

7-16-2003

The Involvement of Florida's Full-Time Community College Faculty in Institutional Governance: Implications for Institutional Decision-Making

Martha Etheredge Campbell
University of South Florida

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd>

 Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Scholar Commons Citation

Campbell, Martha Etheredge, "The Involvement of Florida's Full-Time Community College Faculty in Institutional Governance: Implications for Institutional Decision-Making" (2003). *Graduate Theses and Dissertations*.
<https://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/1334>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact scholarcommons@usf.edu.

The Involvement of Florida's Full-Time Community College
Faculty in Institutional Governance:
Implications for Institutional Decision-Making

by

Martha Etheredge Campbell

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education
Department of Adult, Career, and Higher Education
College of Education
University of South Florida

Major Professor: Dr. Michael Mills, Ph.D.
Dr. James Eison, Ph.D.
Dr. Jeff Kromrey, Ph.D.
Dr. Steven Permuth, Ed.D.

Date of Approval:
July 16, 2003

Keywords: faculty roles, college senate, perceptions of governance, faculty participation

© Copyright 2003, Martha Etheredge Campbell

Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to my mother and father, Evelyn and the late George Etheredge, for giving me a love for language; to my husband, Dan, for providing unwavering support; and to my daughters, Jenny and Leah, for teaching me. I also dedicate this work to my friends, who have listened to me unconditionally.

Acknowledgments

I wish to acknowledge the professional assistance of my committee: Dr. Michael Mills, chair, Dr. Jeff Kromrey, Dr. James Eison, and Dr. Steven Permuth. I am particularly thankful for the patience and guidance of Dr. Mills, the reassurance and support of Dr. Kromrey, and the professionalism and encouragement of Dr. Permuth and Dr. Eison. I am also indebted to Dr. Michael Miller of San Jose State University for permission to use the faculty governance survey. I further acknowledge the assistance of the faculty I interviewed at Santa Fe Community College and Daytona Beach Community College, especially Ward Scott, college senate president of Santa Fe Community College. Finally, I am appreciative for all the community college faculty who took the time to complete the survey and who care about the future of faculty governance in Florida's community colleges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables	iv
Abstract.....	v
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem.....	7
Purpose of Study.....	9
Research Questions.....	9
Rationale.....	10
Limitations/Delimitations.....	16
Definitions.....	16
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	18
Structural Model.....	19
Human Resources Model.....	23
Political Model.....	28
Cultural/Symbolic Model.....	32
Summary.....	35
Other Relevant Studies Influencing This Research	36
III. METHODOLOGY	41
Survey Sample	43
Interview Sample	44
Survey Instrument.....	44
Interview Guide	47
Procedures.....	47
Data Analysis.....	50
Findings.....	55
IV. RESULTS	56
Pilot Study: Survey	56
Survey Distribution.....	57
Summary of Interview Process.....	58
Treatment of Data: Survey.....	59

Data Analysis: Quantitative Design.....	60
Research Question 1	60
Scale of Involvement	70
Research Questions 2 and 3	71
Research Question 4	75
Research Question 5	79
Research Question 6	79
Research Questions 7 and 8	83
Data Analysis: Qualitative Design.....	84
Faculty Governance Structures.....	85
Administrative Structures Related to Faculty Governance.....	87
Administrative Processes: Committees.....	88
Faculty Governance Processes.....	90
Faculty Issues Discussed at Senate.....	92
Faculty Governance Outcomes.....	93
Faculty and Administration Interaction: Implications for Institutional Decision-Making.....	94
Interviewees' Level of Involvement in Faculty Governance.....	96
Personal Characteristic Encouraging Involvement.....	97
Institutional Characteristics Encouraging Involvement.....	98
Personal Characteristics Hindering Involvement.....	99
Institutional Characteristics Hindering Involvement.....	100
Role of the College President	102
Role of the Faculty Senate President	103
The Senate and the Board of Trustees	105
Assimilation of New Faculty into Faculty Governance.....	106
Ideal Governance Process.....	106
Statewide Implications.....	107
Summary	108
Emergent Themes	108
Conclusion	111
V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR THEORY, PRACTICE, AND RESEARCH.....	112
Method Summary.....	113
Summary of Findings.....	113
Conclusion	124
Limitations	126
Implications for Theory	127
Implications for Practice.....	130
Implications for Research	132

REFERENCES	133
APPENDIX TITLE PAGE	138
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	139
APPENDIX B: INTERVIEW GUIDE/QUESTIONS	145
APPENDIX C: E-MAIL COVER LETTER.....	148
APPENDIX D: ONLINE SURVEY	151
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	End Page

List of Tables

Table 1 Level of Involvement in Institutional Governance	61
Table 2 Attendance of Faculty Governance Body Meetings	63
Table 3 Service on Committees During Past Three Years	64
Table 4 Attendance of Committee Meetings	66
Table 5 Engagement in Dialogue About Faculty Issues	67
Table 6 Faculty Governance Involvement Compared to Five Years Ago.....	68
Table 7 Summary of Correlation Coefficients and Probability Values	69
Table 8 Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Sorted by Mean	72
Table 9 Descriptive Statistics for Group: Race and Self-Reported Level of Involvement	81
Table 10 Summary Table: ANOVA Race and Self-Report Level of Involvement	81
Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Group: Race and Scale of Involvement.....	82
Table 12 Summary Table: ANOVA Race and Scale of Involvement	82

The Involvement of Florida's Full-Time Community College Faculty in Institutional
Governance: Implications for Institutional Decision-Making

Martha Etheredge Campbell

ABSTRACT

This study's purpose was to investigate the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance, their perceptions of the faculty governance body's role in institutional decision-making, and the characteristics of an ideal governance process. This study also explored the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement in governance activities and his or her perceptions of the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance as well as the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her gender, race, age, and years of employment. Certain factors that encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance were also probed.

Research methods included a 25-item survey (Miller & Vacik, 1998) detailing the purpose of the study and asking questions regarding the faculty member's demographics and level of involvement in governance. The survey's respondents ($N = 560$) were full-time community college faculty in the state of Florida. The research also included 12 faculty interviews.

This study has shown that Florida's full-time community college faculty do participate in institutional governance but often do not attend faculty governance

body meetings. They are, however, actively involved in service on committees and likely to attend committee meetings regularly.

While Florida's community college faculty can identify the roles faculty governance bodies play in institutional governance, they are less in agreement about the characteristics of an ideal governance process or their perceptions of the roles of their faculty governance bodies. Age does not seem to affect faculty involvement in institutional governance although the race of the faculty member may have some effect. The faculty member's years of experience do not have a major effect on the faculty member's level of involvement.

The interviewed faculty desire a faculty voice in decision making and believe that governance structures and processes should enable faculty to make their opinions known to all members of the college community. The influence of the college president and the senate president is critical for shared governance. The senate president should have access to the highest level of decision-making at the college.

Chapter 1

Introduction

Today's American community college has its roots in the junior college movement at the turn of the twentieth century. Many of these early junior colleges were an outgrowth of the high schools. During this time, America was becoming increasingly industrialized, resulting in a demand for greater literacy. Since many high schools in America at that time did not extend past the eleventh grade and since many universities had admissions standards that many could not meet and tuition costs that many could not afford, the public looked to the "junior colleges" as a source of post-high school training and education.

During the early years of the growth of public junior colleges, some scholars such as Koos (1925) tied the junior college movement to the growth of secondary education with the desired purpose of elevating the first two years of college work. Other junior college advocates (Eells, 1931) viewed the junior college movement in the context of college and university education. Founded in 1922, the American Association of Junior Colleges defined the junior college as an institution "offering two years of instruction of strictly collegiate grade" (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 3).

By the 1940's, the junior college movement, consisting of both private and public junior colleges, was firmly established. The return of war veterans seeking a college education and the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 ("GI Bill of Rights") brought an influx of students and rapid growth to America's colleges and universities. Since

America's universities could not meet the demands alone, the junior colleges once again adapted to meet the rapidly changing economic, social, and political landscape.

The transition from junior college to community college began in the late 1940's and early 1950's. In 1947, the Truman Commission on Higher Education emphasized junior colleges that served the community by "keeping intellectual curiosity alive in its out-of-school citizens, . . . stimulating their zest for learning, . . . [and] improving the quality of their lives as individuals and citizens. . . ." (Gleazer, 1994, p. 18). By 1950, the transition to the community college was complete as represented by the first use of the words *community college* in the title of a book (Ratcliff, 1994).

During the 1960's and 1970's, community colleges, many of them formerly public junior colleges, offered open access to those who had been previously excluded from the "ivy halls." In prior decades, the returning war veterans had flooded higher education institutions. Now other segments of American society streamed through the community college's open doors. By prohibiting racial discrimination by educational institutions receiving federal financial assistance, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 encouraged minorities to seek higher education. The Higher Education Act of 1965 provided increased opportunities for financial aid and made a college education possible for many "first-generation" students. Other changes in the economic and social landscape, including a rising divorce rate, a "glass ceiling," and increasing demands of employers, brought many "older" men and women to the community college's door.

The 1970's witnessed a rise in the comprehensive community college, which included at least five key functions: compensatory education, general education, transfer education, career education, and community education (Cohen & Brawer, 1989). As

financial aid became increasingly available to students through Pell Grants and other sources of federal support, many students chose the community college as an affordable alternative to two years in a university setting. The recession in the early 1970's brought large enrollment increases to community colleges around the nation, and many institutions struggled to meet the increasing demands of the public. Community colleges expanded their vocational programs, offering associate in science as well as associate in arts degrees.

In order to meet the public's needs, community colleges in the 1980's found themselves with an increased reliance on state funding and the accountability demands that often accompany such funding. State legislatures and state coordinating boards had new decision-making authority over many areas influencing community colleges including mission definition, tuition costs, and budgeting (Alfred, 1985; Alfred, 1994).

The 1990's were particularly challenging because of the fast growth of technology, stretching the budgets of community colleges trying to keep up with instructional and institutional technology needs while state funding rose slowly. These challenges have continued into the twenty-first century as many community college leaders find themselves in the political arena, competing with other high-priority public needs for state dollars.

The interest in community college faculty's participation in institutional decision-making has paralleled the historical growth of the community college. This interest has also reflected the interests of higher education faculty in participatory governance.

At the turn of the century, faculty were often considered a "quirky lot who did not take easily to being drilled. . . . They often went marching off in all directions while

their democratically elected sergeant bellowed helplessly. The professor. . . would be sovereign and, at the same time, subject” (Haber, 1991, p. 293). One early observer of faculty-administration relations, Veblen (1918) noted the administration’s frequent use of faculty committees “to give the appearance, but not the reality, of participation” (Birnbaum, 1991, p. 7). Veblen called these committees “committees-for-the-sifting-of-the-sawdust” (p. 7).

An early junior college researcher, Leonard Koos (1925), reported that the primary concerns for junior college faculty were faculty teaching load, faculty preparation and training, and faculty salaries. In comparing junior college faculty with university faculty, Koos (1925) noted that public junior college faculty had greater teaching loads than university faculty but that public junior college faculty were more experienced teachers since many junior college faculty had previously taught in secondary schools. The salaries of junior college faculty compared favorably to many of those college and university instructors teaching under-classmen with the exception of some male university professors with salaries of approximately \$5,000 to \$6,000 a year (Koos, 1925). Koos’ comments reflect the struggle of junior colleges during their formative years to compete for status with four-year colleges and universities.

With the emergence of the community college, community college presidents often made decisions in consultation with a small number of administrators and communicated those decisions through an informal network. During these years, the organizational structures of community college were typically pyramidal with a clear division of roles between the faculty and the administration. The faculty were

responsible for curricular and academic decisions while the administration concentrated on planning and resource allocation (Alfred, 1994).

By the late 1960's and early 1970's, a time of intense growth for community colleges, interest in faculty participation in institutional decision-making was high: "Calls for faculty, student, staff, and community participation in decision-making dominated the literature and discussions on campuses" (Deegan, 1994, p. 76). The American Association for Higher Education's (AAHE) document, Faculty Participation in Academic Governance (1967), is evidence of this discussion. The task force that authored this document cited the greatest faculty unrest among public junior and community colleges. Specifically, the task force examined the varied roles of faculty, the organizational structures that allow faculty to communicate their concerns regarding institutional governance, and the effectiveness of these organizational structures. The AAHE task force argued that faculty participation in decision-making can best be accomplished "by sharing authority at an early stage of decision-making rather than by relegating faculty to a position in which it must react to the prescriptions of the administration" (AAHE, 1967, pp. 23-24).

During these years, community college faculty and administration alike struggled with answers to central question such as, How are institutional decisions made? Who is responsible for making these decisions? How should faculty participate in institutional decision-making? Who is responsible for the success or failure of an institution's decisions? These questions were critical since, during the 1960's and 1970's, a number of community college faculties were engaged in discussion with unions regarding the possible formation of collective bargaining units. Many community college

administrators responded by encouraging the organization of faculty senates with specific areas of decision-making responsibilities (Richardson, 1973).

Scholarly interest in faculty participation in decision-making declined during the late 1970's and 1980's. Birnbaum (1991) suggests: "This dramatic decline in interest was probably less an indication that the questions had been satisfactorily resolved than an indication that other problems had become more pressing in the inexorable flow of institutional life" (p. 1).

The 1990's, however, saw a renewed interest in research related to faculty governance. Complicating this research were the varying definitions of governance. Many definitions of faculty governance in the early 1990's emphasized primarily decision-making practices. For example, Birnbaum (1991) defined faculty governance as a "formal, representative governance structure . . . through which faculty exercise their role in college. . . governance at the institutional level" (p. 7). By the middle of the decade, definitions of faculty governance focused on the political arena. Alfred (1994) defined governance as "the process for locating authority, power, and influence for academic decisions among internal and external constituencies" (p. 245). By decade's end, definitions of governance stressed shared governance included the responsibility of those involved in institutional decision-making. Shared governance was defined as a process involving stakeholders making decisions within the institutional context and including responsibility of participants for the decisions made through the governance process (Guffey, Rampp, & Masters, 1999).

After a century of growth, community college governance appears to be moving from autocracy to participatory governance with faculty at the center of the decision-

making processes (Alfred, 1994). This participation is critical as the community college moves forward in a rapidly changing environment.

Statement of Problem

Traditionally, community colleges have been hierarchical organizational structures characterized by “centralized control, top-down decision making, and rigidly structured hierarchies” (Thaxter & Graham, 1999, p. 3). Many community college faculty and administrators are former middle school and secondary school teachers, and community college administrative structures have typically reflected the organization of the local public school system. Generally, community college faculty have been viewed as less professionalized and less prestigious than university faculty. In a recent study, Townsend and LaPaglia (2000) researched community college faculty’s perceptions of the attitudes of college and university faculty as related to the community college’s academic program. The researchers found that while community college faculty do not consider themselves to be marginalized, a majority of them do believe that college and university faculty consider community college faculty to be “on the margins of higher education” (p. 41).

Yet even in the hierarchical organizational structures found in many community colleges, a faculty governance body often plays a role in institutional decision-making—at least as reflected in the college’s organizational charts. Gilmour (1991) sent a questionnaire to presidents and governance body chairs at 15% of the nation’s community colleges. Of the community colleges that responded (30% response rate), 73% reported a representative governance body as part of the organizational structure.

Organizational development experts such as Yukl (1981), Ouchi (1981), and Kanter (1983) have argued that those employees governed by certain decisions should participate in making those decisions. This desire for involvement in governance is consistent with employees' desire for self-direction and career success (Yukl, 1981). Furthermore, when employees engage in decision-making, they are more likely to commit themselves to the decisions that have been made with their involvement (Yukl, 1981) and increase their productivity (Ouchi, 1981, p. 4). Indeed, Gollattscheck (1985), a community college researcher, asserts that "making decisions that determine the present and future of a community college is one of the most important acts engaged in at the college" (p. 95).

A failure to involve faculty in the decisions that affect them may lead to a loss of talent and morale (Gollattscheck, 1985). Faculty and administration may form conclaves and communicate "only with people similar to themselves" (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 7), leading to fragmentation and alienation within the organization. In a college where faculty and administration do not collaborate in decision-making, organizational decisions will likely be made at the highest level of authority designed to make the decisions (Gollattscheck, 1985, p. 84)—in effect, promoting the continuation of a hierarchical organizational structure within the community college.

A problem central to this research is that the current level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in their institution's governance activities is unknown. Also undetermined is the participation of Florida's community college faculty governance bodies in institutional decision-making. In fact, the most recent study of Florida's faculty governance structures was published in 1980 (Gatlin, 1980). Because

Florida's community college faculty will likely benefit from increased professional authority and participation in making the decisions that affect them, their involvement in the governance activities of their institutions is an important and timely subject for scholarly research.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in the governance activities of their institutions. In addition, this study will examine the perceptions of Florida's full-time community college faculty in relation to the role of their institution's faculty governance body in institutional decision-making and the characteristics of an ideal governance process. This study will further explore the relation between the faculty member's level of involvement in governance activities and his or her perceptions of faculty governance. Other topics for investigation include the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her gender, race, age, years of employment at the institution, and certain factors within the college's environment that encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance.

Research Questions

This study will investigate the following questions:

1. What is the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance?
2. What are faculty members' perceptions of the roles that faculty advisory bodies play in institutional governance?

3. How do Florida's full-time community college faculty envision an ideal governance process?
4. What is the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional decision-making and his or her perception of institutional governance?

Other questions that will be explored include:

5. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her gender?
6. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her race?
7. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her age?
8. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her years of employment at the institution?
9. What do faculty members perceive to be the factors within an institution that either encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance?

Rationale

Educational institutions, including community colleges, are not immune from organizational decay. Like businesses, educational institutions face challenges from the

external societal environment. One of the forces in this rapidly changing external environment is the postsecondary knowledge industry (Peterson & Dill, 1997), “defined as a set of competing organizations that utilize similar resources or attract similar clients, and that produce similar products and services” (p. 5). These competitors are both domestic and global (charter schools, proliferation of online courses, boundaryless education, for-profit providers) and are influenced by rapid technological change (Internet in education, application of technology for disabled students, global electronic classrooms), and pressures for innovation (state and national accountability, parental and community concerns). In a hyperturbulent environment (Harvey & Brown, 2000), the external forces shaping the postsecondary knowledge industry demand responsiveness and adaptability as community colleges grapple with making the institutional decisions needed to address these challenges.

One of the external forces affecting Florida’s community colleges is the recent change in statewide educational governance. Until the 2001 legislative year, Florida’s community colleges were responsible to a statewide coordinating board called the State Board of Community Colleges. Reflecting the traditional, hierarchical structure of the community college, this board coordinated a wide variety of community college functions among Florida’s 28 community colleges. The State Board of Community Colleges reported to the Department of Education and to the State Board of Education, consisting of the governor and the cabinet. The Florida Association of Community Colleges (FACC), also a hierarchical structure with 16 commissions, each representing a specific constituency such as boards of trustees, faculty, career staff, administrative and professional personnel, and community college presidents, worked closely with the State

Board of Community College to formulate and communicate the community colleges' legislative agenda.

Florida's community colleges are currently under a new law creating a Florida K-20 education system. The Board of Community Colleges no longer exists. A new position, Chancellor of Community Colleges, appointed by the governor, will be part of the state Department of Education coordinated by the Florida Board of Education. The role of the Florida Association of Community Colleges is in transition as are its commissions, such as the Council of Presidents. It is unclear what effects these changes in statewide governance will have on institutional governance. However, it is clear that all the constituencies within the community college—administrative and professional staff, career staff, faculty, and students—will be affected by the changes at the state level, and so will institutional governance.

