance in higher education*. Stanford, CA: Stanford Center for Research and Development in Teaching, School of Education, Stanford University.
- Benjamin, R. & Carroll, S.J. (1998). The implications of the changed environment for governance in higher education. In W. Tierney (Eds.). *The responsive university* (pp. 92-112). Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.

- Benton, C.J. (1997). Faculty involvement in two-year college governance. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 9738344).
- Berdahl, R. (1991). Shared academic governance and external constraints. In M. W. Peterson, E. E. Chaffee, & T. H. White (Eds.), *Organization and academic governance in higher education* (4th ed.; pp. 167-179). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn.
- Berret, B. (2007). *Examining the participation of contingent faculty in the shared governance of institutions of higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from Proquest Dissertations & Theses. (UMI No. 3298291).
- Birnbaum, R. (1991a). *Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1991b). The latent organizational functions of the Academic Senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 75, 423-443. doi:10.1002/he.36919917503
- Birnbaum, R. (2000). *Management fads in higher education: Where they come from, what they do, why they fail*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Boord, M. (2010). *Analysis of adjunct faculty at Des Moines Area Community College: Use and application of Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory to predict job satisfaction in teaching improvement and professional development* (Doctoral

dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3438673).

Brams, P.C. (1983). What makes part-times tick? *Journal of Staff, Program and Organization Development*, 1(2), 39-42. Retrieved from <http://newforums.metapress.com/content/121031/?p=d2e6f56ee8ff4644931addbc75e1abe5&pi=0>

Breneman, D. W. (2008). What colleges can learn from recessions past. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(7), A112. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/What-Colleges-Can-Learn-From/16846>

Bradley, G. (2004). Contingent faculty and the new academic labor system. *Academe*, 90(1), 28-32. doi:10.2307/40252585

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2009). *Student demographics by academic year*. Retrieved from https://misweb.cccco.edu/mis/onlinestat/studdemo_annual_college.cfm

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2010a). *Community colleges*. Retrieved from the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office Web site: <http://www.cccco.edu/CommunityColleges/>

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2010b). *Community colleges make concerted effort to meet demand* [Press release]. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Education Code §87482.6, 2008. (2008). Retrieved from California Law Web site, <http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/calaw.html>

California Higher Education Policy Center (1997). *State structures: California case study*. San Jose, CA: Pew Charitable Trusts and the James Irvine Foundation.

- Cameron, K. S., Dutton, J. E., & Quinn, R. E. (2003). *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.
- Campbell, M. E. (2003). *The involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance: Implications for institutional decision-making* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3132441).
- Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. (1973). *Governance of higher education: Six priority problems*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Chandler, G. (2011). A case study of the impact of professional development on instructional practices of part-time faculty at a community college (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3487244).
- Christenson, C. (2008). The employment of part-time faculty. *New Directions For Higher Education*, 2008(143), 29-36. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/he.310/abstract>
- Clark, B. R. (1964). *Faculty organization and authority*. Berkeley, CA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, University of California.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1982). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cohen, A.M. & March, J. (1986). Leadership in an Organized Anarchy. In M. C. Brown II (ed.) *ASHE Reader of Organization and Governance in Higher Education* 5th Edition (pp. 16-35). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Cohen, A. M., March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(1), 1-25. doi:10.2307/2392088

Collins, L. (2002). Shared governance in the California community colleges. *Academe*, 88(4), 36-40. doi:10.2307/40252187

Collins, V. H. (1996). *The faculty role in governance: A historical analysis of the influence of the American association of university professors and the middle states association on academic decision making* [ASHE annual meeting paper]. Lexington, MA: Ginn Custom.

Community College League of California (2001). *First biannual league report on California community college chief executive officer (CEO) tenure and retention: Executive summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/CEOSTudy.pdf>

Community College League of California (n.d.). *Keeping the "community" in California's community colleges*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccleague.org/files/public/PRPccgov.pdf>

Conway, M. M. (1985). *Political participation in the United States*. Washington, DC: CQ.

Cooper, J. E., & Pagotto, L. (2003). Developing community college faculty as leaders. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 123, 27-37. doi:10.1002/cc.119

- Corson, J. J. (1960). *Governance of colleges and universities*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Crellin, M. (2010). The future of shared governance. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 151, 71-81. doi:10.1002/hec.402
- Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Curtis, J. W., & Jacobe, M. F. (2006). *AAUP contingent faculty index, 2006*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- DeCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation; the internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Dedman, D., & Pearch, W. J. (2004). Perspectives on adjunct and other non-tenure faculty. *The Community College Enterprise*, 10(1), 23-24. Retrieved from <http://www.schoolcraft.edu/cce/search.asp>
- Downs, A. (1957). *An economic theory of democracy*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Doyle, J. (2008, November 20). CSU to impose enrollment caps in budget crisis. *San Francisco Chronicle*. Retrieved from <http://www.sfgate.com/chronicle/>
- Duncan-Hall, T. L. (1993). *Faculty participation in institutional planning in California community colleges: Theory and reality* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 9430461).