Another force affecting institutional governance is the increasing number of collective bargaining units in Florida's community colleges. According to Florida State Statute 447.03, state employees have the right to form or join a labor union and the right to refrain from doing so. Currently, the United Faculty of Florida is the collective bargaining agent for 10 of Florida's community colleges while the American Association of University Professors is the bargaining agent for the largest Florida community college, Miami-Dade Community College. In 1980, just six community colleges had collective bargaining units (Gatlin, 1980). In a number of Florida community colleges with collective bargaining units, most notably, Broward Community College, a faculty senate exists that is separate from the collective bargaining unit. Although such scholars as Dr. James Wattenbarger, founder of Florida's community college, have argued that the

demise of faculty senates in community colleges would be inevitable once collective bargaining units were approved (Evelyn, 1998), in fact, faculty senates are flourishing on some community college campuses with collective bargaining units. In January, 2001, the Community College Faculty Coalition of Florida (CCFC) was formed with representatives from both faculty senates and faculty unions “to promote academic excellence in the community college system, to ensure the professional identity of the community college faculty, and to ensure community college faculty inclusion in a shared and collegial approach to the governance of the community college system” (CCFC, 2001). The founding of the CCFC supports Kaplan and Lee’s (1995) assertion that “although faculty senates have either been abolished or atrophied at a few colleges and universities, relationships between faculty unions and senates have, for the most part, been cooperative and mutually supportive” (p. 193).

These transitions in community college statewide governance come at a challenging time with the Florida Retirement System’s Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) resulting in thousands of faculty retirements statewide beginning in July, 2003. A recent study by Berry, Hammons, and Denny (2001) indicated that the mean percentage of faculty 55 or older at community colleges nationwide is approximately 25% (as reported by chief academic officers), and the current expectation is that approximately 30,000 full-time community college faculty members will retire during the next decade. In fact, according to a recent speech by Dr. Mark Milliron (2002) of the League of Innovation for Community Colleges, community colleges are expected to hire as many faculty members in the next five years as in the previous 20 years.

A key question for community college faculty and administrators concerned about the looming number of retirements is the impact on the governance of the institution. Although some senior faculty may suffer from “career malaise” (Alfred, 1985), many of these faculty members have likely been involved in institutional governance, and they will have to be replaced on the college committees and the faculty governance bodies where they have served. In an attempt to gauge the impact of faculty retirement on faculty participation in institutional decision-making, this study will examine the relation between the faculty member’s age and involvement in institutional governance as well as the relation between the number of years the faculty member has served the institution and his or her involvement in institutional governance.

Not only will the expected turnover in faculty have implications for institutional governance as faculty members experienced in governance leave their institutions, but also for new faculty members entering the institution. Institutions will need to assimilate new faculty members into the decision-making processes of the institution, raising several key issues. According to a recent study by the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment (Menges, 1999), new postsecondary faculty have four primary concerns: coping with stress, understanding job expectations, allocating their time, and receiving performance evaluation and feedback. Given these concerns as new faculty cope with the demands of their first years of teaching, how soon should they become involved in institutional decision-making? How will the institution communicate its expectations to the new faculty regarding their participation in faculty governance? This study may shed light on these key questions by investigating how the number of

years of employment at the institution is related to the faculty member's involvement in institutional governance.

Minority faculty members as well as female faculty members can face particular challenges in the community college environment. The *Fact Book of the Florida Community College System* (2002) reports that 8.8% of full-time instructional personnel in Florida's community colleges are black, 7.3% are Hispanic, 2.5% are other minorities, and 51% are female. Of the community college faculty surveyed by the National Center on Postsecondary Teaching, Learning, and Assessment, women faculty members spent nearly twice as much time in service-related activities, including service to the institution, in their first year of teaching. By the third year of teaching, female and male faculty members spent approximately the same amount of time in service activities (Menges, 1999). One question may be whether women are more likely to be asked to engage in institutional governance activities, including committee work, from the beginning of their time at the institution. Tierney and Bensimon (1996) asserted that minority faculty often believe they are obligated "to show good citizenship toward the institution by serving its needs for ethnic representation on committees . . . which is not usually rewarded by the institution . . ." (p. 75). This statement raises the question whether minority faculty are additionally taxed by their institutions and whether these faculty as well as others in the institution view such "cultural taxation" (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) as a distraction from other responsibilities, including teaching. Understanding the level of involvement of female faculty members and minority faculty members in institutional governance may help faculty and administrators who are working toward a good institutional fit for these faculty members.

With the rapidly changing landscape community colleges are facing, involving faculty in institutional decision-making is a challenge. When a quick response time is needed, involving more personnel, especially faculty with their teaching demands, can be cumbersome. Yet when faculty are not engaged in making the decisions that directly affect them, faculty may feel isolated from the administration and may not embrace those decisions.

Limitations/Delimitations

This study will be delimited by the selection of the target population of full-time instructional community college faculty in the state of Florida. In many of Florida's community colleges, participation in faculty governance is limited to full-time faculty members. Further limitations will likely include the survey response rate and the reliance upon a respondent to determine his or her self-reported level of involvement in governance.

Definitions

Three definitions are central to this research proposal: *institutional governance*, *faculty governance*, and *faculty governance body*. Community college scholars such as Birnbaum (1988), Lee (1991), and Lovas and Fryer (1991) define institutional governance in terms of both the formal and informal decision-making structures within the institution and the "process used to reach decisions [as well as] the outcome of recommendations from governance groups to higher-level individuals or groups" (Lee, 1991, p. 42). Based on the work of these scholars, *institutional governance*, for the purposes of this study, is defined as the informal and formal processes and structures for

setting policy and solving problems within the institution. Within this study, institutional governance is also referred to as *institutional decision-making*.

In many community colleges, the formal and informal governance structures and processes include shared responsibility between administration and faculty for institutional decision-making. Such participative governance (Twombly & Amey, 1994) involves faculty and administration collaborating in making decisions related to the institution's missions, goals, and objectives. In this study, the term *faculty governance* denotes the processes and structures for the inclusion of faculty in institutional decision-making.

The formal structure for faculty governance is generally a faculty senate or other forum for the purpose of giving voice to those affected by administrative decisions so "they can decide, act, and react in the service of institutional purposes" (Lovas & Fryer, 1991, p. 150). For this study, a *faculty governance body* is defined as a forum generally composed of elected faculty representatives organized for the purpose of advising the administration regarding policies affecting faculty. A *faculty governance body* is also referred to as a *faculty advisory body*. This faculty governance body or faculty advisory body is not a collective bargaining unit.

Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

Community colleges, like all organizations, are social constructs. As within all organizations, there is interdependence within the community college among all the participants—faculty, students, boards of trustees, administration, career staff, and community. As an educational institution, the community college relies on this interdependence, including the communication among the various participants, for solving problems and adapting to changes both without and within the institution. The success or the failure of a community college to adapt to change is often a result of the effectiveness (or ineffectiveness) of institutional decision-making and leadership at all levels of the organization.

Typically, decision-making in community colleges has taken place within five spheres of influence:

1. administrative dominance (decisions made unilaterally by the administration);
2. administrative primacy (administrative decisions made with input from other constituencies including faculty);
3. shared authority (decision-making power shared by administration and faculty);
4. faculty dominance (unilateral faculty decisions);
5. faculty primacy (faculty decisions made with input from other constituencies including administration. (AAHE, 1967)

While this spheres of influence model is helpful in understanding *where* decisions are made within higher education institutions, other models from the discipline of organizational development can help illuminate *how* and *why* an institution makes its decisions. In *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, Bolman and Deal (1997) discuss frames (or models) from which organizational decision-making can be viewed. Each frame—the structural model, the human resource model, the political model, and the cultural/symbolic model—offers a useful lens for the research of institutional governance.

Structural Model

The structural model is a framework for understanding an organization's patterns of communication and decision-making. Structural models are most often associated with bureaucracies, "the type of organization designed to accomplish large-scale administrative tasks by systematically coordinating the work of many individuals" (Birnbaum, 1988). The structure of the organization is used to set in motion policies and procedures related to the organization's objectives and to determine daily operations necessary to achieve the organization's goals (Gollatscheck, 1985).

Although structures for organizations have existed as long as organizations themselves, recent understandings of the structural model have their origins in the work of such organizational researchers as Weber (1947) and Mintzberg (1979). Weber's work emphasized the division of labor among employees as well as set policies and procedures while Mintzberg's theories addressed specific elements of the organization including the technostructure, operating core, and support staff (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Essential characteristics of the structural model include roles defined by position and

responsibilities, rules and procedures, and organizational charts delineating lines of authority and supervision. The organization's size and age, the turbulence of the environment, the integration of information technology, and the professionalism of the workforce (Bolman & Deal, 1997) influence these characteristics. The underlying assumption of the structural model is that quality and performance will increase with formal structures that fit the organization and its mission (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Within educational institutions, a common source of authority is administrative authority (those responsible for the coordination and supervision of organizational activities) (Birnbaum, 1988). Community colleges have often experienced top-down decision-making with "decisions usually made at the top of the administrative unit assigned authority for making such a decision" (Gollattscheck, 1985, p. 84).

However, professional authority (those whose positions stem from knowledge and autonomy) is also central to any educational organization. The faculty constitute professional authority (Birnbaum, 1988) and, accordingly, are part of the educational organization's formal structure.

When faculty senates first began to take hold in community colleges in the 1970's and 1980's, faculty senates were generally advisory bodies characterized by informal consultation with the administration (Floyd, 1985). Faculty decision-making and administrative decision-making occurred in "separate jurisdictions" (Deegan, 1985) with faculty making academic decisions and administration responsible for non-academic decisions.

As faculty senates matured within the community college structure, some senates promoted decision-making authority shared with the administration. This shared

authority represented an attempt to identify structural processes so that all participants within the organization had clear roles in making and implementing institutional policies (Floyd, 1985).

Viewed from a structural framework, hierarchical organizations may experience several benefits. One advantage is the potential for clear lines of communication, both lateral and vertical, among employees (Bolman & Deal, 1997). These communication lines can promote the creation of forums for information-sharing (Ouchi, 1981), such as faculty senates. Bureaucratic organizations also promise efficiency and quick response time in making decisions since responsibilities for making decisions are aligned with job descriptions. College administrators may argue that a structural framework allows the college “to speak with a single voice to external agencies” (Birnbaum, 1988, p. 17) and free up faculty to focus on curriculum development and accountability.

While hierarchical structures provide control of information, resources, and support, difficulties may occur when conflicts arise within the organization, particularly if information only comes through official communication channels, resources are predetermined without employee input, and support is only provided for official mandates (Kanter, 1983). Employees may not commit themselves to top-down decisions that they were not involved in making (Gollattscheck, 1985), possibly resulting in alienation and segmentation (Ouchi, 1981).

Organizations, seen from a structural framework, are complex social entities. A high degree of structure can get in the way of employees’ productivity, including their participation in institutional decision-making (Bolman & Deal, 1997). For example, in a complex educational institution, those faculty interested in governance may lack the

expertise and/or the time to understand how institutional resources are acquired or how decisions are made (Birnbaum, 1988). As a result, faculty may evaluate the effectiveness of faculty governance based on what decision was made rather than on the decision-making processes used to make it (Gollattscheck, 1985).

Effective governance, from a structural framework, reflects “. . . a belief in rationality and a faith that the right formal arrangements minimize problems and increase quality and performance. . . . The structural perspective focuses on designing a pattern of roles and relationships that will accomplish collective goals as well as accommodate individual differences” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, pp. 39-40). This pattern includes determining which decisions are to be shared, what actions should be taken once the decisions are made, and who is responsible for the outcome of those decisions (Allen, 1991).

As faculty governance organizations mature, they will face numerous structural challenges. One challenge is maintaining open communications among all levels of the organization. Rationales for decision-making and the information being used to make those decisions should be communicated to those whom the decisions affect (Gollattscheck, 1985). If open communication is not taking place, then the organization must be flexible enough to revise its structures and processes to remedy the situation (Alfred, 1994). The structure must also be ready to adapt to changes in circumstances, both internal and external to the organization (Bolman & Deal, 1997). A key structural question for community colleges interested in effective institutional governance is, “What percentage of those involved can accurately describe the institutional system of internal

governance, [and] what steps can be taken to increase awareness where needed”
(Gollattscheck, 1985, p. 89)?

As reflected in the literature, the structural model provides a helpful framework for community college researchers since “many of the early community colleges began as heavily bureaucratic institutions, and most have retained at least some vestiges of bureaucratic governance” (p. 91). The effectiveness of a structural model, in relation to institutional governance, will likely be the efficiency of the college’s response to institutional problems and its processes for the development of rules and procedures to resolve these problems (Birnbaum, 1991, p. 11).

The Human Resources Model

Not only can institutional governance be viewed from a structural framework, but also from a human resources perspective. The human resources model, unlike the structural model, does not emphasize processes for decision-making as much as participation, interaction, and cooperation among employees. The human resources model views the talents and energies of individuals working together to achieve common goals as key to the organization’s success. If a metaphor for the structural model is a factory, then a metaphor for the human resources frame is a family (Bolman & Deal, 1997) or an orchestra (Harvey & Brown, 2001).

The origins of the human resources model can be found in the field of organizational development. Influenced by the post-war industrial success of Japanese business, Ouchi (1981), Kanter (1983), Deming (1986), and others asserted that employees want to perform well and, given the opportunity, will make decisions for the overall good of the organization.

The assumptions of the human resources framework are that:

Organizations exist to serve human needs. . . .People and organizations need each other: organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities. . . . A good fit benefits both: individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed. (Bolman & Deal, 1997, pp. 102-103)

In the human resources model, decision-making responsibility is spread through all levels of the institution for the purpose of empowering employees to become proactive in aiding the achievement of institutional goals and objectives (Harvey & Brown, 2001). Because they are empowered, employees are more likely to be committed to the organization and responsible for the implementation of the decisions they make (Harvey & Brown, 2001). More important than any element of the decision itself is the quality of employee's commitment to the decision (Twombly & Amey, 1994). The goal of decision-making from the human resources perspective is to capitalize on the investment of organizational participants and to maximize their efforts to get things accomplished (Kanter, 1983; Twombly & Amey, 1994).

The human resources model offers many advantages to those interested in shared, or participatory, governance. In a college community, the institution should grant all community members the responsibility for involvement in decision-making and the "freedom to exercise it" (Twombly & Amey, 1994, p. 272). O'Hara (1990) listed nine institutional variables of importance to the professional development of community college faculty. Three of these variables—participative management, meaningful involvement in the institution's mission and goals, and open access to development of a

budget—were directly related to the personal involvement of faculty in institutional governance. Pope and Miller (2000) reported that a survey of 265 community college faculty members showed positive gains in attitudes toward students, organization of courses, motivation, and interest in teaching when faculty actively participated in college governance.

Another advantage of the human resources framework is the chance for faculty and administration to work together to open communication channels for the purpose of developing shared values and vision (Ouchi, 1981; Birnbaum, 1988). These open communication channels then allow the voices of employees to be heard in decision-making processes and knowledge to be shared among employees (Ouchi, 1981). When decision-making results from faculty's participation, any dissenters will likely be pressured to accept the decisions of the group (Yukl, 1981). Participatory decision-making also provides avenues for conflict resolution (Yukl, 1981) and leads to sense of accomplishment and pride among employees (Kanter, 1983). In their survey of community college faculty, Thaxter and Graham (1999) cited numerous studies arguing for participative management including improved work quality, employee commitment, and decision-making processes.

The human resources model presents institutional challenges as well. One of the primary dilemmas is the lack of involvement by some employees. For example, college administration officials could argue that it is unreasonable to expect the same level of involvement in decision-making from all faculty and that some decisions cannot wait until all are ready to participate in making them (Kanter, 1983). Furthermore, they assert, while faculty desire involvement in making institutional decision, they generally do not

like administrative and committee work. Administrators may ask how faculty can expect to reach “their goal of participation in decision-making as long as they shun the mechanism through which decisions are made” (Cohen & Brawer, 1989, p. 85).

Faculty, on the other hand, may perceive the administration as having no clear goals and may assume that decision-making is based only on administrators’ interests (Alfred, 1985). Furthermore, many faculty will argue that there is no time for participation in institutional governance, particularly when the outcomes of this involvement are incremental and sometimes barely noticeable, and administrators often provide little incentive or rewards for faculty involvement. In a study of factors related to job satisfaction among community college faculty, Milosheff (1990) found that the more time community college faculty members spent on activities at school such as advising and committee work, the lower the job satisfaction. Unfortunately, faculty members’ unwillingness to be involved in participative governance could derail any attempt to promote shared governance (Twombly & Amey, 1994): “If participation relies on volunteers, it may not be representative; if it does not, it may be coercive” (Kanter, 1983).

Both administration and faculty, then, can be guilty of segmentalism, “compartmentalizing actions, event, and problems, and keeping each piece isolated from the others” (Kanter, 1983). The result of segmentalism is often seeing problems narrowly, independent of connection and problems (Kanter, 1983). Institutional stakeholders may focus only on their agendas to the detriment of the institution’s overall advancement (Allen & Glickman, 1992). For instance, faculty advisory bodies are often viewed as “watchdog” organizations. Richardson (1973) cited a specific weakness of

faculty “watchdog” organizations—that is, the lack of participation when matters other than welfare issues were at stake. In fact, Richardson argues, “Organizations advisory to the president seem to be most effective when they reach conclusions previously endorsed by the president” (p. 304).

Another challenge of the human resources model is that, unlike the structural model, there may be ambiguity about who is responsible for decisions (Gollattscheck, 1985). Such diffusion may result that the responsibility for the success or failure of decisions may be difficult to discern (Yukl, 1981). Birnbaum (1991) warned that faculty participation in decision-making could be:

. . . organized anarchy. . . a loosely coupled system in which individuals and subunits within the organization make essentially autonomous decisions.

Institutional outcomes are a result of these only modestly interdependent activities and are often neither planned nor predictable. It is difficult to make inferences about cause and effect, to determine how successful one is, or even to be certain in advance whether certain environmental changes or evolving issues will turn out to be important or trivial. (p. 21)

Shared governance is probably most desirable when viewed through a human resources frame—a “. . . perspective [which] regards people’s skills, attitudes, energy, and commitment as vital resources capable of either making or breaking an enterprise” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 101). Through this frame, the college faculty and administration recognize a need for each other as individuals with the shared values of meaningful work and commitment to students. The human resources model recognizes

that “the degree to which people are valued in the organization controls, to a large extent, the quality of work life for participants in the organization” (Lovas & Fryer, 1991, p. 145).

The Political Model

The political model emphasizes decision-making not through structures or employee collegiality but through the exercise of power (Lovas & Frayer, 1991). The metaphor for the political model is an arena, an “organization. . . alive and screaming. . . [with] a complex web of institutional and group interests” (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The political model is built on authority, constituencies, coalitions, and conflicts. From a political perspective, “power and influence. . . [are] the secret of success for both individuals and their organizations” (Pfeffer, 1992, p. 345).

In a structural model, authority comes from position (Alfred, 1985) while in a political model, authority represents “only one among many forms of power” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 167). Power, “the capacity to mobilize resources of the institution for the attainment of specific goals” (Alfred, 1985), can originate from employees who have special expertise, for example, knowledge of advanced technology. Power can also be the result of coercion, the “ability to produce intended change in others, to influence them so that they will be more likely to act in accordance with one’s own preferences” (Birnbaum, 1988). Those employees who direct the institution’s decision-making agenda certainly have power, as do those who control the distribution of rewards and incentives (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Networks and alliances can build constituencies that wield power. Articulate, charismatic leaders within organizations exude power as well (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The primary benefit of the political model is organizational renewal and transformation. The organizational energy within a political framework can promote unity, as opposed to fragmentation, among internal constituencies; encourage fluid participation in institutional decision-making; and generate responsiveness, rather than vulnerability, to the external milieu (Alfred, 1994). A political perspective values organizations “with fluid and permeable boundaries. . . open to meet the unending pressures for change” (Wheatley, 1999).

Within educational institutions, governance, from a political framework, is the “process for locating authority, power, and influence for academic decisions among constituencies internal and external to the college” (Alfred, 1985). The governance process varies depending on whether the college has a union representing its faculty. Unions generally have prescribed, focused roles regarding specific issues such as work conditions, job security, and salary/benefits packages (Alfred, 1985). A union contract details who makes what decisions and the negotiation process between faculty and administration. In schools without faculty unions, faculty governance bodies often serve as forums “for the articulation of interests and as the setting in which decisions on institutional policies and goals are reached through compromise, negotiations, and the formation of coalitions” (Birnbaum, 1991, p. 11).

The political objectives for faculty governance include the strengthening of faculty capabilities to make institutional decisions, the development of opportunities for leadership, and an increase in job satisfaction (Alfred, 1994). The discussion of varying opinions helps participants in faculty governance understand both the contentiousness and the complexity of some issues (Birnbaum, 1991).