- Duryea, E.D. (1984). Evolution of university organization. In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), *ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education* (rev. ed.). (pp. 123-140). Lexington, MA: Ginn Custom.
- Edel, A. (1990). *The struggle for academic democracy: Lessons from the 1938 "revolution" in New York's city colleges*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Elliott, F., & Summerskill, M. B. (1957). *A dictionary of politics*. Hammondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations; on power, involvement, and their correlates*. New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Faculty Association of California Community Colleges. (1989). *Assembly Bill 1725*. Retrieved from <http://www.faccc.org/advocacy/bills/historical/ab1725.PDF>
- Feldman, D.C. & Turnley, W.H. (2004). Contingent employment in academic careers: relative deprivation among adjunct faculty. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 284-307. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2002.11.003
- Flanigan, P. K. (1994). *California community colleges faculty role in shared governance*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED373816.pdf>
- Fryer, T. W., & Lovas, J. C. (1991). Leadership in governance. *Leadership Abstracts*, 4(2), 1-2. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Fulton, R. D. (2000). The plight of part-timers in higher education. *Change*, 32(3), 38-43. doi:10.1080/00091380009601734
- Fulton-Calkins, P. & Milling (2005). Community-college leadership: An art to be

- practiced: 2010 and beyond. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(3), 233-250. doi:10.1080/10668920590901176
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Gerston, L. N., & Christensen, T. (2007). *California politics and government: A practical approach*. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
- Gilmour, Jr., J. (1991). Participative governance bodies in higher education: Report of a national study. *New Directions in Higher Education*, 75, 27-39. doi:10.1002/he.36919917504
- Glass, G. V., & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). *Statistical methods in education and psychology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gollattscheck, J. F. (1985). Developing and maintaining governance. In W. L. Deegan & J. F. Gollattscheck (Eds.), *Ensuring effective governance* (pp. 83-96). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, C. E. (1990). *Professional development need beliefs of part-time teachers of English* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 9104028).
- Gordon, M. (2002). *Part-time faculty in community colleges: The jury is still out*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED472020>
- Green, D. W. (2007). Adjunct faculty and the continuing quest for quality. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 140, 29-39. doi:10.1002/cc.302

- Greisler, D. (2002, September/October). Adjunct to what? A non-tradition perspective on teaching the social sciences. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 25, 9-10. doi:10.1081/PAD-120006129
- Greive, D. E., & Worden, C.A. (2000). *Managing adjunct and part-time faculty for the new millennium*. Elyria, OH: Info-Te.
- Griffith, M., & Connor, A. (1994). *Democracy's open door*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Guffey, J. S., & Rampp, L. C. (1997). *Shared governance: Balancing the euphoria*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED418617.pdf>
- Gumport, P. J. (2000). Academic restructuring: Organizational change and institutional imperatives. *Higher Education*, 39(1), 67-91. doi:10.1023/A:1003859026301
- Halford, A. (1994). *Faculty morale--Enhancing it in spite of diminishing resources and challenges*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED368422.pdf>
- Hamilton, A., Madison, J., Jay, J., Rossiter, C., & Kesler, C. R. (2003). *The federalist papers*. New York, NY: Signet Classic.
- Hannah, S. T., Woolfolk, R. L., & Lord, R. G. (2009). Leader self-structure: a framework for positive leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30, 269-290. doi:10.1002/job.586
- Herzberg, F. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Hobbs, W. C. (1975). Organizational roles of university committees. *Research in Higher Education*, 3, 233-242. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/pss/40194973>

- Howell, C. D. (1997). An assessment of the implementation of shared governance provisions of AB 1725 (1988) at selected. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 21(7), 637.
- Huyck, K. (2011, January 6). *Leadership style in higher education during time of fiscal distress*. Presentation at the Hawaii International Conference on Education, Waikiki, HI.
- Jacoby, D. (2005). Part-time community-college faculty and the desire for full-time tenure-track positions: Results of a single institution case study. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(2), 137-152. doi:10.1080/10668920490891629
- Jenkins, R., & Jensen, B. (2010). How to climb down from top-down leadership. *Academe*, 96(3), 24-27. Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2010/MJ/feat/jenk.htm>
- Kater, S., & Levin, J. S. (2004). Shared governance in the community college. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29(1), 1-23. doi:10.1080/10668920390276849
- Kaufman, J. F. (1984). The college presidency—yesterday and today. In R. Birnbaum (Ed.), *ASHE reader in organization and governance in higher education* (rev. ed.) (pp 238-266). Lexington, MA: Ginn Custom.
- Kawaguchi, L. (2012). *Effective practices: Part-Time faculty and local academic senates*. Retrieved from <http://www.asccc.org/content/effective-practices-part-time-faculty-and-local-academic-senates>
- Kelly, D. K. (1990). *A human resources development approach to part-time faculty in the*