Even faculty with no real decision-making power play an important political role within the structure of the organization. Birnbaum (1991) saw the role of the faculty not only a catalyst for change but also a set of brakes:

The existence of a [faculty] senate reduces administrative aspirations for change and increases the caution with which the administration acts. This not only protects much of value within the organization but also prevents the unwitting disruption of ongoing but latent systems through which the [college] keeps the behavior of organizational participants within acceptable bounds. (p. 19)

Of course, participating in a political framework requires access, and, according to Pope and Miller (2000), access of faculty to institutional-level decision-making varies greatly from institution to institution. For example, inequalities can develop if access to information is not available to all constituencies, resulting in lower participation in the political process (Kanter, 1983). Furthermore, access is not equivalent to decision-making. For many community college faculty governance organizations, access means input in the decision-making process but without control over the outcome (Barwick, 1989).

The political framework, as applied to faculty governance organizations, has many other potential pitfalls. Richardson (1973) believed that the “grafting” of faculty advisory bodies into an already hierarchical structure had resulted in many cases “in the appearance of involvement [rather] than its substance” (p. 301). Too often, faculty groups replicate the bureaucratic structures already existing within a college (Twombly & Amey, 1994).

Another obstacle is a lack of shared knowledge needed to make decisions (Alfred, 1985), which may result from both administrative direction over communication channels and a lack of faculty and administrative leadership continuity (Lee, 1991). How does a faculty member know what information and resources are needed to influence a decision? How does a faculty member learn to promote an idea throughout the organization? How does a faculty member gauge the opposition to certain ideas and effectively disarm his or her opponents? How does the faculty leader keep his or her constituents informed about the process? How does a faculty leader communicate not just his or her successes but also his or her failures? Faculty leadership requires highly developed social skills including the ability to motivate colleagues to work together toward a shared goal. A lack of such leadership can result in institutional power struggles and a loss of trust between faculty and administration (Guffey, Rampp, & Masters, 1999). If faculty advisory bodies do not take action but just set agendas, they can be regarded as part of the bureaucracy rather than as a vehicle for empowerment (Kanter, 1983, p. 255).

In a political framework, conflicts inevitably arise. Both faculty and administration can bring interests that are self-serving into the governance process. Some participants in governance may want to impress those outside the group rather than working to achieve the group's goals and objectives (Kanter, 1983). The result can be polarization between faculty and administration. Administration may view faculty "as self-interested, unconcerned with controlling costs, or unwilling to respond to legitimate requests for accountability" (Birnbaum, 1988) while faculty may view administration as too remote from the "central academic concerns that define the institution" (Birnbaum, 1988). Conflicts may also arise among the faculty as a result of differences in ages,

disciplines, and tenure status, or between those faculty who favor collective bargaining and those who do not (Alfred, 1985).

Given all the obstacles to political success, how, then, can one determine whether faculty participation in decision-making is politically effective? Birnbaum (1991) suggested that political effectiveness is the degree to which the faculty governance body, representing its constituencies, sets clear goals and policies. Guffey, Rampp, & Masters (1999) asserted that if the goal is shared governance, then political effectiveness means that all stakeholders should be involved in the process of making the decisions that affect them and must be responsible for those decisions. Surely, in a healthy organization, political effectiveness should mean transformation of the institution with “active people engaging in influence relationships based on persuasion, intending real changes to happen and insisting that those changes reflect their mutual purposes” (Rost, 1993).

The Cultural/Symbolic Model

Each organization has a distinctive culture. This culture is a reflection of the mission and values of the organization, including both the organization’s traditions and its dynamic energies. Schein (1992), a scholar in the field of organizational development, defined organizational culture as:

a pattern of shared basic assumptions that a group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and integration [and] that has worked well enough to be considered valid and therefore to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems. (p. 12)

An organization’s symbols and rituals also contribute to an organization’s culture and communicate the values of the organization to the employees (Ouchi, 1981). The

metaphor for the cultural/symbolic model is a theater, and the participants in the organization are the actors on the stage (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The theater of the organization “entertains, creates meaning, and portrays the organization to itself” (p. 237).

Symbols are signs in an organization that communicate the organization’s culture to the outside world. An organization’s symbols evolve due to the influences of individuals within the organization as well as changes in the external environment (Tierney, 1991). These symbols bind the common experiences of the organization’s employees. An organizational symbol can be an act or event or even a position on an organizational chart (Tierney, 1991).

The symbolic/cultural model has several key assumptions. One is that the meaning of an event within an organization is more important than what actually occurred. Another is that the creation of symbols in an organization is a hopeful activity that provides directions to the organization’s participants. Furthermore, the expression of a process is more significant than what the process produces (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Organizational symbols can be metaphorical, physical, communicative, or structural (Tierney, 1991). Each of these types of symbols can be related to faculty advisory bodies. For example, a metaphorical symbol is a figure of speech. The president of a community college might refer to the institution as a family and the faculty senate as family members. The family metaphor would be one symbol of the institution’s culture. A physical symbol is an artifact. An illustration is a stole worn by faculty senate members at graduation as a symbol of their participation in institutional governance. This physical symbol is designed to communicate participation in

institutional governance in a tangible form. Communicative symbols are verbal or nonverbal activities designed to send a message about a group's role within the organization (Tierney, 1991). For instance, a president of a community college might ask the president of the faculty senate to sit beside him at a board of trustees meeting to approve the college's budget. The intended meaning of this action is to convey unity to the college's governing board. A structural symbol is a process often designed to symbolize inclusion or change (Tierney, 1991). Many community college presidents include faculty representatives on joint big decisions committees (Yamada, 1991) to symbolize inclusion in institutional decision-making. Faculty advisory bodies are symbolic of the faculty's individual and collective commitment to professionalism (Birnbaum, 1991).

Cultural symbols are often present in shared rituals within organizations. In a community college, participation in graduation is an illustration of a shared ceremony. Ceremonies are designed to foster socialization within the organization and to communicate the stability of the organization to external constituencies (Bolman & Deal, 1997). Another example of a shared ritual is a faculty governance organization's use of a standard agenda and rules of order (Birnbaum, 1991). These rituals promote a sense of professionalism and integration within the organization (Birnbaum, 1991).

The symbolic/cultural model, like the other models presented in this chapter, is not without its challenges. One is the possibility of confused messages sent in shared rituals and ceremonies. A community college may give faculty governance participants a distinctive place to sit at graduation, but such prominence does not mean that the opinions of faculty are valued in institutional decision-making. Faculty may be cynical

about the illusion of inclusion, “participation just for show, without any impact on substance” (Kanter, 1983, p. 254). Another challenge is to be certain that the symbols of the organizational culture are consistent with its mission and the shared values of the employees.

Faculty participation in institutional decision-making, then, can also be viewed symbolically—as an expression of the college’s culture, “. . . the interwoven pattern of beliefs, values, practices, and artifacts that define for members who they are and how they are to do things” (Bolman & Deal, 1997, p. 217). At its best, faculty participation in decision-making should “. . . symbolize a general faculty commitment to substantive values” (Birnbaum, 1991, p. 12). At its worst, faculty participation is symbolic only—with no political power.

Summary

While each of the models—structural, human resources, political, and cultural/symbolic—illuminates the decision-making processes of organizations, no model is sufficient unto itself. Successful organizations balance the autonomy of their employees with structures and processes, the desires of their employees for empowerment with a search for “a common purpose and language” (Twombly & Amey, 1994). Shared, or participatory, governance can meld the human resources and cultural/symbolic models with the structural and political models. Shared governance promotes: clarity when the structures and processes for making decisions are known by the college’s constituencies; openness through access to decision-making processes; fairness when the constituencies believe their voices are being heard; and trust through respect for all institutional actors (Lovas & Fryer, 1991). The result can be “a

governance model that is participatory in nature but with clear lines regarding how decisions are made” (Myran & Howdyshell, 1994, p. 599).

Shared governance, however, is not yet a reality in many of the nation’s community colleges. Gilmour (1991) conducted a national study of participative governance bodies, including those in community colleges. Although the response rate from community colleges was low (30% of institutions sampled), the community colleges that did respond indicated that participation in faculty governance was insufficiently rewarded, that the governance bodies lacked efficient processes for decision-making, and that more member participation was needed to strengthen the organization of the governance body.

Organizations should focus their attention on the governance systems themselves and not just the individual decisions made by them. Good institutional governance should not be left to chance (Gollattscheck, 1985). An awareness of institutional governance should include “what it is and what it can and should be, what it does and what it can and should do” (Gollattscheck, 1985, p. 87).

Other Relevant Studies Influencing This Research

Although many studies have researched faculty governance in higher education institutions, few have examined community college faculty’s participation in the internal decision-making processes of their institutions. As related to Florida’s community colleges, only one dissertation (Gatlin, 1980) has examined internal governance structures and faculty participation in institutional governance. However, for the purposes of his research, the author did not separate faculty and administration into separate groups. Instead, the participants in the study were randomly selected from a list

of all administrators, teachers, counselors, and librarians in Florida's 28 community colleges. The literature review discussed the role of the trustees, president, and students in governance, yet trustees and students were excluded from the participants in the study. Gatlin (1980) collected data using a survey instrument developed by the researcher. The survey included sections about the respondent's demographics and his or her institution, the respondent's perception of the faculty's role in various activities surrounding faculty concerns, and his or her level of satisfaction with the faculty role.

This research study revealed the following findings:

1. Policy in Florida's community colleges is administered from the top;
2. Respondents "indicated that they 'desired' a 'consultation' level of participation" (p. 100);
3. The size of the institution was not significantly related to the faculty participation level;
4. Nine of the colleges were satisfied or very satisfied with their decision-making roles while 10 were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied;
5. Participants were most dissatisfied with their decision-making in the areas of personnel and faculty welfare
6. Twenty-six of the 28 colleges reported faculty advisory bodies for general decision-making.

A review of this study (Gatlin, 1980) revealed a gap in the literature that this research project proposes to address. Whereas Gatlin's (1980) research used each Florida community college as the unit of analysis (resulting in a small sample), this researcher will consider the individual faculty member as the unit of analysis. Furthermore, since

the purpose of the currently proposed research is to examine the level of involvement of Florida's community college faculty in governance in relation to their perceptions of institutional governance, this researcher will survey only full-time community college faculty as opposed to faculty and administrators.

Miller & Vacik (1998), two researchers from the National Data Base on Faculty Involvement in Governance (NDBFIG), authored another influential study. This study surveyed faculty from three community colleges in Mississippi, Nebraska, and Georgia. The 25-item survey was divided into three parts: "perceptions of faculty involvement in governance; characteristics of an ideal governance process; and roles of faculty in governance" (p. 1). The central question addressed in the research was, how do faculty in community colleges "perceive their role in involvement in governance activities" (p. 1)? Asked to self-report their involvement in faculty governance, 53% of the 110 respondents reported that they were somewhat involved in governance while 27% perceived themselves as being not involved and 20% as being very involved.

The authors used analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures to evaluate the data. Of the questions related to faculty's perceptions of their involvement in governance, the reported mean was highest for the item, "Issues considered by our faculty advisory body are important" ($M = 4.02$, $SD = 0.82$) and lowest for "Faculty members are adequately rewarded for their participation in the governance process" ($M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.05$).

Of the questions related to faculty roles in governance, the reported mean was highest for the item, "Facilitate cooperation with administration" ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 0.71$) and lowest for "Assist in clarifying roles of administrators so that they know they are to administer policy and not impose their own" ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.02$).

For the last section, “Perceived Characteristics of an Ideal Governance Process,” the highest reported mean was for the item, “The faculty advisory board is utilized as a conduit through which faculty participation is solicited” ($M = 3.95$, $SD = 0.85$).

The ANOVA procedures did reveal significant differences between very involved faculty and not involved faculty and between somewhat involved faculty and not involved faculty on the first section of the survey (“Perceptions of Faculty Involvement in Governance”). Unfortunately, the authors (Miller and Vacik, 1991) did not state any descriptors or characteristics used to determine the faculty members’ self-reported levels of faculty involvement: highly involved, somewhat involved and not involved.

Miller and Vacik (1991) concluded by emphasizing the importance of involved faculty in the process of shared governance. Specifically, they argued that “shared governance seems rooted in the belief that faculty can and will act responsibly when given charges to perform and decisions to make” (p. 4).

In another study (Armstrong, Miller, & Newman, 2001), the authors summarized the findings of NDBFIG-sponsored studies since 1993. The following findings are relevant to this study:

1. “Researchers found no legal basis for faculty involvement in administrative policy or decision-making” (p. 82);
2. “Involvement in governance activities was positively correlated with perceived teaching effectiveness” (p. 83);
3. “Teaching faculty did not differ from their research-oriented colleagues about their responsibility to academic citizenship” (p. 83).

The authors further acknowledged that the study of faculty governance in community colleges has been limited.

This study will add to the literature regarding governance in higher education by investigating the involvement of full-time faculty in governance in a rapidly growing community college system. The use of Miller and Vacik's 1991 survey and the research questions from Chapter 1 of this proposal will explore the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance and their perceptions of the involvement of their faculty advisory bodies in institutional decision-making. Due to the changing landscape of Florida's educational system, this research study will also examine the relation between the level of involvement of a community college faculty member and race, age, gender, and number of years at the institution. Finally, this study will investigate certain factors within an institution's environment that encourage or discourage faculty participation in institutional decision-making.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The purposes of this study are: 1) to determine the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional decision-making; 2) to examine Florida's full-time community college faculty's perceptions of their faculty governance body's role in institutional governance as well as their perception of an ideal process for governance; 3) to explore the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement in governance and activities and his or her perceptions of faculty governance; 4) to investigate the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her gender, race, age, years of employment at the institution, and 5) to explore faculty members' perceptions of institutional factors that encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance.

I used a survey and personal interviews to investigate each of the following research questions:

1. What is the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance?
2. What are faculty members' perceptions of the roles that faculty advisory bodies play in institutional governance?
3. How do Florida's full-time community college faculty envision an ideal governance process?

4. What is the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional decision-making and his or her perception of institutional governance?

Other questions that were explored include:

5. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her gender?
6. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her race?
7. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her age?
8. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her years of employment at the institution?
9. What do faculty members perceive to be the factors within an institution that either encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance?

Using sound survey methods (Dillman, 2000; Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996), I conducted a census survey of Florida's full-time community college faculty. The intent of this research was to generalize the findings from the participants in the survey to the population of Florida's full-time community college faculty.

Following the administration of the survey, I conducted standardized, open-ended interviews (Patton, 2002) with 12 faculty during two-day site visits to two Florida community colleges. The purpose of these interviews was to explore and interpret the faculty members' views of 1) their level of involvement in their college's faculty governance processes; 2) the involvement of their faculty advisory body in institutional decision-making; 3) their descriptions of an ideal governance process; and 4) their perceptions of certain institutional factors that encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance (research questions #1-3 and 9).

The purpose of mixing quantitative and qualitative research was to enrich the study's design by using more than one method of inquiry. The goal of a mixed design is "opportunities for deeper insight into the relationship between inquiry approach and the phenomenon under study" (Patton, 2002, p. 248).

Survey Sample

The target population for this study was Florida's full-time community college faculty. According to the *Fact Book of the Florida Community College System* (2002), Florida's 28 community colleges employed 4,951 full-time instructional personnel in Fall, 2001. In December, 2002, I compiled a list of 5,582 email addresses of Florida's full-time community college faculty from the web sites of the 28 Florida community colleges. After the deletion of email addresses of community college employees who had been misidentified as faculty and the removal of undeliverable emails from the faculty email address listing, the follow-up email reminder went to 5,122 faculty, a difference of 460 from the original number of email addresses. This number is also 3.5% higher than the 4,951 full-time faculty reported in the *Fact Book of the Florida Community College*

System (2002). However, the *Fact Book* data are based on Fall 2001- 2002 annual personnel reports. The number of full-time faculty is constantly changing, and the 2003 *Fact Book* has not yet been released. Following a pilot study in January, 2003, I then conducted a census survey of Florida's full-time community college faculty in February and March, 2003. The unit of analysis was the individual faculty member.

Interview Sample

For the interviews, I used purposeful sampling to select 12 full-time faculty members, six each from two Florida community college campuses. I selected "information-rich cases" (Patton, 2002, p. 46) based on the survey results. Specifically, I interviewed six faculty at each of the two colleges with among the highest survey response rate and the highest level of involvement in faculty governance as self-reported by faculty (question III.8 on the survey). These two colleges, Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, Florida, and Daytona Beach Community College in Daytona Beach, Florida, also had among the highest means for survey questions #2 and #3. The selected faculty included both male and female interviewees as well as interviewees of different ethnicity. My intent was that the interviews on the first campus would inform and enrich the interviews on the second campus, drawing a more complete picture of faculty highly involved in the decision-making processes of their institutions.

Survey Instrument

I administered a 25-item survey (see Appendix A) to collect data from a census of full-time community college faculty in Florida. The items on this survey embodied three categories: perceptions of faculty involvement in governance (16 items), roles of faculty in the governance process (5 items), and perceived characteristics of an ideal governance

process (4 items). The survey asked faculty to rate their response to each item on a 1 to 5 point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree 5 = strongly agree). Each item also featured a *don't know* category. Dr. Miller, currently a dean at San Jose State University, gave his permission to adapt the survey for use in this study.

The survey also requested demographic information (date of birth, gender, institution, race, and years of service at the institution) to address research questions #5 – 8. Furthermore, the survey featured several questions related to the faculty member's participation in institutional governance. I used the responses to these questions to ascertain the faculty member's level of involvement in institutional decision-making.

Other changes to Miller and Vacik's (1998) original survey included new instructions and operational definitions of key constructs such as *level of involvement in faculty governance* and *faculty governance body*. Furthermore, some questions were reworded for clarity and consistency of syntax. I added the response DK for *don't know*. N for *neutral* was changed to DK for *don't know* to address "respondents' possible lack of familiarity with a topic" (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 1996, p. 297).

Prior to the administration of the survey, I asked a panel of experts to examine the survey instrument for content validity, "the degree to which instructions for and formats of instruments are mutually intelligible to the instrument designer . . . and to the participants to whom the instrument is applied" (Goetz & LeCompte, 1984, pp. 231-232). This panel consisted of Ward Scott, president of the Community College Faculty Coalition of Florida; Beverly Grundset, chair of the Faculty Commission of the Florida Association of Community Colleges; Theresa Geiger, former vice-president of the St. Petersburg College Faculty Senate, and George Greenlee, president of the St. Petersburg

College Faculty Senate. Each of these panelists has years of experience and a high level of involvement in faculty governance in Florida's community colleges.

I requested the members of the panel to suggest questions that could be added to the survey to determine a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance. Specifically, I interviewed each of the panel members regarding what questions he or she would ask a faculty member to determine the following: a high level of involvement in institutional governance, a moderate level of involvement in institutional governance, infrequent involvement in institutional governance, or a lack of involvement in institutional governance. Furthermore, I asked the panel to review each of the survey items for clarity and suggest additions or deletions. As a further check of content validity, I requested that the panel of experts define the operational constructs from Chapter 1: institutional governance, faculty governance, and faculty governance body.

To check for internal reliability, I computed a coefficient alpha on items 1-16 (questions related to the perceptions of faculty involved in governance; items 17-20 (items related to the roles of faculty in the governance process); and items 21-25 (questions related to perceived characteristics of an ideal governance process) (Miller & Vacik, 1998). I further computed a coefficient alpha for all 25 survey items. Miller and Vacik (1998) reported that a similar survey had been given six times and had achieved an internal reliability coefficient of .70.

Interview Guide

For the faculty interviews, I used an interview guide with key questions designed to elicit responses from the interviewees (see Appendix B). In addition to the questions on the interview guide, I asked probing and follow-up questions as necessary.