- community college*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED316279.pdf>
- Kelman, H. C. (1958). Compliance, identification, and internalization: Three processes of attitude change. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2(1), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/172844>
- Kerr, C., Gade, M. L., Kawaoka, M. & Ebrary, I. (1994). *Troubled times for American higher education the 1990s and beyond*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, 75(4), 371-399. doi:10.1353/jhe.2004.0022
- Kozeracki, C. (2002). Faculty attitudes about students. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 2002(118), 47-58. doi:10.1002/cc.63
- Leatherman, C. (1998). "Shared governance" under siege: Is it time to revive it or get rid of it? *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 44(21), A8-A9. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Shared-Governance-Under/99443/>
- Lee, C., & Zemke, R. (1993). The search for spirit in the workplace. *Training*, 30(6), 21-28. Retrieved from http://strandtheory.org/images/The_search_for_spirit_in_the_workplace.pdf
- Leonard, N. H., Beauvais, L. L., & Scholl, R. W. (1999). Work motivation: The incorporation of self-concept-based processes. *Human Relations*, 52(8), 969-998. doi:10.1177/001872679905200801

- Leonhardt, D. (2010, May 7). Students of the great recession. *The New York Times*, MM13. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/09/magazine/09fob-wwln-t.html>
- Liaison Committee of the Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education. (1960). *A master plan for higher education in California, 1960-1975*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.
- Liebscher, P. (June 06, 1998). Quantity with quality? Teaching quantitative and qualitative methods in an LIS Master's program. *Library Trends*, 46(4), 668-680. Retrieved from https://www.ideals.illinois.edu/bitstream/handle/2142/8180/librarytrendsv46i4f_opt.pdf
- Lipset, S. M. (1963). *Political man: The social bases of politics*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 3(2), 157-189. doi:10.1016/0030-5073(68)90004-4
- Locke, K. M. (2004). *A study of the implementation of the shared governance provisions of AB1725 in the California community colleges* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3135575).
- Longin, T.C. (2002). Institutional governance: A call for collaborative decision-making in American higher education. In L.A. McMillin & W.G. Berberet (Eds.) *New academic compact: Revisioning the relationship between faculty and their institutions* (pp. 211-221). Bolton, MA: Anker.

- Lopez, E. S. (2004). *The composition of staff in California's community colleges, 1994-2002*. Sacramento, CA: California Research Bureau.
- Lovas, J. C., & Kanter, M. J., & Jackman, J. J. (1994). *Shared governance: The next generation*. Paper presented at Leadership 2000, the annual conference of the League for Innovation in Community College and the Community College Leadership Program, San Diego, CA, July 17-20. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED375873>
- Luthans F., Avolio B.J., Norman S.M., & Avey J.B. (2008). The mediating role of psychological capital in the supportive organizational climate-employee performance relationship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 29*(2), 219-238. doi:10.1002/job.507
- Mahon, R. (2008, December). *Part-time faculty: Where are we now?* Retrieved from <http://asccc.org/content/part-time-faculty-where-are-we-now>
- Mandel, M., & LeVine, S. (2009, October 19). The recession goes to school. *Business Week, 20*. Retrieved from <http://www.businessweek.com/>
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Master Plan Survey Team. (1998). *A master plan for high education*. Retrieved from <http://www.cpec.ca.gov/CompleteReports/1998Reports/98-01.pdf>
- Masterson, K. (2008). Colleges lower their expectations for endowments. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 55*(6), A15-A16. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Lower-Their/29052>
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The achieving society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.

- McGuire, J. (1993). Part-time faculty: Partners in excellence. *Leadership Abstracts*, 6(6), 367-429. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED367429.pdf>
- McKeachie, W. J. (1997). Critical elements in training university teachers. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 2, 1, 67-74. doi:10.1080/1360144970020108
- McMillan, J. H., & Schumacher, S. (2010). *Research in education: Evidence-based inquiry*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- McMillen, L. (2002). Compacts and collaboration across the faculty/administrator divide. *Liberal Education*, 88(3), 42-47. Retrieved from <http://www.aacu.org/liberaleducation/le-su02/le-su02feature3.cfm>
- McPhail-Naples, F. (2006). *Aspirations of community college leadership: A study of talent engagement and the barriers and motivation for faculty leadership development* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3251464).
- McShane, S. L., & Glinow, M. V. (2005). *Organizational behavior: Emerging realities for the workplace revolution* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Metzger, W.P. (1989). Academic governance: An evolutionary perspective. In J. H. Schuster & L. H. Miller (Eds.), *Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Miles, A., Miller, M., & Anderson, L. (2007). Legal perspective on faculty involvement in governance. In A. Miles (Ed.), *College law* (2nd ed., pp. 221-230). Tuscaloosa, AL: Sevgo.
- Millett, J. D. (1977). *The academic community*. Westport, CN: Greenwood.

- Mize, R. (1998). *Full-time part-time faculty: A proposal for perspective*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED427800>
- Mortimer, K. P., & McConnell, T. R. (1978). *Sharing authority effectively*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London, UK: Sage.
- Murray, J. P. (2002). The current state of faculty development in two-year colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 118, 89-97. doi:10.1002/cc.67
- National Bureau of Economic Research. (2008). *Determination of the December 2007 peak in economic activity*. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/cycles/dec2008.html>
- Nussbaum, T. J. (1995). *Evolving community college shared governance to better serve the public interest*. Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED397922>
- Nussbaum, T. J., & California Community Colleges, Sacramento Office of the Chancellor. (1998). *Reforming the governance of California community colleges*. Sacramento, CA: California Community Colleges.
- Orr, C. (2010). *California community college administrators' perceptions of part-time faculty shared governance participation* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3433713).
- Outcalt, C. (2002). *A profile of the community college professorate, 1975-2000*. New York, NY: Routledge Falmer.

- Piland, W. E., & Bublitz, R. F. (1998). Faculty perceptions of shared governance in California community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22(2), 99-110. doi:10.1080/1066892980220201
- Pope, M. L., & Miller, M. T. (2005). Leading from the inside out: Learned respect for academic culture through shared governance. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 29(9), 745-757. doi:10.1080/10668920591006610
- Redmond, R. (2011). *Faculty involvement in shared governance and decision making: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3300824).
- Rhoades, G. (2005). Capitalism, academic style, and shared governance. *Academe*, 91(3), 38-42. doi:10.2307/40252785
- Richardson, J. T. (1999). Centralizing governance isn't simply wrong: It's bad business too. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 45(23), B9. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Centralizing-Governance-Isnt/8672/>
- Rifkin, T. (1998). *Differences between the professional attitudes of full- and part-time faculty*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED417783>
- Rivera, C. (2011, March 31). California community colleges to slash enrollment, classes. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/mar/31/local/la-me-0331-community-colleges-20110331>
- Robbins, S. P., Judge, T. A., & Campbell, T. T. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. Harlow, UK: Pearson.

- Romo, K. (1998). *Assessing the faculty's role in shared governance: implications of AAUP Standards*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Rousseau, J. J., & Cole, G. D. H. (1950). *The social contract: And discourses*. New York, NY: E.P. Dutton and Company.
- Rowley, J. (1996). Motivation and academic staff in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 4(3), 11-16. doi:10.1108/09684889610125814
- Sandy, J., Gonzalez, A., & Hilmer, M. J. (2006). Alternative paths to college completion: Effect of attending a two-year school on the probability of completing a four-year degree. *Economics of Education Review*, 2006, 25(5), 463-471.
doi:10.1016/j.econedurev.2005.05.003
- Schmidt, S. W., Shelley, M. C., & Bardes, B. A. (2009). *American government & politics today*. Boston, MA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Schults, C. (2001). *The critical impact of impending retirements on community college leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.aacc.nche.edu/Publications/Briefs/Documents/11062001leadership.pdf>
- Schuster, J., & Finkelstein, M. (2006). *The restructuring of academic work and careers: The American faculty*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press
- Schuster, J., & Miller, L. (1989). *Governing tomorrow's campus: Perspectives and agendas*. New York, NY: American Council on Education/Millian.
- Scott, S. (2011). *Community colleges chancellor Jack Scott reacts to Gov. Brown's budget: Proposed cuts hurt colleges' ability to serve students and Sacramento, CA*. Retrieved from http://www.cccco.edu/Portals/4/News/press_releases

/2010/MEDIASTATEMENTChancellorScottonGovJerryBrownStateBudgetPropo
sal%20FINALWITHFACTSHEET_1-10-11.pdf

Shinn, L.D. (2004, January/February). A conflict of cultures. *Change*, 36(1), 18-26.

doi:10.1080/00091380409605080

Tella, C. O. Ayeni, S. O., & Popoola (2007, April). Work motivation, job satisfaction, and organizational commitment of library personnel in academic and research libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 2007, 1-16.