Procedures

Following the submission of the survey to a panel of experts for content validity, I conducted a pilot study of the survey in January, 2003, distributing the survey by email (see Appendix C) to a random sample of 400 full-time community college faculty. During the pilot study, I worked with a computer consultant, Sean Woodruff, to assure successful data collection. St. Petersburg College granted space on one of its servers as well as access to the college's SQL database. The computer consultant programmed the survey in hypertext markup language, uploaded the survey to the college's server, and wrote a PHP: Hypertext Preprocessor script to send the data directly from the web survey to the Structured Query Language (SQL) database and then to Microsoft Excel for data analysis. Each response received a code to assist in data analysis and to ensure confidentiality. Based on suggestions by Dillman (2000), the consultant and I worked together to design a web-based survey that would be easy to use including restrained use of color, plentiful white space to increase readability, use of radio buttons for survey responses, "click here" messages to reveal drop-down menus, a "don't know" category for every survey item, and a "thank you" message at the completion of the survey (see Appendix D).

The results from the pilot study both refined the survey instrument and tested the functionality of the data collection methods. The data collection methods for the pilot study were as follows:

1. The faculty in the random sample received a presurvey email contact sent two or three days prior to the survey itself. The presurvey email identified the researcher and the purpose of the study. Dillman (2000) recommended a precontact email prior to the administration of a web survey in order “to leave a positive impression of importance so that the recipient will not immediately discard the questionnaire when it arrives” (p. 368).
2. The pilot study participants then received an email cover letter (Appendix C) identifying the study’s purpose, presenting the information regarding confidentiality and informed consent as approved by the University of South Florida’s Institutional Research Board, and indicating a response deadline. The cover letter concluded with a hyperlink to the web survey.
3. Shortly before the deadline, I sent another email to the 400 faculty in the sample, thanking those who had responded earlier and asking those who had not responded to do so by the stated deadline. Because the survey responses were anonymous, I had to send the reminder email to all possible participants. The reminder email also concluded with a hyperlink to the survey since Dillman (2000) suggested that another questionnaire be sent with any reminder message.

As soon as the pilot study was completed, I sent a precontact email to all 5,582 email addresses of those identified as Florida’s full-time community college faculty. This precontact email was identical to that sent to the participants in the pilot study. As

in the pilot study, I followed the precontact email with a cover letter including the hyperlink to the web survey and a follow-up reminder email. I used multiple contacts because recent research supports that this method is effective to increase the response rate for email surveys (Schaefer & Dillman, 1998). Each time an email was sent, I removed the undeliverable emails from the faculty email address listing.

To obtain names of potential interviewees, I contacted the two faculty senate presidents at each college, Ward Scott at Santa Fe Community College and D.J. Henry at Daytona Beach Community College, and requested a list of possible faculty interviewees to include both male and female faculty, faculty experienced and inexperienced in faculty governance, and faculty reflecting ethnic diversity. Ward Scott assisted in arranging the six faculty interviews at Santa Fe. Faculty interviewees at Daytona Beach Community College came from a variety of sources including references from faculty senate officers, the Faculty Commission of the Florida Association of Community Colleges, and the Community College Faculty Coalition of Florida. The final list of interviewees included seven females and five males, including one African-American female, one Hispanic female, one Farsi male, and two physically handicapped faculty from a variety of disciplines. The list also included one faculty member who was minimally involved in faculty governance, some who were new to faculty governance, and two who each had over 30 years experience in faculty governance.

I employed the following data collection methods for the interview:

1. Each selected faculty member received an email asking him or her to participate in a one-hour, tape-recorded interview on a specific date, at a specific time, and in a designated location.

2. Each interviewee signed an informed consent form approved by the University of South Florida's Institutional Research Board. This form delineated the purposes of the study, obtained the faculty member's informed consent, and assured the faculty member of confidentiality.
3. I then conducted and transcribed the interview.
4. I sent a follow-up email thanking the interviewee for participating and his or her cooperation.

All interviews were transcribed in their entirety, and I reviewed each transcript for accuracy and completeness. Garbled responses were noted as were unrelated interruptions. To preserve anonymity, initials, rather than names, appeared in the transcriptions. The date and time of each transcription were noted.

Data Analysis

The data analysis consisted of both descriptive and inferential statistics. To answer research question #1, I constructed a frequency distribution table to report the faculty members' self-reported level of involvement. For each of the questions in section III. of the survey, I used a correlation procedure to determine the strength and direction of the relation between the response to the question and the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. I also computed a composite variable called a *scale of involvement*. This variable is the sum of the z-scores obtained for each response to each question in section III. of the survey.

To address research questions #2 and #3, I reported the means and standard deviations for each of the 25 survey items (from highest mean to lowest mean). I

compared and contrasted the means of this survey administration to that of Miller and Vacik (1998).

To answer question #4, I used correlational statistical procedures for each of three null hypotheses:

1. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceptions of faculty involvement in institutional governance.
2. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceptions of the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance.
3. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceived characteristics of an ideal governance process.

For each of the above hypotheses, I computed a coefficient alpha for the related items on the survey. Then I conducted two correlation procedures. For the first procedure, the continuous independent variable was the measurement of the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement in faculty governance. The dependent variable, also continuous, was the measure of the related items on the survey. For the second procedure, the continuous independent variable was the measurement of the faculty member's scale of involvement. The dependent variable remained the same. Then I computed a Pearson product moment correlation coefficient to indicate the strength and direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. The p value rejected or failed to reject the null hypothesis.

For research question #4, I conducted an a priori power analysis (Cohen, 1977) to determine the desired number of respondents based on a power of .80, a medium effect size (0.30), and an alpha level of .05. I chose a medium effect size of 0.30 that, according to Cohen (1977), “implies that 9% of the variance of the dependent variable is attributable to the independent variable” (p. 80). A medium effect size is common in behavioral science research (Cohen, 1977). Furthermore, because this research question had multiple nulls, I used a Bonferroni adjustment (SISA, n.d.) to lower the alpha level to .02. Using Cohen’s power tables (alpha = .01), I estimated that 110 pairs of observations will be needed or 220 total observations, resulting in a desired number of respondents of 440.

The null hypothesis for question #5 is that there is no significant difference between male faculty members’ levels of involvement in institutional governance and female faculty members’ levels of involvement. To answer question #5, I used two-tailed t-tests to examine the differences between the means of two groups, male faculty members and female faculty members, on the self-reported level of involvement. Then I followed with additional t-tests to determine the differences between the means of male faculty members and female faculty members on the scale of involvement variable. The obtained probability statistic (p value) rejected or failed to reject the null hypothesis. A calculation of Cohen’s d for both procedures determined the magnitude of the effect size.

An a priori power analysis ($ES = 0.50$, power = .80, $\alpha = .05$) of research question #5 revealed a desired number of 64 in each group of observations or 128 total (Cohen, 1977). The desired number of respondents for this research question is 256.

The null hypothesis for research question #6 is that a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance does not vary according to his or her race. To test this hypothesis, I used two analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistical procedures and constructed an ANOVA summary table for each procedure. For the first ANOVA procedure, the nominal independent variable was the faculty member's race while the dependent variable was the measure of the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. For the second ANOVA procedure, the nominal independent variable was the measure of the faculty member's scale of involvement. The dependent variable remained the measure of the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. For both procedures, an examination of the p value rejected or failed to reject the null.

I checked for any violation of assumptions—homogeneity of variance, independence of observations, and normality. If the ANOVA procedure revealed significant differences among groups, then post hoc procedures such as Tukey multiple comparison tests looked for differences among groups.

An a priori analysis for research question #6 ($ES = 0.50$, power = .80, alpha = .05, $u = 4$) resulted in a desired number of 40 in each group or 160 total observations (Cohen, 1977). I estimated a need for 320 respondents for this research question.

The null hypothesis for question #7 is that there is no significant difference in the level of involvement of faculty according to age. The null for question # 8 is there is no significant difference in the level of involvement of faculty according to the faculty member's number of years at the institution. I tested both the null hypothesis for question #7 and the null hypothesis for question # 8 using correlation procedures. For the first correlation procedure, I computed a Pearson product moment correlation showing

the strength and direction of the relationship between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and number of years at the institution. For the second procedure, I computed a Pearson product moment correlation indicating the strength and direction of the relationship between the faculty member's scale of involvement and his or her years at the institution. For both procedures, a *p* value rejected or failed to reject the null.

For research questions #7 and #8, I conducted an a priori power analysis (Cohen, 1977) based on an effect size of 0.30, desired power of .80, and an alpha level of .05. Using Cohen's power tables, I concluded that 64 pairs of observations will be needed or 128 observations total. The desired number of survey respondents is 256.

Following the statistical analysis of the responses to the survey, I completed a nonrespondent analysis ($n = 20$). Nonresponse is a source of survey error. This analysis investigated whether the characteristics of the faculty who did not respond to the survey were different from those who did respond.

After the interviews were transcribed, I used an inductive analysis approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1985) to examine the text of the interviews for emergent themes and interrelationships; to clarify and interpret the meanings, both stated and implied, in the text; and to analyze the implications of the interviews in light of this study's research questions. Specifically, I scanned the data "for categories of phenomena and for relationships among such categories" (Guba & Lincoln, 1985, p. 335). I then described each category and its subcategories (Kvale, 1996) in relation to its key terms and semantic relationships, careful to avoid overlapping of categories (Guba & Lincoln, 1985). Using textual analysis, I reviewed the meaning units for each category "indicating [the] occurrence and non-occurrence of a phenomenon" (Kvale, 1996, p. 192), my goal

being the saturation of key themes within the qualitative data. In addition, I used structured narratives incorporating key quotes from the interviews to clarify and illuminate the qualitative data.

Findings

Based on an a priori analysis of each research question (Cohen, 1977), I estimated that the desired number of survey respondents ranged from 256 to 440—a return rate of approximately 5% to 10%. No research definitively provided data regarding response rates to web surveys. However, Vehovar, et al. (2002) stated that the response rate of web surveys solicited through email rarely reached 30%.

I used SAS programming to analyze the survey data and compute critical F values (for ANOVA procedures), critical t values (for t tests), correlation coefficients, and p values rejected or failed to reject each null. I then presented my quantitative research findings, implications, and recommendations for future research.

The results of the analysis and interpretation of the interviews were also reported. These results illuminated the dominant themes of the interviews and the consistencies and inconsistencies of the findings in reference to the research questions.

Chapter 4

Results

In light of this study's purposes as stated in the previous chapter, this chapter presents the results of the quantitative and qualitative analysis used to investigate each of the research questions. Specifically, this chapter includes a summary of the data collection process, the research decisions regarding the treatment of the data, and the analysis of data results. Furthermore, this chapter provides a summary of the interview process and a discussion of the themes that emerged from the transcriptions of the interviews.

Pilot Study: Survey

In December 2002, I conducted a study to evaluate the survey instrument for content validity. The validation study consisted of interviews with a panel of experts, whose names are listed in Chapter 3. Each panel member identified activities that he or she believed were related to a high level of involvement in faculty governance, a moderate level of involvement, infrequent involvement, or a lack of involvement.

When the interviews were completed and the results reviewed, the expert panel had identified the following activities as central to participation in faculty governance: attending faculty governance meetings, participating on college-wide or campus-wide committees, and being involved in projects that resulted in significant outcomes or recommendations to the college. The panel also identified serving as an officer of a faculty governance body and/or a chair of a college wide or campus wide committee as

indicative of significant faculty involvement in institutional governance. Based on these results, I revised the questions in the second section of the survey to include the information from the expert panel.

Data collection for this study began with a pilot study of a web-based survey administered in January 2003. The survey (see Appendix A) consisted of the stated purpose of the study, six questions requesting demographic information, nine questions related to participation in faculty governance activities, and a 25-item survey (Miller and Vacik, 1998). While Miller and Vacik (1998) reported an internal reliability of .70, the Cronbach coefficient alpha for the survey items for this administration was .88.

The pilot study distributed the survey by email to a random sample of 400 full-time community college faculty in the state of Florida from a list of 5,582 email addresses of Florida's full-time community college faculty obtained in December, 2002, from the web sites of the twenty-eight Florida community colleges.

Of the 400 faculty in the pilot study sample, 37 responded for a response rate of 9%. During the pilot study, the data collection process (see Chapter 3) proved successful, including the transfer of the data from the web survey to the SQL database. Email addresses of community college employees who had been misidentified as faculty were also removed.

Survey Distribution

Following the pilot study, I distributed the survey in February, 2003, according to the data collection process delineated in Chapter 3. Of the 5,122 faculty members who received the final email regarding the survey, 560 completed the survey for a response rate of 11%. This response rate met the desired rate as determined by the a priori power

analysis. Of the 560 respondents, the average age was 51 years with 14 years of experience at the institution. Two hundred sixty-three (47%) were male, and 297 (53%) were female. According to the *Fact Book of the Florida Community College System* (2002), 2,424 (49%) full-time Florida community college instructional personnel were male, and 2,527 were female (51%). A chi-square test indicated that the proportions of males and females in the sample were not significantly different from the proportions of males and females in the population ($X^2 = 0.80, p = .37$). Thus, both male and female faculty members were well represented in the survey respondents.

Furthermore, of the 560 respondents, 5.4% ($n = 30$) were black, 3.2% ($n = 18$) were Hispanic, 88% ($n = 493$) were white, and 3.4% ($n = 19$) identified themselves as other. The *Fact Book of the Florida Community College System* (2002) identified 8.8% ($n = 436$) of the state's full-time community college faculty as black, 7.3% ($n = 360$) as Hispanic, 81.4% as white ($n = 4029$), and 2.5% ($n = 126$) as other. Based on the results of the chi-square analysis, I determined that the proportions of faculty of different ethnicity among the respondents were significantly different from the proportions of faculty of different ethnicity in the population ($X^2 = 23.24, p < .0001$). While whites were overrepresented among the survey respondents, blacks and Hispanics were underrepresented. The age, years of experience, gender and ethnicity of the nonrespondents ($n = 20$) (see Chapter 3) did not differ noticeably from those of the respondents.

Summary of Interview Process

In accordance with the research design outlined in Chapter 3, I used purposeful sampling to select 12 faculty members, six each on two Florida community college

campuses: Santa Fe Community College in Gainesville, Florida, and Daytona Beach Community College in Daytona Beach, Florida (including one interview on the DeLand Campus). These two community colleges had among the highest survey response rate and the highest level of involvement in faculty governance as self-reported by faculty (question III.8 on the survey). Furthermore, these two colleges had among the highest means for survey items #2 and #3. Santa Fe Community College was of particular interest since this college's senate is composed of administrators and professional staff as well as faculty—a unique configuration among Florida's community colleges.

According to the protocol established in Chapter 3, I conducted six, hour-long, tape-recorded interviews at Santa Fe Community College on April 1 and 2, 2003, and six hour-long, tape-recorded interviews at Daytona Beach Community College on April 22 and 23, 2003. Upon completion of the interviews, I transcribed 11 of the interviews with a transcriptionist completing the final interview.

Treatment of Data: Survey

The unit of analysis was the individual faculty member who responded to the survey. Each respondent was encouraged to answer every question, and respondents received a cue if any questions were unanswered. Responses were anonymous with no records kept of the email addresses from which the responses were sent. I used SAS for Windows, Version 8.12, to analyze the data entered into Microsoft Excel from the SQL database. Furthermore, I treated all “don't know” responses as missing data. Other data remained as entered except for the date of birth, which I changed to chronological age. I also recorded all of the individual responses in the comments section at the end of the survey.

For purposes of this study, the introduction to the survey defined the operational construct, *faculty governance body*, as a forum generally composed of elected faculty representatives organized for the purpose of advising the administration regarding policies affecting faculty—and not a collective bargaining unit. In Florida’s community college system, some colleges have collective bargaining units and no defined faculty senates while other colleges have faculty senates without any union representing faculty. A few community colleges in Florida have no faculty senate or faculty union, and at least one college has both a faculty senate and a collective bargaining unit. Given the diversity of these organizational structures, I made the decision to accept every response, despite the college affiliation of the responding faculty member, because the unit of analysis was the individual faculty member and not the individual college and because governance structures might have been in place of which I had no knowledge.

Data Analysis: Quantitative Design

Research Question 1

The first research question was: “What is the level of involvement of Florida’s full-time community college faculty in institutional governance?” Table 1 presents the responses to the question III.8 of the survey:

How would you rate your level of involvement in the governance of your institution?

Table 1

Level of Involvement in Institutional Governance

Level of Involvement	Percentage	<i>n</i>
Not involved	.36	2
Not much involved	14.29	80
Moderately involved	74.82	419
Highly involved	10.54	59

A high percentage of faculty (85.36%) reported themselves as either moderately or highly involved in the governance of their institutions (see Table 1). The large number of moderately involved faculty ($n = 419$) clearly affected the survey's data analysis. On the other hand, survey respondents ($n = 2$) who identified themselves as not involved did not appreciably contribute to the survey's findings.

Furthermore, in addition to the survey response rate of 11% ($N = 560$), the small number of faculty who reported themselves as not involved raised questions about the faculty who did not respond to the survey. It is likely that the percentage of Florida's community college faculty who are not involved in institutional decision-making is higher than .36%. It is also probable that the faculty who responded to the survey were those who were interested in the survey's subject and thus were more likely to be involved in faculty governance activities. Among the nonrespondents ($n = 20$), 25% reported themselves as not involved, 30% reported being not much involved, 30% reported a moderate level of involvement, and 10% reported themselves as highly involved. Therefore, the nonrespondent analysis confirmed that the survey data revealed

more about faculty who were moderately or highly involved than faculty who were not involved, which may be as much as half the faculty.

Prior to question III.8, the survey asked the respondents a number of questions related to involvement in specific aspects of governance activities. The first question, III.1, was:

Have you served as an officer of a faculty governance body (either a campus or college-wide position) within the last three years?

Of the 560 respondents, 26.43% ($n = 148$) indicated that they had served as an officer of such a body while 73.57% ($n = 412$) had not. A Pearson correlation coefficient revealed a moderately strong relationship between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her service as a faculty governance body officer within the last three years ($r = .37, p < .0001$). A frequency table showed that only 98 (24%) of moderately involved faculty ($n = 419$) answered yes to this question while 74% ($n = 43$) of the highly involved faculty responded in the affirmative. These percentages help explain the strength of the correlation coefficient.

The next question, III.2, asked:

How many campus and/or college-wide meetings of your faculty governance body do you attend?

Table 2

Attendance of Faculty Governance Body Meetings

Attendance of Faculty Governance Meetings	Percentage	<i>n</i>
None or almost none	41.96	235
Less than half	14.11	79
About half	5.00	28
More than half	8.93	50
All or almost all	30.00	168

Table 2 indicates that the largest percentage of respondents (41.96%, $n = 235$) attended none or almost none of their faculty governance bodies' meetings while 38.93% ($n = 218$) attended more than half, almost all, or all of the meetings. Perhaps this response is an indication that faculty either commit themselves to attending regularly or choose not to attend.

To determine the direction and strength of the relationship between the self-reported level of involvement and the frequency of attendance at faculty governance body meetings, I computed a Pearson correlation coefficient ($N = 560$). Given the large sample size and the small p value, this correlation coefficient ($r = .41, p < .0001$) showed a moderately strong relationship between frequency of attending faculty governance meetings and the level of involvement of the faculty member. A cross-tabular frequency

table showed that of the 419 faculty who were moderately involved, 166 (39.6%) attended none or almost none of the meetings while almost the same number ($n = 162$, 39%) attended more than half or all or almost all of the meetings. This division among the moderately involved faculty, the group most represented in the survey, helped determine the moderately strong correlation coefficient.

The next question, III.3, asked faculty:

How many campus-wide or college-wide committees have you served on within the past three years?

Table 3

Service on Committees During the Past Three Years

Number of Committees	Percentage	n
None	1.61	9
One	16.43	92
Two	23.57	132
Three	26.07	146
Four or more	32.32	181

Nearly one-third of the respondents (32.32%, $n = 181$) had served on four or more committees within the past three years while only 1.61% ($n = 9$) had served on no committees. Approximately half of the faculty responding (49.64%, $n = 278$) had served on two or three committees during the last three years (see Table 3).