Retrieved from <http://unllib.unl.edu/LPP/tella2.pdf>

University of California: Office of the President. (2009). *California master plan for higher education: Major features*. Retrieved from http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca_masterplan_summary.pdf

Vaughn, G. B. (2001). *Developing community college leaders for the future: Crisis or opportunity*. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED457873.pdf>

Veblen, T. (1957). *The higher learning in America; a memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men*. New York, NY: Sagamore.

Warters, W. C. (2000). *Mediation in the campus community: Designing and managing effective programs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Washington, K. (2011). *Towards a deeper understanding of community college part-time faculty: Perceptions of roles and expectations* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database (AAT 3463734).

Weber, M., Henderson, A. M., & Parsons, T. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Western Association of Schools and Colleges (2009). *Focus on learning: The*

accreditation manual. Retrieved from http://www.acswasc.org/pdf_fol/CompleteBasicFOL.pdf

Wilcox, A. (2009, May 8). UC regents approve student fee increase. *The Daily Californian*. Retrieved from http://archive.dailycal.org/article/105630/uc_regents_approve_student_fee_increase

Wilson, R. (1999). How a university created 95 faculty slots and scaled back its use of part-timers. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(9), A18-A20. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/How-a-University-Created-95/10422/>

Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. (2010). *Scholar says recession's effects will linger for years*. Retrieved from <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/article/scholar-says-recessions-effects-will-linger-for-years>

Zukin, C. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Zusman, A. (2005). Challenges facing higher education in the twenty-first century in P.G. Altbach, R.O. Berdahl & P.J. Gumport (Eds.), *American higher education in the twenty-first century: Social, political and economic changes* (pp. 115-160). Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

APPENDIX A

Introductory Letter to be Included in Mailed Packet

Date

Name

Title

Institution

Street

City, State Zip Code

Dear ;

I am a doctoral student at Pepperdine University conducting research as part of the fulfillment of my dissertation, *Incentives for Part-time Faculty to Participate in the Shared Governance Process Within the Institution of California Community Colleges (CCC)*. I am writing to ask your assistance to take a few moments of your time and complete the enclosed questionnaire and return to me in the enclosed, stamped envelope by (). You have been selected to participate in this survey because of your current or past participation serving on the elected body of the Academic Senate as a part-time faculty member.

The enclosed questionnaire examines the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in CCCs in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system.

This survey is voluntary and your name and institution will remain anonymous. Participants will receive a small token of appreciation, a \$2 lottery ticket, upon completion. The surveys are coded in the lower left hand corner as a means to issue the lottery ticket. Please be assured your response will be held in strict confidence.

Completion of the survey will take approximately 10 minutes and is to be returned in the enclosed postage paid envelope. If you would like the results of the survey, you can contact me at Kristen.Huyck@pepperdine.edu.

Warm regards,

Kristen J. Huyck

Fellow Part-time Faculty & Academic Senator (Mt. San Jacinto Community College District)

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Incentives for Part-time Faculty Participation in Shared Governance

Instructions:

Per California Education Code §87482.6, 2008, part-time faculty are defined as any member who works for no more than 67% of the hour per week at one institution (2008).

This questionnaire examines the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in CCCs in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exist causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty in the CCC system.

Check all the answers that are applicable to each question (you can select as many or as little as your choose).

Please be as accurate as possible in answering each question. There is no right or wrong answer. Your answers should be what actually occurs rather than what you believe should happen or how you think people should perceive it.

Question 1

Part 1: In some Community College Districts, Part-Time Faculty are able to run for an elected position within the shared governance process. Please place a check mark next to all the bodies of shared governance to which you have been elected or have served on while employed as a part-time faculty member.

(check all that apply)

_____ Academic Senate (“Senate”)

_____ Site Council

_____ Faculty Advisory Board

_____ Executive Council

_____ Executive Committee

_____ Executive Senate

_____ Other (please specify _____)

Part 2: As a part-time faculty member, how did you hear about opportunities for part-time involvement in an elected position within the shared governance in California Community Colleges?

Question 2

Part 1: Defined as external factors of motivation, what are the institutional incentives for part-time faculty to serve in a position of shared governance?