I conducted a correlation procedure to examine the direction and strength of the relationship between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and the

number of campus-wide committees he or she had served on during the last three years. The Pearson correlation coefficient ($N = 560$) revealed a moderately strong relationship ($r = 0.31, p < .0001$) between committee participation during the last three years and the self-reported level of involvement. A look at a cross-tabular frequency table showed that of the moderately involved faculty ($n = 419$), 83% ($n = 349$) had served on three, four, or more committees in the last three years, further indicating a relationship between a higher level of involvement and committee service. The findings for this question suggest that committee membership may be more directly related to a moderate or high level of faculty involvement in governance than attendance of faculty governance body meetings.

Of those faculty who responded affirmatively to question III.3 regarding service on committees, 193 (35.03%) had served as chair or co-chair (question III.4). A correlation analysis between question III.3 and III.4 indicated that faculty who served on more campus wide or college wide committees were more likely to serve as chair or co-chair of one of those committees ($r = .27, p < .0001$). A Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a weak relationship between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her service as chair or co-chair of a committee within the past three years ($r = .16, p = .0001$). This weak relationship is further shown by a frequency table showing that, of the faculty reporting themselves as moderately involved ($n = 419$), 279 (67%) had not served as a committee officer.

The next question (III.5) asked:

How frequently did you attend committee meetings during the academic year (excluding summers)?

Table 4

Attendance of Committee Meetings

Attendance of Committee Meetings	Percentage	<i>n</i>
Less than twice during academic year	11.62	64
At least twice during each semester	31.40	179
At least once a month	56.99	314

Not only do the survey respondents serve on committees (see Table 4), but over half (56.99%, $n = 314$) attend meetings monthly. Furthermore, a Pearson correlation coefficient determined a strong relationship between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and the frequency of his or her attendance at committee meetings ($r = .42, p = .003$). A cross-tabular frequency table revealed that compared to the moderately involved faculty, the highly involved faculty ($n = 59$) showed a significantly higher percentage (81.38%) attending committee meetings at least once a month as opposed to less than twice during the year or at least twice during the semester. The findings for this question further supported committee participation as more indicative of involvement in faculty governance than active engagement in the faculty governance body meetings.

A high percentage (74.41%, $n = 410$) had served on a project or committee with a defined role that had resulted in significant outcomes or recommendations to the college (question III.6). A Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a weak relationship between

the faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement and his or her participation on a committee or a project with significant outcomes for the college ($r = .13, p = .0022$). Furthermore, a frequency table revealed that the highly involved faculty ($n = 59$) were more likely to have contributed to a committee or project with a defined role for the college (89.5%) while the faculty who were not much involved were almost evenly divided in their responses—perhaps contributing to the low correlation coefficient.

Question III.7 asked survey participants:

How often do you engage in dialogue (e.g., conversations, electronic bulletin boards) with other faculty regarding faculty issues in institutional decision-making?

Table 5

Engagement in Dialogue About Faculty Issues

Engagement in Dialogue About Faculty Issues	Percentage	<i>n</i>
Never	15.00	84
Twice a semester	21.79	122
Monthly	30.00	168
Weekly	33.21	186

Table 5 shows that a third of respondents (33.21%, $n = 186$) indicated that they engaged in weekly dialogue. Slightly less than a third (30.00%, $n = 168$) reported that they engaged in monthly dialogue while slightly more than a third (36.79%, $n = 206$) conversed about these issues twice a semester or never participated in such dialogue.

To determine the direction and strength of the relationship between level of involvement in governance activities and engagement in dialogue, I computed a Pearson correlation coefficient using the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and the response to question III.7. The analysis ($r = .35, p < .0001$), indicated that faculty who self-reported that they were involved in faculty governance were likely to participate in dialogue about faculty issues in institutional decision-making. Of the moderately involved faculty ($n = 415$), the largest group of survey respondents, 75% ($n = 312$) engaged in monthly dialogue about faculty governance issues while 25% ($n = 102$) participated in such dialogue on a weekly basis. Among the highly involved faculty ($n = 58$), 10% ($n = 6$) participated in monthly dialogue and 90% ($n = 52$) in weekly dialogue. These responses among the moderately and highly involved faculty supported a moderately strong relationship between the participation level of faculty and their engagement in dialogue about governance issues.

Question III.9 asked faculty:

Compared to five years ago, are you more involved in faculty governance activities, less involved, or involved about the same?

Table 6

Faculty Governance Involvement Compared to Five Years Ago

Governance Involvement Compared to 5 Years Ago	Percentage	<i>n</i>
Same level of involvement	13.39%	75
Less involved	57.50%	322
More involved	29.11%	163

Over half of the respondents (57.50%, $n = 332$) indicated that they were less involved than five years ago (see Table 6). This percentage is almost twice that of faculty reporting that they are more involved currently than five years ago.

I computed a Pearson correlation coefficient to explore the strength and direction of the relation between the current self-reported level of involvement and the response to question III.9 above. The Pearson correlation coefficient indicated a moderately strong relationship between faculty's current involvement in governance activities and the involvement five years ago ($r = .29, p < .0001$). A cross-tabular frequency table showed that 97.5% of the faculty who reported themselves as not much involved ($n = 80$) were involved at the same level or were less involved than five years ago while 58% of the moderately involved faculty ($n = 242$) and 37% of the highly involved faculty ($n = 22$) were less involved in governance activities than five years ago.

Table 7 provides a summary of the correlation coefficients and the p values for questions III.1 –7, and question III.9 as correlated with the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement.

Table 7

Summary of Correlation Coefficients and Probability Values

Question	Text of Question	r	p	n
III.1	Have you served as an officer of a faculty governance body (either a campus or college-wide position) within the last three years?	.37	<.0001	560

Table 7 (Continued)

III.2	How many campus and/or college-wide meetings of your faculty governance body do you attend?	.41	<.0001	560
III.3	How many campus-wide or college-wide committees have you served on within the past three years?	.31	<.0001	560
III.4	Were you chair or co-chair of any of these committees?	.16	.0001	560
III.5	How frequently did you attend committee meetings during the academic year (excluding summers)?	.42	.03	557
III.6	Have you served on a project or committee with a defined role that resulted in significant outcomes or recommendations to the colleges?	.13	.0022	560
III.7	How often do you engage in dialogue (e.g., conversations, electronic bulletin boards) with other faculty regarding faculty issues in institutional decision-making?	.36	<.0001	560
III.9	Compared to five years ago, are you more involved in faculty governance activities, less involved, or involved about the same?	.29	<.0001	560

Scale of Involvement

The faculty member's self-reported level of involvement (question III. 8) is a variable reflecting the faculty member's perceptions of his or her participation in institutional governance. However, the self-reported level of involvement does not necessarily relate to specific behaviors deemed by this study's panel of experts to be

relevant to faculty involvement in decision-making, including attending faculty governance body meetings, serving on committees, participating in special projects, and engaging in dialogue with other faculty regarding faculty issues. Therefore, based on each respondent's answer to each question in section III. of the survey, I computed a composite variable called *scale of involvement*. This variable consisted of the sum of the z-scores for each faculty member's responses to questions III. 1 through III. 9 (see Table 7). This variable is a better indication of faculty involvement than the self-reported level of involvement because it reflects the individual faculty member's responses to all of the questions in section III. as compared to the responses of other faculty to the same questions. A Pearson correlation coefficient showed a relatively strong relation between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her scale of involvement ($r = .62, p < .0001$), but still indicates some differentiation between the two measures of involvement.

Based on the survey data results subject to the limitations of the survey response rate of 11% the answer to research question #1 is that the survey respondents are most likely to be moderately involved in the governance of their institutions. However, given the nonrespondent analysis, this finding cannot be generalized to the population. Furthermore, service on campus wide or college wide committees, but not necessarily as chair or co-chair, is perhaps a greater indication of faculty involvement than attendance of faculty governance body meetings.

Research Questions 2 and 3

The second research question asked: "What are faculty members' perceptions of the roles that faculty advisory bodies play in institutional governance?" The third

research question was, “How do Florida’s full-time community college faculty envision an ideal governance process?” I explored these questions by determining the means and standard deviations for survey items 1 through 25 (see Table 8). Table 8 clarifies the results by sorting the survey questions from highest to lowest mean.

Table 8

Descriptive Statistics for Survey Questions Sorted by Mean

Question	Mean	SD	n
21. Faculty should convince the administration that the faculty "voice" is a valuable component in decision-making.	4.44	0.80	556
22. Faculty must insist on rights and responsibilities in appropriate governance roles.	4.44	0.80	556
25. Faculty should be more involved in developing specific outcomes for budgetary expenditures.	4.15	0.87	545
24. Faculty should assist in clarifying roles of administrators so that they know they are to administer policy and not impose their own.	4.11	0.98	542
16. Issues considered by our faculty governance body are important.	3.95	0.99	538
13. It is difficult to get people to serve on faculty governance body standing and/or ad-hoc committees.	3.61	1.15	499
9. Faculty governance body members and academic administrators meet regularly.	3.60	1.16	487
15. Our faculty governance body leaders are well prepared to assume their positions.	3.40	1.12	503
1. Our faculty governance body adequately represents the faculty point of view.	3.39	1.26	535
18. The faculty governance body is utilized as a conduit through which faculty participation is solicited.	3.30	1.25	544
23. Faculty committees should work harder to cooperate with the administration.	3.27	1.11	535
2. Our faculty governance body is well represented on committees making decisions on policy, planning, and allocation of resources.	3.22	1.35	529
7. Communication is good between our faculty governance body and academic administrators.	3.20	1.32	519
4. Our faculty governance body operates efficiently.	3.09	1.22	526
14. Management information is readily provided to the faculty governance body concerning issues it considers.	3.02	1.21	463
5. Our faculty governance body attracts the most capable people as members.	2.97	1.24	519
11. Our faculty governance body is involved in important decisions about the way the institution is run.	2.92	1.30	526
17. Faculty are empowered to question policy decisions through a well-articulated process.	2.88	1.34	537
8. Communication is good between our governance body and the Board of Trustees.	2.65	1.31	447

Table 8 (Continued)

19. Institutional procedures involve faculty governance early in the decision-making process.	2.59	1.25	509
10. Faculty governance body representatives and the Board of Trustees meet regularly.	2.56	1.26	403
6. Our faculty governance body's operating budget is adequate.	2.53	1.09	336
12. Academic administrators' and faculty governance body's expectations regarding the governance body's role are the same.	2.48	1.19	468
3. Faculty members are adequately rewarded for their participation in the governance process.	2.26	1.10	506
20. Neutral "consultants" are utilized to mediate faculty-administration dealings.	2.17	1.03	412

Table 8 shows that respondents agreed that the faculty's voice in decision-making should be heard, their governance responsibilities and rights should be fulfilled, and their roles in governance should be defined. They also agreed that faculty should be involved in budget planning and that the issues considered by their faculty governance bodies were important. The survey respondents further confirmed that the level of faculty involvement faculty is of concern, particularly soliciting faculty to serve on faculty governance body committees.

However, respondents were neutral about whether their faculty governance bodies adequately represented the faculty point of view or whether the faculty governance body served as a conduit for soliciting faculty participation in decision-making. In addition, faculty were neutral whether communication was good between faculty and administration, whether faculty were well represented on decision-making committees, and whether faculty committees should work harder to communicate with the administration.

Respondents disagreed that faculty were involved in making important decisions about their institutions or that the faculty were empowered to question administrators'

decisions. They also disagreed that communication was good between the faculty governance body and the board of trustees although many respondents did not know about this question ($n = 447$), nor did many respondents know whether their faculty governance body representative met regularly with the board of trustees ($n = 403$). Faculty further disagreed that their colleges use neutral consultants in faculty dealings with administration, but a low number of respondents ($n = 412$) is perhaps an indication that most faculty do not know about the role of neutral consultants. Faculty respondents also disagreed that faculty and administrative expectations about the role of the senate were the same or that the faculty were adequately rewarded for participation in governance. The fewest number of faculty ($n = 336$) responded to the question, “Our faculty governance body’s budget is adequate,” indicating a lack of knowledge in this area among many of the respondents.

Miller and Vacik (1998) administered this survey to 110 community college faculty from three states: Georgia, Mississippi, and Nebraska. The means for each of the first 16 survey questions, with two exceptions, were higher in the Miller and Vacik study. The respondents in this current study had a higher means for question #9, “Faculty advisory body members and administration meet regularly.” The means for this question for the current study and the Miller and Vacik (1998) study, respectively, were 3.6 ($SD = 1.16$) and 3.52 ($SD = .89$). Also, the mean in this current study was higher for question #13: “It is difficult to get people to serve on faculty advisory bodies and/or ad-hoc committees.” The mean for this study was 3.61 ($SD = 1.15$) as opposed to 3.12 ($SD = 1.13$) for the Miller and Vacik (1998) study. With these two exceptions, faculty in the

Miller and Vacik (1998) study were more likely to agree to statements related to their perceptions of faculty involvement in governance (questions 1-16).

Questions 17-20 elicited responses regarding the characteristics of an ideal governance process. Once again, the means for each question were higher in the Miller and Vacik (1998) study. Whereas respondents to the Miller and Vacik study (1998) agreed with each survey item in this section, the respondents to the current study were either neutral or disagreed with each item. Although the section of this survey was labeled “Characteristics of an Ideal Governance Process,” some of the survey respondents may have answered questions 17-20 based on their experiences at their own institutions rather than on their perceptions of an ideal governance process.

For questions 21-25 relating to the desired roles of faculty in the governance process, the means of the current study were higher for each question, with one exception. Florida’s faculty respondents were neutral about whether “faculty committees should work harder to cooperate with the administration” ($M = 3.27, SD = 1.11$) whereas the respondents in the Miller and Vacik (1998) study agreed with this statement ($M = 4.22, SD = .71$). Overall, in this section Florida’s faculty agreed to the survey items to a greater degree than did the faculty in the Miller and Vacik (1998) study.

Overall, the data used to answer research questions #2 and #3 indicated that survey respondents agreed about what the roles of faculty *should be* in institutional governance. However, they were less in agreement about the characteristics of an ideal governance process or their perceptions of their faculty governance bodies’ current involvement in governance. Thus, there is an apparent discrepancy between faculty’s responses regarding their ideal roles as faculty members involved in governance and their

articulation of the role of their faculty governance bodies in institutional decision-making or their understanding of an ideal governance process.

Research Question 4

The fourth research question asked, “What is the relation between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional decision-making and his or her perception of institutional governance?”

Three null hypotheses addressed this question:

1. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceptions of faculty involvement in institutional governance.
2. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceptions of the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance.
3. There is no significant relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in faculty governance and his or her perceived characteristics of an ideal governance process.

Because of the multiple null hypotheses, I used an a priori power analysis (Cohen, 1977) with the following assumptions: power of .80, alpha level of .02 (Bonferroni adjustment), and medium effect size (0.30). This analysis determined that the desired number of respondents was 440. The survey response met this requirement.

To investigate the first null, I began by computing a coefficient alpha for internal reliability for items 1 – 16. The Cronbach coefficient alpha for these items was .72. Then I computed a Pearson correlation coefficient between the overall means of survey

items 1-16 (for each respondent) and the respondent's self-reported level of involvement. The correlation procedure rejected the null ($r = .28, p < .0001$). Thus, there is a moderately strong relationship between a faculty member's perceptions of faculty involvement in institutional governance and his or her self-reported level of involvement. I also calculated a Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the overall means of survey items 1-16 and the variable, scale of involvement. For this analysis, the p value also rejected the null hypothesis; however, this analysis showed a weak positive correlation between the scale of involvement for each faculty member and his or her perceptions of faculty participation in institutional governance ($r = .14, p = .0009$).

For the second null, I checked the internal reliability of survey items 21-25 by computing a coefficient alpha. The Cronbach coefficient alpha for these items was .70, showing a high correlation between the items. Then I examined the relation between the overall means of survey items 21-25 (for each respondent) and the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. Using a Pearson Correlation Coefficient, the analysis rejected the null ($r = .16, p < .0001$), indicating a weak relationship between a faculty member's perceptions of desired faculty roles in governance and his or her level of involvement. I also computed a Pearson Correlation Coefficient using the variable, scale of involvement, and the overall means for survey items 21-25. The p value rejected the null, but this analysis indicated a weak positive correlation between the variables ($r = .14, p = .0011$), suggesting that as the scale of involvement for the individual faculty member increases, the faculty member is only slightly more likely to agree about the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance.

For the third null, I investigated the internal reliability of questions 17-20. The Cronbach coefficient alpha for these items was .81, showing a high correlation between the items. Then I examined the relation between the overall means of survey items 17-20 (for each respondent) and the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. Using a Pearson correlation coefficient, I rejected the null ($r = .24, p < .0001$), demonstrating a weak correlation between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her perceptions of an ideal governance process. I also calculated the Pearson correlation coefficient for the variable, scale of involvement, and the means for survey items 17-20. This correlation coefficient also rejected the null, indicating a weak positive correlation between the variables ($r = .11, p < .0001$).

Overall, for each of the null hypotheses for research question #4, the survey items showed a high degree of internal reliability, the p value for each statistical technique rejected the null, but the correlations between the variables were not strong. Thus, based on this survey's results and a response rate of 11%, there is a significant relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in governance and his or her perceptions of faculty involvement in institutional governance and the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance. The strength and direction of the relationship are strongest for the second null hypothesis, lending further support to the findings for research questions #2 and #3. As suggested by the nonrespondent analysis, these findings are based on the responses of faculty more likely to be involved in faculty governance.

Research Question 5

The fifth research question was: “What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s involvement in institutional governance and his or her gender?”

The null hypothesis for question #5 is that there is no significant difference between female faculty members’ levels of involvement in faculty governance and male faculty members’ levels of involvement. An a priori power analysis for this research question ($ES = 0.50$, $power = .80$, $\alpha = .05$) concluded that 256 respondents were needed to address this question. The survey response met this requirement.

To investigate the null hypothesis, I used a two-tailed t-test to examine differences in the means between the females’ self-reported levels of involvement in faculty governance ($M = 2.04$, $SD = .47$) and the males’ self-reported levels of involvement ($M = 2.04$, $SD = .55$). This t-test failed to reject the null ($p = .8349$). The rejection of the null determined that the differences in the means between the females’ self-reported involvement and the males’ self-reported involvement in faculty governance were not statistically significant. To check the degree of the mean differences, I computed Cohen’s d as $-.15$. This computation determined that the magnitude of differences in the means of females and males was less than $.15$ standard deviations apart—a very small effect. I also used a two-tailed t-test to investigate the differences in the means between the females’ scale of involvement ($M = -1.78$, $SD = 4.57$) and the males’ scale of involvement ($M = -1.50$, $SD = 4.62$). This t-test also failed to reject the

null ($p = .5015$). I also calculated Cohen's d for this t-test as $-.11$, also a very small effect.

Therefore, the answer to research question #5 is that the survey data did not support a relationship between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her gender. Furthermore, the data did not indicate any relation between the faculty member's scale of involvement and his or her gender.

Research Question 6

This question asked, "What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her race?" The null hypothesis was that a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance does not vary according to his or race. An a priori power analysis ($ES = 0.50$, power = $.80$, $\alpha = .05$, $u = 4$) estimated a need for 320 respondents to this research question. These requirements were met.

To explore the research question, I used an ANOVA procedure for unbalanced groups and a Tukey Studentized Range (HSD) Test to look for differences among four groups: black, Hispanic, white, and other. The independent variable was the faculty member's race while the dependent variable was the measure of the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. To check to see if the assumptions of normality had been met, I noted the skewness and kurtosis of each of the four groups and determined that the assumption of a normal distribution had not been met. A Levene Test for homogeneity of variance indicated that the variance of the groups were not significantly different. Therefore, the assumption of homogeneity of variance was met. In addition, the ANOVA procedure met the assumption for the independence of observations.

Table 9

Descriptive Statistics for Group: Race and Self-Reported Level of Involvement

Race	Group Mean	Group SD	Group <i>n</i>
Black	2.033	0.4138	30
Hispanic	2.444	0.6157	18
White	2.030	0.5111	493
Other	2.053	0.4050	19

Table 10

Summary Table: ANOVA Race and Self-Reported Level of Involvement

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr >F
Between groups	3	2.9818	0.9939	3.87	0.0093
Within groups	556	142.9021	0.2570		
Total	559	145.8839			

The *F* statistic and *p* value rejected the null ($F = 3.87, p = .0093$), indicating differences in the means among the four groups (see Tables 9 and 10). Furthermore, the Tukey test ($\alpha = .05$) indicated a significant difference in the group means of Hispanic and black faculty members and a significant difference in the group means of Hispanic and white faculty members.

I also used an ANOVA procedure to examine the differences between racial groups—black, Hispanic, white, and other—with the independent variable being the faculty member's race and the dependent variable being the faculty member's scale of

involvement. The F statistic and p value failed to reject the null ($F = 2.15$, $p = .0934$), indicating there were no significant differences in the means among the four groups (see Tables 11 and 12).

Table 11

Descriptive Statistics for Group: Race and Scale of Involvement

Race	Group Mean	Group SD	Group n
Black	-3.2797	4.4404	30
Hispanic	-3.4525	3.6141	18
White	-1.5233	4.8464	490
Other	-2.0556	4.8119	19

Table 12

Summary Table: ANOVA Race and Scale of Involvement

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Pr >F
Between groups	3	147.8447	48.2816	2.15	.0934
Within groups	553	12696.0913	22.9586		
Total	556	12843.9936			

Thus, there is likely some relationship between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her race. Specifically, according to the survey results, there may be some effect of being a white faculty member as opposed to being a black or Hispanic faculty member. However, this difference in effect is not present when examining a faculty member's scale of involvement in relation to his or her race—

perhaps because there is a greater range of values for the variable, scale of involvement, and this variable is a better indication of involvement than the variable, self-reported level of involvement.

Research Questions 7 and 8

This research question stated: “What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her age? The eighth research question was: “What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her years of employment at the institution?”

For both research questions #7 and 8, an a priori power analysis (Cohen, 1977) with a desired effect size of 0.30, power of .80, and alpha level of .05 concluded that the desired number of survey respondents to these questions was 256. The survey’s response exceeded the desired number.

To investigate question #7, I first calculated a Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement and his or her age. The p value for this analysis failed to reject the null ($r = .02, p = .7203$), suggesting that there is no significant relationship between these variables. I then determined the Pearson Correlation Coefficient between the variable, scale of involvement, and the faculty member’s age. For this analysis, the p value also failed to reject the null ($r = -.06, p = .1723$), supporting a lack of correlation between these two variables.

For research question #8, a correlation procedure investigated the relationship between a faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement and his or her years of experience at the institution. The p value failed to reject the null ($r = 0.01, p = .8240$). A

correlation procedure further explored the relationship between the variable, scale of involvement, and a faculty member's years of experience at the institution. This analysis, however, rejected the null ($r = .10, p = .0214$), indicating a weak positive correlation between the variables.

Therefore, to answer research question #7, the survey data did not reveal a relation between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her age. Furthermore, the survey's results did not show a relationship between a faculty member's scale of involvement and his or her age. In response to research question #8, the data did not indicate a link between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her years at the institution, but did demonstrate a weak relationship between the faculty member's years at the institution and his or her scale of involvement.

Data Analysis: Qualitative Design

The 12 interviewees are full-time community college faculty from two Florida community colleges, Santa Fe Community College and Daytona Beach Community College. I chose these colleges from those with among the highest survey response rate and the highest level of involvement in institutional governance as self-reported by faculty. This purposeful sampling does have limitations in that the faculty at these colleges are involved in governance to a greater degree (as measured by the survey) than faculty at other of Florida's community colleges. Therefore, these interviewees' experiences are not necessarily representative of those of other full-time community college faculty.

Using an inductive approach, I discovered a variety of themes threading their way through the interviews. All of the interviewees discussed their structures for faculty governance, and the differences between these structures were evident. In addition, all of the interviewed faculty articulated the processes that their senates used for communication and discussion of issues and concerns. Each faculty member also mentioned the most important issues that the senate discusses and the issues that have been effectively (or ineffectively) represented to the administration with important outcomes for the college.

The faculty also provided information regarding the college's administrative structures and how these structures have interacted with the senate. Particularly important are the college's committee structures, especially those outside the confines of the senate. The interviewees detailed the outcomes of several decisions made with the faculty and administration working together for the benefit of the college.

In response to research question #9, the interviewees discussed their current levels of involvement as well as the personal and institutional characteristics that encouraged and/or hindered their involvement. Moreover, they acknowledged the key leadership roles of the college president and the senate president. They also communicated their perceptions of their faculty leader's interaction with the Board of Trustees and how the faculty leader's position might evolve in an ideal governance process. Finally, several of the interviewees presented some of the statewide implications for governance.

Faculty Governance Structures

The governance structure at Santa Fe Community College (SFCC) is a college senate with representatives from professional and administrative staff and full-time

faculty. (Long-term adjunct faculty are currently being considered for membership.) Faculty senators represent their academic departments. In a national survey of faculty senates in community colleges by Miller (2003), six out of 61 respondents reported that their senate was made up of administrators and staff as well as faculty. Furthermore, 41% of the respondents ($n = 18$) had senates with faculty representing an academic department. SFCC's representative structure dates from the early 1980's.

In contrast, the senate at Daytona Beach Community College (DBCC) is a faculty senate with all full-time faculty as members but no representation from departments or other constituency groups within the college. The survey by Miller (2003) indicated that 14% of the respondents ($n = 6$) had senates with all eligible faculty as members. DBCC's structure dates from the early 1990's. Before that time, DBCC's faculty senate was a representative senate. When I asked why DBCC changed its faculty senate to a non-representative structure, a faculty member said that the former senate had "lost. . .the trust of the faculty. That's why we went to. . . the general representation. . . .There is a lot of resistance to going back to an elected senate body."

The organizational structure of SFCC's college senate has several advantages, as represented by the interviewees. One advantage is clearly the presence of the administration, including the president, at college senate meetings. As one interviewee said, "They [the administration] hear our voices." Another faculty member cited increasing attendance at senate meetings because faculty "get a feeling that they're [the administration] listening to us." Although the college senate was described as "a forum where we [faculty] sort of have an equal weight," a former college senate president admitted that non-faculty present at the senate meetings might be resentful that so much

time at the senate was spent talking about classroom issues and perhaps not enough time about the concerns of non-faculty. Another faculty member was clear in her desire for a faculty only governance forum at SFCC: “Faculty do not have a gathering place.”

Some of the DBCC faculty members are pleased with the current non-representative system because more faculty can participate and department chairs, who are faculty, can attend. The DBCC faculty senate is described as “one governance structure, and we all feed into the structure.” One faculty member conceded that she “felt more of an obligation under the old system to come back and let everybody [in her department] know what was going on.” One faculty member who has participated in both a representative and a non-representative senate claimed: “They seem . . . to operate about the same. The level of involvement is limited.”

Administrative Structures Related to Faculty Governance

The interviewees shared their knowledge of the administrative structures at their colleges. Since these structures affect the interaction between the senate and the administration, a brief introduction to the administrative structure of each institution appears below.

At SFCC, the president of the college sets the agenda for the president’s cabinet, of which the faculty senate president is a member. The president and the faculty senate president are also members of the college senate’s executive council. Both the president and key members of his administration attend college senate meetings. The college senate appoints a variety of faculty to senate standing and ad hoc committees as needed to discuss critical issues.

At DBCC, the college president also chairs the president's cabinet, but membership "is at the discretion of the president himself" and does not include the faculty senate president. The cabinet does include the vice-presidents and the associate vice-presidents as well as the EA/EO officer, but does not include the deans or department chairs. The perception among DBCC faculty is that the president's cabinet makes the decisions.

A key part of DBCC's institutional governance is the planning council. The planning council is composed of 50% faculty and 50% members from other constituency groups (professional, career, etc.). Of the approximately 15 faculty members on the planning council, half are appointed by the president, and half are elected through a process involving the faculty senate. The planning council makes recommendations to the president regarding various issues such as prioritization of budget items. The planning council has a number of committees that report to it concerning personnel issues, budgetary issues, etc.

Administrative Processes: Committees

At SFCC, college senate committees such as the budget advisory committee, professional standards committee, curriculum committee and salary/benefits committee convene and make a report to the senate. The senate then takes a vote of support (or lack of support) on their recommendations and motions. The college senate president reports the results of the committee's work to the college senate executive council and to the president's cabinet. Several of the SFCC faculty who were interviewed indicated their desire for even more faculty involvement on college senate committees: "There are more concerted efforts to get faculty on committees, [but] we're not as good as we could be."

Some committees and task forces also operate outside the purview of the college senate, including a few committees that were the results of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) accreditation process—e.g., the strategic planning committee.

When a new president came to DBCC a few years ago, he initiated a new governance process called the planning council, which recently received a SACS commendation. The planning council hosts a number of committees including a faculty senate committee (chaired by the faculty senate president), a teaching and learning committee, a technology committee, and a human resources committee. The president has promoted the planning council as “faculty-driven,” yet except for the faculty senate committee, all the committee chairs are administrators.

In response to the planning council, the faculty senate has appointed a number of subcommittees—in essence, subcommittees that are parallel to the committees of the college wide planning council. The goal is to have a faculty senate member on each of the planning council committees and to coordinate planning council and faculty senate efforts—“to increase and enhance communication through. . . a team approach so we’re all working toward the same goal.” However, the perception is that “the committees that you participate in as part of the faculty senate are not viewed as important committees.” Some faculty speculated that this duplication between the planning council and the faculty senate has resulted in less active participation by faculty in the faculty senate. The potential for conflict and duplication of efforts between the planning council and faculty senate is clear. An example is the recent healthcare plan presented to the faculty by some “supposedly representative” task force whose members were unidentified.

Faculty Governance Processes

Each senate has specific processes it uses to “bubble up” concerns from faculty for senate discussion, to report back to faculty about the events at senate meetings, and to carry discussion from the senate to the administration. For example, SFCC’s college senate sends out the senate agenda and minutes electronically and uses an electronic bulletin board and email for faculty concerns and feedback. Furthermore, college senate meetings are generally broadcast via the Internet.

Because SFCC’s governance is representative, senate representatives send reports from the senate meeting by email and/or report informally at department meetings. Department members also communicate requests through their representatives to the senate—either informally through email or “water cooler” conversations or formally through department meetings.

The culture of SFCC informally promotes representative governance. A new SFCC representative indicated his strong desire to cast his vote at the college senate according to his department’s wishes: “I made it very clear to my faculty that I’ll vote their way even if I am violently opposed to it. . . . I’ll do it that way because that’s the charge.” Another representative stated: “You’re not there to take over and do things against the wishes of your department. You’re there to inform them of what’s going on and get their input and to vote their group mind.” One minimally involved SFCC faculty member indicated her support of the representative process: “I usually let my senate rep do most of the work.” Another faculty member, however, indicated some dissatisfaction with a department representative to the senate: “Sometimes that [representation] hasn’t

worked very well. We had reps in the past who didn't know what was going on or what they were representing us on." At SFCC, the college senate president, a faculty member, is responsible for communicating the decisions at the senate to the college executive council and to the president's cabinet for further discussion.

Like SFCC's college senate, DBCC's faculty senate uses email (including occasional informal surveys) and an electronic bulletin board to communicate with faculty, although one of the interviewees mentioned that the electronic bulletin board was rarely used. Faculty also indicate their concerns to the faculty senate officers informally. A former senate officer made this statement about the frequency of faculty coming by his office to express concerns: "Occasionally they do, but really they don't. They're just so uninvolved."

A major problem of DBCC's faculty senate is the lack of attendance at many of the senate meetings. Only about 20 faculty—less than 10% of the full-time faculty—are present at most senate meetings, prompting one former senate officer to describe the attendance as "pathetic." Although DBCC broadcasts faculty senate meetings to remote sites over its television system, attendance at the remote sites is not good either. With so few faculty attending senate meetings, "only a small minority of people are actually influencing the decisions," and the fear is that "the [college] president doesn't really feel that the faculty senate represents the faculty because such small numbers actually show up." In the past, DBCC's senate tried a vote proxy system through which faculty appointed a department member to voice the department's opinions, but the faculty senate president at that time believed that "some faculty members felt that only members

that were present at the meeting should be voting.” Another former DBCC faculty senate president remarked:

Another problem with not having an elected body is that different people show up at different meetings, so you’ll have something discussed and carried forth to the next meeting. Now you’ve got another group of people showing up at the second meeting. They haven’t heard the discussion from the first meeting, so the continuity is awkward.

With this “awkward” continuity, it is not clear what the process is for communicating to faculty what has happened at the senate meetings—other than through the senate minutes. At DBCC, the faculty senate president does serve as chair of the faculty senate committee and does meet with the president at regular intervals along with the chairs of other constituency groups (professional, career, etc.). However, the DBCC faculty senate does not sit on the president’s cabinet and does not represent the faculty’s concerns at that level.

Faculty Issues Discussed at Senate

Both the SFCC and DBCC senates have discussed a wide variety of faculty issues. The issues most frequently identified as important to the interviewees were salary and faculty development and evaluation processes. Not only were faculty salaries a regular topic of discussion, but faculty at both colleges mentioned the senate’s role in recent faculty equity studies.

Other less frequently discussed issues included faculty benefits such as the health care plan and retirement; personnel issues (need for more faculty, hiring procedures, discrimination and sexual harassment policies); classroom-based issues (teaching and

learning, summer terms, new programs); organizational culture issues (academic freedom, need for communication/information sharing); and budgeting.

Faculty interviewed at both colleges, however, mentioned issues that had not been discussed widely at senate but that warranted discussion or should have been discussed in a timely manner. These included issues in special committees or task forces that should be within the confines of the college senate, such as work load/equity issues, hiring projections, the reasons for a lack of involvement in faculty senate, and a discussion of the competition between the faculty senate and other administrative structures such as DBCC's planning council (discussed later in the chapter). Faculty also indicated two issues that should have received more discussion at senate but were brought before the group with little time left before implementation: minimesters to begin in Fall 2003 (SFCC) and the healthcare plan (DBCC).

I also asked interviewees about issues that were discussed at the senate that did not appear to them to be substantive. Three of the interviewees did not believe that the senate discussed many issues that were not substantive. Many of the other issues mentioned as not being substantive were college-specific such as the Lifetime Achievement Awards at SFCC or the distribution of dog track funds at DBCC. Two former senate officers viewed nonsubstantive issues as "the process of personalizing too many things that don't involve the collective group" and "yakking [about issues] that never really can come to conclusion."

Faculty Governance Outcomes

The interviewees noted several examples of faculty issues that had been effectively represented to the administration. The interviewees felt that the senate most

effectively represented their concerns related to faculty salary/benefits (portfolios, credit banking, phased retirement) and the evaluation process (self-evaluation, faculty evaluation of supervisors and administrators). Another faculty member highly experienced in governance stated that effective representation did not mean institutional changes: “Certain things went the wrong way, even with all our efforts.”

One-third of the interviewees either could not give examples or did not know of issues lacking effective representation. Other issues mentioned by faculty as lacking effective representation to the administration were faculty work load, sabbaticals, the healthcare plan, and the process for faculty grievances. One faculty member implied that many issues on his campus lacked effective representation because there was an illusion or covering of some sort of representative involvement. . . [but] no real meaningful involvement.”

Faculty and Administration Interaction: Implications for Institutional Decision-Making

The interviewees identified a number of institutional decisions that were a result of faculty and administration working together. At both colleges, interviewees cited decisions related to faculty salaries and benefits. At SFCC, faculty and administration worked together to investigate faculty salaries at other community colleges in Florida and made a major salary adjustment to full-time faculty salaries in an attempt to raise the average salary of its faculty as reported in *The Community College Fact Book* issued annually. Other important salary/benefits decisions made with the faculty and administration working together included credit banking and phased retirement.

At DBCC, the faculty senate and administration worked on a faculty equity salary study, also examining salaries at other community colleges and across campus

departments. The faculty senate recommended a step plan that was “modified by the administration.”

The faculty interviewed at SFCC also cited administrative support for a proposed faculty self-evaluation process changing the focus from faculty evaluation to professional development. This proposal, developed by the professional standards committee of the college senate, included a pilot study currently in progress. Other institutional decisions mentioned were revised hiring procedures for faculty, the transformation to a technological campus, and the hiring of a new president. However, not every SFCC faculty member is pleased with the interaction of the faculty and administration to make decisions. For example, one interviewee cited a successful student program that had not been refunded because it was not a budget priority.

Two of the faculty interviewed at DBCC identified the establishment of channels of communication between faculty and administration as an important institutional decision worked out between both groups. Another faculty member discussed DBCC’s “upward evaluation” of administrators and supervisors by faculty.

These institutional decisions ideally “validate what we are doing out here at the grassroots level of the institution.” Faculty and administration acknowledge that “we can help each other” and that “it’s best to at least listen and be responsive to senate input.” The result is a healthy tension between administration and faculty with both consensus building and conflict.

Other faculty, however, are not confident that the administration is listening to faculty input in institutional decision-making--specifically at DBCC. One faculty member said that sometimes the work of a committee is “completely disregarded.”

Another stated that “there are [opportunities for interaction] as long as we are in unison with the general plan.” Still other faculty believe that many decisions made by the administration are a “kind of a done deal,” “a *fait accompli*,” “a preset plan . . . as to what’s going to happen and that’s what’s going to happen.” One faculty summarized his perception of faculty participation in institutional governance: “There’s an artificiality to the governance. I think that it’s a lot of busyness to create the illusion of participation.”

Interviewees’ Level of Involvement in Faculty Governance

Among the interviewees, the length of service at the institution ran from less than one year to 34 years. This wide range of years of experience at the institution means that the interviewed faculty’s views range from those of novice to expert. They are also committed to the community college system. Although two of the interviewees have over 30 years experience at the college, only one plans to retire within five years.

The interviewed faculty included two who are new to faculty governance involvement, two who are minimally involved, four who are highly involved (including former senate officers), and three who are currently heavily involved in committee work. One faculty member, a former faculty senate president who described her involvement as “very little,” said, “When I first came into being involved in this college in faculty senate or other committees that I participated in, I would criticize colleagues that would not come to faculty senate, . . . but, unfortunately, I have become one of them.” However, another former faculty senate president, still highly involved, described his active participation as being over “many, many, many, many years.” Of the 12 interviewees, seven are more involved than five years ago, one is involved about the same, and four

have less involvement. Two of the four faculty with less involvement are still involved but are no longer senate presidents, so they reported themselves as “less involved.”

Personal Characteristics Encouraging Involvement

These faculty noted many personal motivations for their current level of involvement. Three faculty mentioned a desire to serve their departments as elected representatives to the senate. Half of the interviewees cited support from colleagues, administrators, a department chair, and faculty mentors as encouraging factors. One faculty member credited her involvement to a former senate president who worked in her area: “He talked it up with us. . . and he was engaged and he was letting us know what was happening, [so] we became more involved.”

Two faculty became involved because they strongly believed in a faculty voice in governance. One of these faculty affirmed: “They [faculty] should be sharing in the decision-making. . . especially in things that affect the classroom.” Other motivating factors included social networking (getting “out of the silo”), being a “busy body,” and being invited to be a faculty senate officer or major committee chair. One faculty member cited her curiosity as a major reason for her involvement: “To be an effective faculty member. . . I need to know what the issues are, what the big picture’s all about, so that’s one of the main reasons I’ve gotten involved.”

Some faculty mentioned that being in the senate offered them leadership opportunities and a chance for recognition. As one faculty member said:

I think it’s [being a faculty senate officer] really propelled me. . . . I wasn’t really ladder climbing; that was really not my point, but I think that there’s no doubt that there’s a direct correlation between the faculty senate vice-presidency and my

new chairmanship role at the college. . . . It put me into a position to deal with the administration, get to know them, and they saw whatever they liked or they didn't like, and they made their own judgments on that.

Some of the interviewed faculty who were new to senate involvement clearly liked what they saw happening at the meetings. A faculty member, who described himself as "antipolitical," admitted he was elected as a representative when he "missed a meeting," but now, "I see the good things that are getting done in our senate, and I want to be a part of that." Another faculty member, who had been uninvolved for many years while working on his doctorate, said that when he was inactive in faculty governance, he "didn't see any direct results of being in the faculty senate," but his attitude has changed: "I do now."