(check all that apply)

_____ Stipend. How much? _____

_____ Hourly compensation. How much? _____

_____ Release time/Reassignment time

_____ Continuing education credit (Flex hours)

_____ Continuing education reimbursement

(Please turn to the next page for question 3)

Question 3

Part 1: Thinking to when you served in a position of shared governance as a part-time faculty member, what was your motivation to serve? (check all that apply)

Goal internalization:

- Involvement in institutional planning
- Commitment you have/had towards your school
- Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs
- Achieve self-actualization through governmental participation

Intrinsic factors that come from within the job:

- Career advancement
- Increased responsibility
- Job recognition by peers, subordinates or management
- Recognition, honor, autonomy, career development and helping others
- Training opportunity / A joint understanding on educational or institutional goals
- Learn new skills

Extrinsic factors that come from the organization:

- Build Relationships
- Control the agenda/ Forum for debate for institutional issues and policies
- Passion for student involvement
- See beyond personal needs and look at the needs of the institution
- General welfare of academia
- Increase probability of gaining full-time employment

Other (please specify _____)

Part 2: Please comment on the top two or three motivating factors that contributed to your decision to run for and serve in an elected shared governance position while working as a part-time faculty member.

Question 4

Part 1: What are the barriers for part-time faculty to serve on a shared governance committee?

(check all that apply)

No protection of due process:

- _____ Avoid the risk of addressing sensitive subjects
- _____ I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me vulnerable to retaliation

Availability:

- _____ I do not have enough available time
- _____ I am not on campus aside from my instruction time
- _____ I am on campus at odd times- not when shared governance meetings take place
- _____ External obligations (family, other employment, etc.)
- _____ I choose not to be involved with day-to-day activities of the college

Ineffective process:

- _____ The shared governance process is too complicated
- _____ Shared governance is too cumbersome thus impeding decisions from being made quickly
- _____ Poor communication within the college so I do not know how to get involved
- _____ Limited authority of governance bodies

Part-Time faculty is not supported by the college:

- _____ Lack of support and staff development
- _____ No voice in decision making
- _____ Lack of respect for part-time faculty from the college
- _____ Do not feel connected to the college; disconnected

_____ Other (please specify _____)

Part 2: Please comment on the top two or three barriers you found to be present when serving in an elected position in the shared governance process while working as a part-time faculty member.

Demographics

Circle one

1. Sex: Male Female

2. Age: _____

3. Number of years you have worked as member of the part-time faculty within the community college system: _____

4. Your highest level of academic achievement:
 Bachelor's degree
 Master's Degree
 Doctorate Degree
 Other: Please Specify _____

5. Please check the primary subject area in which you teach:
 Art (music and theater)
 Business (accounting, economics, management, marketing)
 Career and technical
 English
 Science (biological science, chemistry, physical, etc)
 Physical Education
 Social Studies (history and political science, philosophy, religion)
 Health sciences (nursing, PT, OT, etc)
 Other: Please specify _____

6. Number of institutions/organizations where you teach during the last three years:

7. I teach a:

Full-time day schedule	Full-time evening schedule
Part-time day schedule	Part-time evening schedule
Other: _____	

8. Are you seeking a full-time teaching position? Yes No

9. In the last three years how many course sections have you taught in each of the following

_____ Online	_____ Hybrid	_____ Face-to-face
--------------	--------------	--------------------

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent Form to Participate In a Research Study

Incentives for Part-time Faculty to participate in the Shared Governance Process

Within the Institution of California Community Colleges

PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR: **Kristen Huyck**

CONTACT INFORMATION: **XXXXXXXX**

Kristen.Huyck@pepperdine.edu

FACULTY ADVISOR: **Dr. Robert Barner**

CONTACT INFORMATION: **Robert.Barner@pepperdine.edu**

Kristen Huyck, a doctoral student at Pepperdine University and Part-time faculty member serving on the Academic Senate, is conducting a study to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in California Community Colleges (CCCs).

Purpose and Procedures: The purpose of this study is to examine part-time faculty members who have served or serve in an elected position or shared governance within the institution of CCC in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exists causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty.

Compensation: There is no cost associated with participation in this study, however upon completion, participants will receive a \$2.00 lottery ticket as a small token of appreciation.

Risk/Benefits to the Participant: Responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential. No individual names will be used for reporting results or when information about this research is published. Responses will be kept in a secure file. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants will be strictly enforced.

Participant's Right to Withdraw from the Study: At any time participants may elect to withdraw from participation in this research study.

Voluntary Consent by Participant: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and individual consent will be indicated through the participant's willingness to complete the survey.

Questions: Any and all questions you may have about the study should be answered prior to the completion of the questionnaire. Please direct your inquires to Ms. Kristen Huyck at XXXXXXXXXXXX or Kristen.Huyck@Pepperdine.edu. If you have questions about the rights of research participants you may call Dr. Yuying Tsong, Pepperdine University's Education Division at (310) 568-5768.

Voluntary Consent: Participants are free to withdraw or refuse consent, or to discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty or consequent.