Institutional Characteristics Encouraging Involvement

Although one faculty member said that, until recently, he was "minimally aware" of the faculty senate although he had been at the institution for 20 years, the other interviewees felt that certain institutional characteristics of the college promoted involvement in faculty governance. One of these characteristics is the expectations of faculty members to provide service to the college and develop themselves professionally. A former faculty senate president stated that being involved in governance has "become more and more a part of our job description and a part of the obligation that we have to the college. And it's widely publicized and promoted by the administration."

Another institutional characteristic encouraging faculty involvement in governance is incentives or rewards for that involvement. At DBCC, for instance, a portfolio system used for salary ranges and assignment of professional rank promotes

faculty senate involvement, particularly as an officer. At both colleges, faculty senate officers received release time and/or stipends.

Both institutions have provided a way for the senate meetings to be broadcast to the college community. SFCC provides web casting for its senate meetings while DBCC offers video conferencing. A former senate president mentioned that the senate meetings were scheduled at a time when faculty should be able to come.

Clearly, the organizational culture of the institutions can promote faculty involvement in institutional governance. SFCC faculty were proud of their history of shared governance. One former senate president at SFCC, a faculty member with over 30 years experience at the institution, supported the current climate at the college:

We've been lucky that we've had an administration that has been very supportive of the whole process. . . . It's clear that the administration always makes the final decision, but they've been involved with reaching out to the college senate when they make a committee or they are looking into a new area. They try to be responsive. . . . And they have backed up the shared governance model.

At DBCC, the faculty were less certain about an organizational climate for effective faculty governance. The primary advisory body on campus is not the faculty senate, but the planning council that came into being with the arrival of a new president a few years ago. One of the DBCC faculty expressed confidence in this governance structure: "The new president. . . perceives a participatory governmental system of the college. It involves faculty senate, but it also involves many other orders of the career employees, the professionals, and everything else combined at the college to make decisions."

Personal Characteristics Hindering Involvement

The interviewees also stated some personal concerns that could discourage involvement in faculty governance. Five of the interviewees mentioned that work load was a hindrance to involvement in governance because a community college faculty member's work load is already heavy—particularly for those faculty teaching Gordon Rule courses—without adding on the responsibilities of faculty involvement in governance. For example, each college requires faculty to teach a base load of 15 credit hours each semester (except for the Santa Fe Community College's English faculty, whose base load is 12 credit hours). A faculty member's teaching schedule often includes evening classes, and many faculty teach supplemental classes and online classes in addition to their base loads. A DBCC faculty member added that the responsibilities of the vocational faculty often precluded them from attending afternoon faculty senate meetings.

Other faculty, particularly at DBCC, are clearly discouraged about faculty governance outcomes at their institutions. Specifically, they are concerned about a lack of attendance at faculty senate meetings because the faculty senate's power is waning compared to that of the planning council. They are also concerned about faculty who are “putting the brakes” on faculty governance involvement: “It's not that they're not active. They're just active doing what they need to do to maintain their particular niche.”

Another discouraging factor is the belief by some of the faculty—specifically at DBCC--that the faculty senate is a “waste of time” because the administration will do what it wants to do and the faculty senate lacks power. One interviewee succinctly

stated: “I have come to the epiphany that, unfortunately, the involvement of faculty in the governance system is a futile exercise.”

Institutional Characteristics Hindering Involvement

Certain institutional characteristics hinder involvement as well. For example, both SFCC’s college senate and DBCC’s faculty senate meet in the afternoons. One SFCC science faculty member mentioned that she often had labs scheduled during the times when the college senate met, precluding her attendance. A former senate president at DBCC added that there was frequently competition for the time previously dedicated to faculty senate meetings:

Over the last couple of years, there seem to be more and more meetings during that period of time, but it [the time for the senate meeting] was set up . . . to allow for faculty not to be tied up in other kinds of academic meetings or college wide committee meetings so that they would be free to attend the faculty senate.

Although DBCC does have a portfolio evaluation system which encourages faculty involvement in the governance of the institution, this incentive is removed when a faculty member has reached the top of a salary range (or professional rank). As one faculty member stated: “I’m not as involved any more because I’ve reached the top of the senior professor level, so I have nothing to do to go any further, so I let other people do all those kinds of things.”

One-third of the interviewees cited another discouraging institutional characteristic—a “top-heavy,” hierarchical administrative structure so that faculty have “the perception that it [involvement in faculty governance] may not matter.” In both colleges, senate decisions are advisory only: “They [the administration] always make the

final decision. It's always advisory what the senate does; it's never mandated what they do." Another faculty member believed that the male-dominated administrative structure in many of Florida's community colleges might be an obstacle for minority and female involvement in faculty governance.

Role of the College President

At SFCC, half of the interviewed faculty cited the support of shared governance by the current college president, Dr. Jackson Sasser. One faculty member stated: "He has always tried to keep faculty involved, our entire campus involved, asked for our opinions, advice, and feedback and information." Another faculty member stated the role of Dr. Larry Tyree, one of SFCC's previous presidents: "He asked for input, he took it to heart, and he listened to us, and he. . . made us all believe in such a thing as shared governance."

The current SFCC president also intervened in several instances to resolve faculty concerns at the college senate. One of these issues involved hiring procedures for faculty. When the president learned about a conflict in the procedures for the search and screening of faculty, he intervened at senate and helped resolve the issue. This resolution resulted in changes in the wording of the hiring procedures. After these wording changes occurred, the revised documents were sent to the senate for review. Just after Dr. Sasser arrived at SFCC, he became involved in a controversy regarding one of the college's art exhibits. Because of the controversial nature of the exhibit, the president was under pressure from some of the major donors to the college and from other members of the community. However, as one faculty member stated it, President Sasser stepped into the fire and supported academic freedom and the art exhibit's presence on campus.

According to one faculty member, “The faculty was greatly surprised not because we knew him and thought he wouldn’t support us, but because we didn’t know him and we just assumed that he wouldn’t, that he wouldn’t stand up.” Because of the president’s active involvement on campus, one faculty member said: “I definitely feel that I’m more informed about the campus.”

At DBCC, President Kent Sharples has instituted the planning council as a form of participatory governance. He has also held a president’s forum for all employees to attend and interact with the president. According to one of the DBCC faculty, with Dr. Sharples, “everything is about relationships.” However, some faculty were concerned about president-driven decision-making and the “illusion of inclusion” in participatory governance. One DBCC faculty member gave the example of the healthcare plan recently presented at the faculty senate by a task force outside the confines of the senate. At the senate meeting, none of the task force members were identified, and though the task force supposedly included faculty members, no faculty member made a presentation on the proposed plan. This faculty member’s perception was that the plan “was just done to us It wasn’t open for discussion. It was just done.”

Clearly, the faculty who were interviewed on both campuses believe that the president sets the tone for faculty input into institutional decision-making. Furthermore, the senate’s effectiveness depends in large part on the relevance the president assigns to faculty involvement in institutional governance. The faculty interviewed recognize that faculty senates and college senates are advisory only. As one faculty member stated, “I think we’re [faculty and administration] still not trusting each other very well.”

Role of the Faculty Senate President

The SFCC college senate president, Ward Scott, chairs the college senate and appoints the senate committees. As the spokesperson for the senate at the president's cabinet and president's executive council, he "has been very instrumental in making the college senate play a greater role in the life of the campus." The college senate president is also president of a statewide organization, the Community College Faculty Coalition of Florida, and has been active in promoting a community college faculty voice at a state level. SFCC faculty view him as actively engaged in the decision-making processes of the college. One of the members of the college senate stated: "Our president has been very proactive in making sure that as much information about whatever decisions that he has insight into somehow come to the senate."

The DBCC faculty senate president just left her position. Her responsibilities were to attend constituency meetings called by the president, to solicit faculty involvement in the senate, and to establish channels of communication to the administration by establishing committees parallel to those in the college planning council—what one faculty member called "a tough road." She chaired the faculty senate meetings and set the agenda. The DBCC faculty senate president asked to be a part of the president's cabinet, but this request was declined. Reportedly, the president indicated his worry about setting precedence for future faculty senate presidents. A former faculty senate president at DBCC stated: "Being faculty senate president. . . was. . . not something that would. . . be considered important." Another former DBCC faculty senate president added that the president's not allowing the faculty senate president to sit on the cabinet "spoke volumes as to how faculty were perceived. We were perceived as

outsiders. . . as people who would just rob the decision-making process if we were able to listen to what was said, let alone actually have input into what was being said.”

Just as the college president sets the tone for faculty governance, the faculty’s confidence in their senate leaders affects their willingness to involve themselves in governance activities. One faculty member expressed her confidence this way: “There have been some faculty senate leaders that I thought really cared about what was going on at DBCC and cared about faculty senate having a voice, and so I think that when leaders like that have been in office, I’ve been more involved in the process.”

The Senate and the Board of Trustees

The faculty at both colleges receive notice of board of trustees meetings. Furthermore, there was some confusion among the interviewed faculty about whether the senate president attended the board meetings or regularly appeared on the agenda. Two of the faculty had no knowledge of the faculty senate president’s attendance at the board of trustees meeting or his or her place on the agenda. Three faculty believed that the faculty senate president was present at the board meetings but was not on the agenda. One faculty member was sure that the faculty senate president was on the board agenda, but added, “I doubt that anything controversial, or. . . not in unison would be spoken of there.” Another faculty member incorrectly believed that the senate president was a member of the board of trustees.

Interestingly, five of the interviewees reported that faculty were not encouraged to talk to individual board of trustees members. One faculty member, a counselor at her institution, said: “In all the leadership training I’ve gone to, they’ve said that it’s not our role to interact with the board of trustees.” When I asked a former faculty senate

president if the board had ever asked him what faculty thought about an issue, he replied, “I cannot imagine it happening at this institution.”

Assimilation of New Faculty into Faculty Governance

With so many faculty retiring in the next few years as part of Florida’s Deferred Option Retirement Plan, many new faculty will be entering the community college. Part of the governance responsibilities of the institution is the assimilation of these new faculty into the decision-making processes. Two of the interviewees indicated that they did not know the process for the assimilation of new faculty although they “would like to see something like that.” Another one-third mentioned informal mentoring (through the “grapevine”) as a way of assimilating new faculty. Over half stated that they knew of a college orientation for new faculty that the faculty senate president attended. A few faculty mentioned the importance of the faculty senate leader’s email to new faculty welcoming them and seeking their involvement. Both colleges, then, use both formal and informal structures to assimilate new faculty into the governance activities of the institution.

Ideal Governance Process

When asked to identify the characteristics of an ideal governance process, some faculty envisioned this process as a partnership with administration and faculty having equal voices, footing, and access in an atmosphere of mutual respect and enlivening inquiry—or, as one faculty member described it, not having to beg to get the college president to listen to a concern. The goal is a “healthy tension” between administration and faculty leading to the “best outcome without letting one group dominate.” Several faculty mentioned that this partnership would require more visibility and participation in

governance by faculty so that the senate's work is respected and taken into consideration. Thus, more initiatives would be faculty-driven and would not appear "out of the blue" from the administration. The role of the senate president is also vital in this ideal governance process with the senate president working closely with the college president and presenting faculty concerns to the president's cabinet and other decision-making bodies.

One faculty member argued for an ideal governance process being a "benevolent dictatorship" with the leader actively considering everyone's opinion and then making the decision best for the group from a long-term perspective. This benevolent dictator would use his or her wisdom and take the heat for the decisions that were made. However, other faculty members desired shared governance with the administration actively asking for faculty involvement in institutional decision-making because "it's very hard for people to participate in decisions when they feel that they had no voice making them." Without this involvement, mistrust occurs, and "things are not going to work." In fact, as one faculty member stated: "It takes very, very little to make a good college and to make it run well and to make everybody happy and to do a great job."

Statewide Implications

With the recent change in higher education governance in Florida, the Community College Faculty Coalition lacks its former place on the agenda of the State Board of Community Colleges, which no longer exists. Furthermore, the Presidents' Council, consisting of the presidents of Florida's 28 community colleges, has no faculty representative, and the Coalition is not on the agenda of the Presidents' Council. In fact, when the Faculty Commission of the Florida Association of Community College asked

for representation on the presidents' council, the request was refused. Thus, according to four current or former community college senate presidents, there is "zero outlet" statewide for a report of community college faculty's views. As one faculty member said, "There's been a real backsliding on the statewide level in governance for listening to faculty views."

Summary

As reflected in the data analysis of the survey results, Florida's community college faculty are generally moderately involved in institutional governance activities. As a group, they do not regularly attend faculty governance body meetings, but they do participate on committees and talk to their colleagues about issues related to governance. Many of the survey respondents are less involved in governance than five years ago. Florida's community college faculty agree about what the role of faculty should be in decision-making but are less in agreement about the desired role of their faculty governance bodies or the characteristics of an ideal governance process. According to the survey's results, personal characteristics such as age, and years of experience at the institution do not relate to the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement. However, there is some effect of race on a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement.

Emergent Themes

A careful analysis of the interviews reveals a number of important, recurring themes. These themes, interwoven through the interviews, are echoed in the voices of the interviewed faculty present in the remainder of this chapter. One of these predominant themes is the need for the faculty voice to be heard in institutional decision-making—no

matter what the faculty governance structure is. Not only is the voice of the faculty important, but also the perception that the voice is heard, respected, and trusted by those in a decision-making role. Faculty want to believe that their work in governance is making a difference in the institution.

Another key theme is the need for internal and external communication structures and processes to clarify faculty's opinions on a wide variety of issues and to make these opinions known to the faculty as a whole, the administration, and other bodies such as the board of trustees and the state board of community colleges. Some of the communication is lateral, including communication with other faculty and with department chairs. Upward communication is also critical—for example, communication between the faculty governance leaders and governance participants and decision-makers within the administration.

The voices of the interviewed faculty speak clearly to the importance of what the local senate does and the issues it discusses. Faculty can articulate what has been achieved with the administration and faculty working together toward a desired goal. Furthermore, they recognize the influence that both the faculty senate president and the college president should have as leaders of the institution and as promoters of shared governance.

Another recurring theme is the motivation for the personal involvement of faculty in institutional decision-making—coming out of their offices to do the work of governance. The motivations for involvement are both intrinsic and extrinsic. Many faculty clearly believe such participation is part of their service to the college and

embrace that duty, and some enjoy the social networking. Faculty also look for both the tangible and intangible rewards the college offers faculty who participate in governance.

The concerns of these faculty are also evident. Some fret about the lack of involvement of many faculty in institutional decision-making. They worry that the administration has predetermined plans and so participation in faculty governance is not valued. They wonder about how new faculty will be assimilated into the institution and its governance.

These faculty have visions of an ideal governance process and can articulate their dreams. They believe that faculty should be empowered to make decisions and that faculty will be more likely to abide by decisions that they helped make.

SFCC is an example of a community college where shared governance is a reality. The faculty interviewed at SFCC expressed their confidence in the college's leadership, and the college senate is active, addressing a wide range of issues. The SFCC faculty could describe the decision-making processes and the outcomes of those processes. The senate representatives take their roles seriously and work diligently to keep open the lines of communication.

In contrast, faculty participation in decision-making at DBCC takes place largely in the planning council—the college president's forum for participatory governance. Participation in the faculty senate is waning, and some of DBCC's faculty are not convinced that meaningful shared governance is occurring at their college. Instead, many faculty are discouraged by the displacement of faculty participation from the senate to the planning council and by the college president's refusal to allow the faculty senate president on his cabinet. This discouragement has resulted in the perception that

institutional decisions are often predetermined by the administration and that faculty participation in institutional decision-making is frequently an artificiality—an illusion.

Conclusion

In light of this study's purpose and nine research questions, this chapter presented the results of the data analysis of each survey item following the procedures set forth in Chapter 3. Furthermore, using established qualitative analysis techniques, I explored the interviews of 12 of Florida's full-time community college faculty at two institutions. The purpose of using both quantitative and qualitative analysis was to enhance the study's findings, conclusions, and implications.

Chapter 5

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Implications for Theory, Practice, and Research

This study's purpose was to investigate the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance activities. Furthermore, this study examined Florida's full-time community college faculty's perceptions of the faculty governance body's role in institutional decision-making as well as the characteristics of an ideal governance process. This study also explored the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement in governance activities and his or her perceptions of the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance. Other topics for investigation included the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her gender, race, age, and years of employment at the institution. Certain factors within the college's environment that encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance were also probed.

For purposes of this study, a *faculty governance body* was defined as a forum generally composed of elected faculty representatives organized for the purpose of advising the administration regarding policies affecting faculty. A *faculty governance body* was also called a *faculty advisory body*. The terms *faculty governance body* or *faculty advisory body* did not refer to a collective bargaining unit.

Method Summary

I distributed a 25-item survey developed by Miller and Vacik (1998). The survey included an introduction detailing the purpose of the study, demographic questions, and questions related to the faculty member's level of involvement in governance activities. The response rate of 11% ($n = 560$) met the a priori power analysis requirements but raised questions about the characteristics of those who did not respond to the survey. An analysis revealed that while whites were overly represented among the survey respondents (as compared to the number of white full-time instructional faculty in *The 2002 Fact Book of the Florida Community College System*), Hispanics and blacks were underrepresented. The percentage of male and female survey respondents was not significantly different from the percentage of males and females in the population (Florida's full-time community college faculty).

Various statistical techniques, including nonrespondent analysis, were used to study the data and analyze the survey results. Following the administration of the survey, I employed purposeful sampling methods to choose twelve faculty at two community colleges for one-hour, tape-recorded interviews. Using inductive methods, I analyzed the interview transcripts and presented the results.

Summary of Findings

Using both quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques, this study explored nine research questions, each of which is presented below with a summary of the findings for each question.

1. What is the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance?

A majority of the survey's respondents (85.34%) reported themselves as either moderately or highly involved in the governance of their institutions. Further evidence of involvement was the fact that approximately one-quarter of the respondents indicated that they had served as a faculty governance body officer within the last three years. Using correlation analysis, I determined a moderately strong relation between a faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her service as a faculty governance officer.

However, a nonrespondent analysis revealed that while only 14.36% of the survey respondents reported themselves as not involved or not much involved in the faculty governance of their institutions, 55% of the nonrespondents were either not involved or not much involved. This study's outcomes, then, were affected both by the large number of moderately involved faculty and the small number of uninvolved faculty who responded to the survey.

Among the interviewees, two of the four faculty who had once served as presidents of their faculty governance bodies reported their current level of involvement as less involved than five years ago (the time of their tenure as president). Seven of the 12 interviewees were currently highly involved in governance activities—more involved than five years ago.

Among survey respondents, attendance at faculty governance body meetings was reported as weak with slightly more than half of the respondents attending less than half of the meetings. This low attendance may be due to the fact that many community college senates are representative. However, at one of the institutions I visited that has a non-representative structure, only about 10% of the full-time faculty attend—and faculty

from that institution reported that the attendance at many of the senate meetings was even less than the 10%.

Survey respondents were actively involved in committee work with over half the respondents attending committee meetings monthly during the fall and spring semesters. Nearly one-third of the respondents had served on four or more committees during the past three years. One-fourth of the interviewees are presently highly involved in committee work. Committee work clearly plays an important role in the governance of community colleges—both within and outside the confines of the senate. At one of the community colleges, Daytona Beach Community College, the primary governance committee is outside the senate—the college’s planning council. The college’s faculty senate, realizing the challenge of this council, has created a parallel system of committees—a testimony to the perceived importance of the role of committees in institutional decision-making. Not surprisingly, the results of a correlation analysis indicated a moderately strong relationship between committee work and a faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement.

Among survey respondents, faculty who chaired or co-chaired committees were more likely to serve on fewer committees, probably because of the amount of work that chairing or co-chairing a committee often involves. Three-fourths of the survey respondents had served on a committee or project resulting in significant outcomes to the college.

Florida’s community college faculty use both formal and informal methods to communicate their concerns to their governance bodies. Several of the interviewees discussed the importance of “water cooler” conversations for informal “bubbling up” of

concerns from faculty to the senates. Faculty also reported discussing faculty concerns at department meetings and with their senate representatives.

Slightly more than half of the survey respondents reported themselves as less involved than five years ago. One-third of the interviewed faculty reported less involvement than five years ago. One faculty member admitted her disaffection with the faculty governance process, believing it to be futility. However, several other faculty who had been uninvolved for many years acknowledged the benefits of faculty participation in institutional decision-making.