*IRB Approval: Pepperdine University's IRB has approved the solicitation
of participants for the study*

APPENDIX D

Survey Questions: Correlation with the Research

Correlates with RQ 2: Are part-time faculty included in the shared governance process?

Part 1: In some Community College Districts, Part-Time Faculty are able to run for an elected positions within the shared governance process. Please place a check mark next to all the bodies of shared governance you have been elected or have served on while hired as a part-time faculty member.

Academic Senate (“Senate”)	(Miller, McCormack, Thomas, & Pope, 2000) (Academic Senate of California Community College, 2002) (Mt San Jacinto Community College, 2012)
Site Council	(Miller, McCormack, Thomas, & Pope, 2000) (Mt San Jacinto Community College, 2012)
Faculty Advisory Board	(Miller, Vavik, Benton, 1998) (Miller, McCormack, Thomas, & Pope, 2000)
Executive Council	(City College of San Francisco, 2012)
Executive Committee	(Academic Senate of California Community College, 2002)
Executive Senate	

Correlates with RQ 3: How do part-time faculty become aware of the institutional incentives provided to them for their participation in the shared governance process?

Part 2: As a part-time faculty member, how did you become informed of part-time involvement in an elected position within the shared governance in California Community Colleges?

Correlates with RQ 3: What institutional incentives are provided to part-time faculty for their participation in the shared governance process?

Part 1: Defined as external factors of motivation, what are the institutional incentives for part-time faculty to serve on run and serve in a position of shared governance?

(check all that apply)

Institutional Incentive	Source
Stipend. How much? _____	Mt San Jacinto Community College (Herzberg, 1959)
Hourly compensation. How much? _____	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Local senate profile survey
Release time/Reassignment time	Academic Senate for California Community Colleges' Local senate profile survey
Continuing education credit	
Continuing education reimbursement	

Correlates with RQ 5: What were the motivating factors for part-time faculty who serve or have served in a shared governance position?

Part 1: Thinking to when you served in a position of shared governance as a part-time faculty member, what was your motivation to serve? (check all that apply)

Motivation	Source
Goal internalization: -Involvement in institutional planning -Commitment you have /had towards your school -Willingness to contribute to the larger needs of the institution over personal needs -Achieve self-actualization through governmental participation	(Kelman, 1958) (Benton, 1997; Birnbaum, 1991; Duncan-Hall, 1998 p. 142; McPhail Naples, 2006) (Birnbaum, 1991; McPhail Naples, 2006; Rousseau & Cole, 1950) (Etzioni, 1961) (Conway, 1985; Maslow, 1954)
Intrinsic factors that come from within the job: -Career advancement -Increased responsibility -Job recognition by peers, subordinates or management -Recognition, honor, autonomy, career development and helping others - Training opportunity / A joint understanding on educational or institutional goals -Learn new skills	(McPhail Naples, 2006) (Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961) (Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961) (Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961) (McClelland, 1961; McKeachie, 1997) (Birnbaum, 1991; McClelland, 1961; Pope & Miller, 2005; Rousseau & Cole, 1950) (McClelland, 1961; McKeachie, 1997) Intrinsic motivators are preferred by members in higher education.
Extrinsic factors (hygiene factors) that come from the organization: -Build Relationships	(Herzberg, 1959; McPhail Naples, 2006) (Herzberg, 1959; McClelland, 1961; Pilard & Bublitz, 1998)

-Control the agenda/ Forum for debate for institutional issues and policies	(Birnbaum, 1991; Jenkins & Jenson, 2010; Pope & Miller, 2005;)
-Passion for student involvement	(Pope & Miller, 2005)
-General welfare of academia	(Birnbaum, 1991; Pope & Miller, 2005)
-Increase probability of gaining full-time employment	(Jacoby, 2005)

Correlates with RQ 5: What were the motivating factors for part-time faculty who serve or have served in a shared governance position?

Part 2: Please comment on two or three of the motivating factors that drove you to run and served in an elected shared governance position while working as a part-time faculty member.

Correlates with RQ 6: What have been the greatest barriers for part-time faculty who decide to serve in a shared governance position?

Part 1: What are the barriers for part-time faculty to serve on a shared governance committee?

(check all that apply)

Barriers	Source
No protection of due process:	
-Avoid the risk of addressing sensitive subjects	(Bradley, 2004)
-I do not have the benefit of tenure, making me vulnerable to retaliation	(Collins, 2002)
Availability:	(Jenkins & Jensen, 2010; Millett, 1977)
-I do not have enough available time	(AAUP, 2003a, p. 10).
-I am not on campus aside from my instruction time	“They are paid for specific classes they teach and are often on campus only for those scheduled class meetings, rushing off to teach the next course at another campus or to another job entirely” (Curtis & Jacobe, 2006 p. 8)
	(Curtis & Jacobe, 2006 p. 8)
-I am on campus at odd times- not when shared governance meetings take place	(Curtis & Jacobe, 2006 p. 8)
-External obligations (family, other employment, etc)	(Dedman & Pearch, 2004; Fulton, 2000)

-I choose not to be involved with day-to-day activities of the college	
<p>Ineffective process</p> <p>-The shared governance process is too complicated</p> <p>-Shared governance is too cumbersome thus impeding decisions from being made quickly</p> <p>-Poor communication within the college so I do not know how to get involved</p> <p>-Limited authority of governance bodies</p>	<p>(Association of Governing Board of Universities and Colleges, 2001, p. 3)</p> <p>(Berrit, 2007; Gumpport, 2000; Hobbs, 1975; Warters, 2000)</p> <p>(Flanigan, 1994; Lovas, Kanter & Jackson, 1994; Romo, 1998)</p> <p>(Nussbaum, 1998)</p>
<p>Part-time faculty is not supported by the college:</p> <p>-Lack of support and staff development</p> <p>-No voice in decision making</p> <p>-Lack of respect for part-time faculty from the college</p> <p>-Do not feel connected to the college; disconnected</p>	<p>(Kozeracki, 2002)</p> <p>(Kozeracki, 2002)</p> <p>(Kozeracki, 2002)</p> <p>(Green, 2007; Wilson, 1999)</p>

Correlates with RQ 6: What have been the greatest barriers for part-time faculty who decide to serve in a shared governance position?

Part 2: Please comment on two or three of the barriers that you found to be present when serving in an elected position in the shared governance process while working as a part-time faculty member.

Demographics

Correlates with RQ 1: What are the demographic characteristics of part-time faculty members who serve in shared governance?

Conditions caused from individual demographics influence the amount of control people feel, thus affecting their participation levels (Almond & Verba, 1989)

Circle one

1. Sex: Male Female

2. Age: _____

3. Number of years you have worked as member of the part-time faculty within the community college system: _____

4. Your highest level of academic achievement:
 Bachelor's degree
 Master's Degree
 Doctorate Degree
 Other: Please Specify _____

5. Please check the primary subject area in which you teach:
 Art (music and theater)
 Business (accounting, economics, management, marketing)
 Career and technical
 English
 Science (biological science, chemistry, physical, etc)
 Physical Education
 Social Studies (history and political science, philosophy, religion)
 Health sciences (nursing, PT, OT, etc)
 Other: Please specify _____

6. Number of institutions/organizations where you teach during the last three years:

7. I teach a:

Full-time day schedule Full-time evening schedule
Part-time day schedule Part-time evening schedule
 Other: _____

8. Are you seeking a full-time teaching position? Yes No

9. In the last three years how many course sections have you taught in each of the following:
 _____ Online _____ Hybrid _____ Face-to-face

APPENDIX E

Oral Instructions to be Provided Upon Face-to-Face Administration of Questionnaire

(to be read by Conference Administrator or Kristen Huyck)

Kristen Huyck, a doctoral student at Pepperdine University and Part-time faculty member serving on the Academic Senate, is conducting a study to examine the involvement of part-time faculty in the shared governance process in California Community Colleges (CCCs).

Purpose and Procedures: The purpose of this study is to examine part-time faculty members who have served or serve in an elected position or shared governance within the institution of CCC in order to make recommendations as to what incentives and motivations encourage participation and what institutional barriers exists causing a decrease in the involvement of part-time faculty.

Compensation: There is no cost associated with participation in this study, however upon completion, participants will receive a \$2.00 lottery ticket as a small token of appreciation.

Risk/Benefits to the Participant: Responses to this questionnaire will be kept confidential. No individual names will be used for reporting results or when information about this research is published. Responses will be kept in a secure file. The anonymity and confidentiality of the participants will be strictly enforced.

Participant's Right to Withdraw from the Study: At any time participants may elect to withdraw from participation in this research study.

Voluntary Consent by Participant: Participation in this study is completely voluntary and individual consent will be indicated through the participant's willingness to complete the survey.

Questions: Any and all questions you may have about the study should be answered prior to the completion of the questionnaire. Please direct your inquires to Ms. Kristen Huyck at XXXXXXXX or Kristen.Huyck@Pepperdine.edu. If you have questions about the rights of research participants you may call Dr. Yuying Tsong, Pepperdine University's Education Division at (310) 568-5768.

Voluntary Consent: Participants are free to withdraw or refuse consent, or to discontinue participation in this study at any time without penalty or consequent.