In response to research question #1, Florida's community college faculty who responded to the survey are likely to be moderately involved in the institutional governance. Many do not attend faculty governance body meetings regularly, but they do serve on committees. Therefore, service on committees is perhaps a stronger indicator of faculty participation in governance than attendance of faculty governance body meetings.

2. What are faculty members' perceptions of the roles that faculty advisory bodies play in institutional governance?

The survey results, based on the means and standard deviations for survey items 1-25 in section IV., demonstrated that faculty believe "that faculty should convince the administration that the faculty 'voice' is a valuable component in decision-making." This survey item (question #21) had the highest mean of the 25 items. Another survey item (question #22) with the same mean stated: "Faculty must insist on their rights and responsibilities in appropriate governance roles." Faculty also agreed that the issues considered by their faculty governance body were important (question #16) ($M = 3.95$,

$SD = .99$). However, faculty were neutral about whether “faculty committees should work harder to cooperate with the administration” (question #23) ($M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.11$). In general, survey respondents showed agreement on survey items related to the roles of faculty governance bodies in institutional governance.

The faculty who were interviewed supported the survey results. Several of the faculty interviewed mentioned specifically that they had entered faculty governance because they believed that faculty should have a voice in decision-making. The faculty who were interviewed at Daytona Beach Community College clearly desire another voice, the voice of their faculty senate president sitting on the president’s cabinet in an “appropriate governance role,” yet the president has refused to allow the faculty senate president to assume this role. In addition, the faculty who were interviewed had no trouble identifying a total of 15 important issues. Most of the issues related to faculty salaries and benefits although faculty identified a number of issues related to teaching and learning concerns.

Several of the faculty at Santa Fe Community College desired more faculty on committees. Faculty at both colleges pointed to institutional decisions that had been made with faculty and administration working together on committees. Yet there is the concern that the work of a committee may be disregarded and that the outcomes of committees may be predetermined.

3. How do Florida’s full-time community college faculty envision an ideal governance process?

Among the survey questions related to this question, questions 17-20, the question with the highest mean was question #18: “The faculty governance body is utilized as a

conduit through which faculty participation is solicited” ($M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.25$). Faculty did not agree with the other survey items: whether faculty are empowered to question policy decisions (#17), whether faculty governance is involved early in the decision-making process (#19), and whether neutral consultants mediate faculty-administration dealings (#20). However, it is conceivable that survey respondents answered these questions based on their experiences at their institutions even though that section of the survey clearly indicated that the questions were related to the characteristics of an ideal governance process.

None of the faculty interviewed mentioned anything related to question #20 as related to an ideal governance process. In fact, interviewees believed that consensus building and conflict promoted a healthy tension between administration and faculty. Moreover, several faculty stated that an ideal governance process would involve a partnership, with the administration seeking faculty input and respecting faculty-driven initiatives. This respect would include bringing issues to the senate in time for the senate to engage in full discussion of those issues before decisions were made. Faculty further acknowledged that an ideal governance process would require leadership, increased participation by faculty, and all parties listening to each other.

Overall, in response to research questions #2 and #3, Florida’s community college faculty agreed about what the roles of faculty should be in institutional decision-making. However, there was less agreement about the roles their faculty governance bodies play.

4. What is the relation between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional decision-making and his or her perceptions of institutional governance?

The quantitative analysis of this question addressed three null hypotheses. The survey response met the a priori power analysis requirement for each null. A correlation procedure rejected the first null, finding a moderately strong relationship between a faculty member's perceptions of faculty involvement in institutional governance (represented by the overall means for survey items 1-16) and the self-reported level of involvement. A correlation analysis also indicated a weak positive correlation between the scale of involvement for each faculty member and his or her perceptions of institutional governance.

The quantitative analysis for the second null showed similar results, examining the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her perceptions of the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance. Correlation procedures showed a weak positive correlation between the faculty member's self-reported level of involvement and his or her perceptions of the faculty roles in institutional decision-making as well as a weak positive correlation between the faculty member's scale of involvement and those perceptions.

The third null was whether a faculty member's level of involvement was related to his or her perceptions of an ideal governance process. Correlation procedures demonstrated a weak correlation between a faculty member's self-reported involvement level and his or her perceptions of ideal governance and between the faculty member's scale of involvement and those perceptions.

A comparison with the results of the survey by Miller and Vacik (1998) indicated that although Florida's community college faculty understands what the roles of faculty governance bodies should be in institutional governance (research question #2) and, as

shown through the interviews, can articulate this knowledge, they are less in agreement about the characteristics of an ideal governance process (research question #3) and the relation between a faculty member's level of involvement and his or her perceptions of institutional decision-making (research question #4).

Demonstrating this lack of agreement about a faculty member's level of involvement and the perceptions of institutional governance are the interviewed faculty, particularly at DBCC, who are greatly concerned with the lack of participation of faculty in the faculty senate. Some faculty believed that faculty did not attend faculty senate meetings because of other commitments. Other faculty, however, are convinced that the lack of participation is due to the perception that the faculty senate does not matter—perhaps because of its competition with other governance groups such as the planning council.

The answer to research question #4, based on the survey results, is that there is a significant relationship between a faculty member's participation in governance and his or her perceptions of faculty involvement in that process, the desired roles of faculty in institutional governance, and the characteristics of an ideal governance process.

5. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member's level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her gender?

The quantitative analysis showed no significant difference between the female and male faculty members' self-reported levels of involvement in faculty governance. Furthermore, the data analysis revealed no significant difference between the means of the females' scale of involvement and the means of the males' scale of involvement.

Of all the interviewees, only two discussed gender issues and faculty involvement in governance. One faculty member guessed that she was appointed to committees because, in addition to several other factors, she was female. Another faculty member spoke of differences in male and female communication styles and the effect on governance: “We’ve had to communicate at their [the males’] level to help them understand that this is not the way we’re going to communicate, so we’re just going to shut down and not say anything.”

Therefore, according to this study’s analysis, the survey data did not support a relationship between a faculty member’s gender and his or her level of involvement.

6. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her race?

An ANOVA procedure followed by a Tukey Studentized Range (HSD) Test looked for differences in the self-reported level of involvement among four racial groups: black, Hispanic, white, and other. The assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance, and independence of observations were met. The analysis showed differences between the means of Hispanics and blacks and between the means of whites and Hispanics. However, an ANOVA procedure to examine differences in the scale of involvement among the four racial groups did not reveal any significant difference in the means of the different racial groups—perhaps because the variable, scale of involvement, has greater variability than the variable, self-reported level of involvement.

Only one of the interviewed faculty mentioned race as a reason for her involvement on so many governance committees although she mentioned other personal

factors as well: “The bottom line is that people are trying to have a level of diversity in their committees. You know, being an African-American female faculty member . . . I think that’s some of the reason initially. I think over time I’ve proved myself. So that’s not the major concern, but it’s still, it’s a part.”

Therefore, while there may be some relationship between a faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement and his or her race, this difference of effect is not present when analyzing a faculty member’s scale of involvement as it relates to his or her race.

7. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her age?

A correlation analysis showed no significant relation between age and either a faculty member’s self-reported level of involvement or a faculty member’s scale of involvement. Furthermore, no interviewees mentioned the age factor as related to participation in institutional governance activities. Based on this study, there is no apparent link between a faculty member’s level of involvement and his or her age.

8. What is the direction and strength of the relationship between a faculty member’s level of involvement in institutional governance and his or her years of employment at the institution?

A correlation procedure did not show a relationship between a faculty member’s years of experience at the institution and his or her self-reported level of involvement. However, a correlation coefficient did show a weak correlation between the faculty member’s scale of involvement and his or her years of service. This difference may be

accounted for because the scale of involvement is a composite, rather than a single, variable.

Of the faculty who were interviewed, one faculty member had been at the institution for twenty years (seventeen of them as an adjunct) but was only minimally aware of the presence of the senate or the senate's participation in institutional decision-making. Another faculty member, in her first year as a counselor at the college, volunteered to serve as the faculty senate secretary. In sum, there was a wide range of involvement levels among the interviewees and the survey respondents and perhaps a weak relationship to the length of service at the institution.

9. What do faculty members perceive to be the factors within an institution that either encourage or discourage faculty participation in governance?

Qualitative research, rather than quantitative analysis, addressed this question.

Interviewees mentioned factors within the institution that both encouraged and discouraged faculty participation in governance. These factors were both personal and institutional in nature.

Faculty mentioned intrinsic motivation, a desire for leadership opportunities and recognition, a need for social networking, and the personal support of colleagues as reasons for their involvement in faculty governance. Faculty also strongly stated their belief in a faculty voice sharing in institutional governance and their satisfaction with the "good things" occurring at the senate meetings. Institutional factors that encouraged involvement included the expectations of faculty member to provide service to the college, the incentives and rewards for such service, and the use of college resources to

broadcast the meetings. Furthermore, the organizational culture of the college should foster faculty involvement.

Faculty at both colleges felt discouraged from involvement by their work loads and teaching schedules, often preventing them from attending senate meetings. Another discouraging personal factor was the disillusionment of some faculty that work in governance made a difference, resulting in a lack of participation at faculty senate meetings and apathy. Institutional characteristics that hindered active involvement included hierarchical communication structures and the competition between the senate and other governance structures.

Conclusions

Faculty governance in Florida's community colleges has not been a subject of extensive research for the past twenty years. Before this study, the current level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in their institution's governance activities was not known. Also the level of faculty participation of Florida's community college faculty governance bodies in institutional decision-making was undetermined.

A study of governance among Florida's community colleges by Ervin Gatlin (1980) indicated that the level of faculty participation in decision-making was largely informal while faculty desired more formal procedures of governance. Furthermore, Gatlin's study (1980) showed that faculty had the "least participation and satisfaction level in personnel and faculty welfare activities" (p. 103). The unit of analysis for Gatlin's study (1980) was the individual college while the unit of analysis for this study was the individual faculty member.

In the 23 years since Gatlin's study, all but two or three of Florida's community colleges have some formal procedures for faculty involvement in institutional governance, according to the Florida Community College Coalition. Faculty at two colleges, Florida Community College at Jacksonville and Miami Dade Community College, are working to determine the future of faculty governance at their institutions after recent votes to unionize faculty.

This study has shown that among the survey respondents, Florida's full-time community college faculty do participate in the governance of their institutions but often do not regularly attend faculty governance body meetings. They are, however, actively involved in service on committees and are likely to attend committee meetings regularly. They frequently discuss faculty issues in dialogue with other faculty. Only a third of the faculty respondents, however, are more involved in faculty governance than five years ago with more than half reporting themselves as less involved—a troubling trend.

While the faculty survey respondents can identify the roles faculty governance bodies play in institutional governance, they are less in agreement about what characterizes an ideal governance process or what their perceptions are about the desired level of involvement of faculty. Age does not seem to affect faculty involvement in institutional governance although the race of the faculty member may have some effect. The faculty member's years of experience do not seem to have a major effect on the faculty member's level of involvement.

The faculty interviewed for this study believe that the voice of faculty should be heard in institutional decision-making. Although they recognize that the role of faculty governance bodies is advisory, they still consider the issues they discuss important. They

desire that the college's governance structures and processes should allow faculty to disseminate their opinions to all members of the college community. They also want a faculty "voice" at the state level. The interviewed faculty recognize the importance of the organizational culture in fostering faculty participation in governance—particularly the roles of the college president and the senate president. The college president's belief that faculty governance is important is central to the success of faculty governance. These faculty want their senate president to be a member of the highest-level decision-making body at the college.

At Santa Fe Community College, shared governance is a reality appreciated by the faculty interviewed there. This representative structure via a college senate is unusual among Florida's community colleges, but Santa Fe's faculty seem satisfied with the decisions made through shared governance.

At Daytona Beach Community College, faculty participation in the senate, a non-representative structure, is declining, and the college president is creating other governance structures. The majority of the faculty interviewed at Daytona Beach are discouraged about the future of faculty governance at their institution, including the future of their faculty senate.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. One is that minority faculty members are slightly underrepresented in the sample, so that the survey sample is not representative of the population in every aspect. The sample, however, does adequately represent males and females among Florida's full-time community college faculty.

Another limitation is the restriction of the sample to Florida's full-time community college faculty. This limitation means that the results of this study may not be generalized to full-time community college faculty in other states or to part-time community college faculty.

A third limitation is that the purposeful sampling for the interviews resulted in interviews with faculty who, for the most part, were highly involved in governance. Thus, the findings of the interviews may not be generalized to all of Florida's full-time community college faculty.

Perhaps the most important limitation of the study is the survey response rate of 11%. This response rate raises questions of possible survey error, addressed in part by the nonrespondent analysis. The survey response rate also raises questions about the large number of Florida's community college faculty who did not respond to the survey and the generalizability of the study's findings to the target population of all full-time community college faculty in the state of Florida.

Implications for Theory

Organization development researchers such as Ouchi (1981), Yukl (1981), Kanter (1983), Deming (1986), Bolman and Deal (1997), and Harvey and Brown (2001) have argued that participative management and shared decision-making are desirable in organizations. They have asserted that the desire to participate in decision-making is consistent with employees' professional development and success and that the performance of employees will increase with governance structures that fit the organization and its mission. Furthermore, employees who participate in making decisions are more likely to assume responsibility for them.

Reflecting the work of organizational development scholars, community college researchers such as Floyd (1985), Gollattscheck (1985), Birnbaum (1988) examined the processes and structures for decision-making within community colleges. In the 1990's, many community college researchers such as Milosheff (1990), Lovas and Fryer (1991), Twombly and Amey (1994), and Thaxter and Graham (1999) investigated the advantages of participatory management from a human resources perspective. They argued that shared governance enhanced the quality of decision-making processes and fostered satisfaction among community college faculty.

More recently, community college researchers such as Lovas and Fryer (1991), Birnbaum (1991), Miller and Vacik (1998), Barwick (1999), Guffey, Rampp, and Masters (1999), and Pope and Miller (2000) have explored governance from a political framework. These researchers have examined issues of power: who has power over the governance agenda of community colleges; who controls rewards and incentives; who promotes leadership; what are the catalysts for change within the institution. These researchers have discovered that access to decision-making does not equal power because in many community colleges faculty have input into decisions but lack control over the outcomes of these decisions.

Despite the research on institutional effectiveness and organizational development, many community colleges are still hierarchical administrative structures with decisions made at the highest level of authority and in arenas where faculty leaders lack access. Although Alfred (1994) predicted that community college governance was moving from autocratic structures to participatory governance with faculty at the center

of decision-making, governance that is shared between a faculty governance body and an administration appears to be a rarity in Florida's community colleges.

Gilmour (1991) in a study of community colleges found that participation in faculty governance bodies was insufficiently rewarded, that faculty governance bodies lack efficient processes for decision-making, and that more involvement of faculty is needed in institutional governance. Yet Miller (2003) asserted that "the community college has become a fertile testing ground for shared decision-making" (p. 420) although this article offered little evidence to support this statement. This study, an examination of the level of involvement of Florida's community faculty in the governance of their institutions and the implications for decision-making, has added to this body of research. While Florida's community college faculty are moderately involved in institutional governance and can articulate what the role of faculty should be in institutional decision-making, they are less certain about the value of participating in their faculty governance bodies and are concerned about faculty's lack of access to shared governance. According to the results of the survey and the analysis of the interviews, Florida's community college faculty's participation in decision-making stems less from their involvement in faculty governance bodies and more from their participation on committees and the governance practices of their local institutions. Based on the findings of this study and the limited research on community college governance, perhaps future community college research should not only examine the participation of faculty in senates and other formal governance structures but should also focus on other forms of governance—for example, faculty participation on college wide committees, presidents' cabinets, boards of trustees, and state wide community college organizations.

Implications for Practice

The results of this study lead to several implications for decision-making in Florida's community colleges. These include changes to make faculty participation in governance authentic by promoting access to decision-making and improving communication:

1. The administration of Florida's community colleges should create structures that cooperate and collaborate with the faculty governance organization of the institution.
2. The faculty and administration should work together to communicate institutional decisions that have been made through shared governance and to solicit feedback from all constituents regarding those decisions.
3. Faculty should have a voice in the decision-making structures of the institution, including the presence of the faculty senate president at the highest level of decision-making. Organizational development research has clearly shown that employees governed by certain decisions should participate in making those decisions. Also, employees are more likely to commit themselves to the decisions made with their involvement.

Other suggested changes in practice would provide leadership skills and recognition for faculty:

4. The administration and the faculty should provide leadership and mentoring opportunities to strengthen the faculty's ability to make institutional decisions and to deal with consensus building and conflict in decision-making.

5. Faculty and administration should give consideration to the assimilation of new faculty members into the governance activities of their institutions. This consideration should include both structures and processes for this assimilation such as orientations and invitations to visit senate meetings.

Other changes would provide incentives for faculty governance:

6. The administration and faculty should work together to identify both the intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for participating actively in faculty governance.
7. The administration and faculty should encourage attendance at senate meetings and should examine their faculty governance structures to see if certain characteristics of those structures are hindering faculty participation.

Some changes in practice are necessary to broaden faculty participation in governance:

8. The administration of Florida's community colleges should work toward establishing structures and processes for shared authority or shared governance with faculty. Florida's community colleges should recognize and support the role of the college president and the senate president in setting the tone for shared governance.
9. The administration and faculty should work together to dispel the "illusion of the inclusion" of faculty in institutional decision-making. Administration and faculty should communicate that shared governance is a priority.
10. A faculty representative should be a member of the college's board of trustees.

11. Florida's community college faculty should have a voice at the state level including representation on the Presidents' Council of the Florida Association of Community Colleges.

Implications for Research

The results of this study suggest several areas for future research:

1. a comparison of the faculty governance structures of community colleges to those of four-year colleges and universities;
2. an examination of the structures, processes, and outcomes of faculty involvement in decision-making within community colleges with collective bargaining units compared to those colleges without unionization;
3. an investigation of which faculty governance structure (representative vs. non-representative, college senate as opposed to faculty senate) is most effective in institutional decision-making within community colleges;
4. an inquiry into formal governance structures within community colleges other than faculty senates (committees, presidents' cabinets, boards of trustees);
5. an exploration of faculty representation at a state level in Florida compared to faculty representation in other states;
6. the influence of differences in gender communication styles on faculty involvement in decision-making;
7. the influence of differences in ethnicity on faculty involvement in decision-making.

References

- Alfred, R. L. (1985). Power on the periphery: Faculty and student roles in governance. In W. L. Deegan & J. F. Gollattscheck (Eds.), Ensuring effective governance (pp. 25-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Alfred, R. L. (1994). Research and practice on shared governance and participatory decision-making. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 245-258). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Allen, L. (1991). Implementing shared governance: Models for empowering teachers. Paper presented to the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL. ERIC ED 334 680.
- Allen, L., & Glickman, C.D. (1992). School improvement: The elusive faces of shared governance. NASSP Bulletin, 76, 180-187.
- American Association for Higher Education. (1967). Faculty participation in academic governance. Washington, DC: American Association for Higher Education.
- Barwick, J.T. (1989). Team building: A faculty perspective. Community College Review, 17, 33-39.
- Berry, L. H., Hammons, J. O., & Denny, G. S. (2001, Feb.). Faculty retirement turnover in community colleges: a real or imagined problem? Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 25: 123 – 137.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic organization and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Birnbaum, R. (1991). The latent organizational functions of the academic senate: Why senates do not work but will not go away. In Robert Birnbaum (Ed.), Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making. (pp. 7-25). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, A. M., & Brawer, F. B. (1989). The American community college (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Cohen, J. (1969). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences. New York: Academic Press.

- Community College Faculty Coalition of Florida. (2001, January 26). Constitution.
- Deegan, W. L. (1994). Entrepreneurial management in American community colleges: Theory and practice. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 319-329). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Deegan, W. L. (1985). Toward a new paradigm: Governance in a broader framework. In W. L. Deegan & J. F. Gollattscheck (Eds.), Ensuring effective governance (pp. 73 - 81). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Deming, J. E. (1986). Out of the crisis. Boston: MIT Press.
- Dillman, D. A. (2000). Mail and internet surveys: The tailored design method. New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Eells, W. C. (1931). The junior college. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Evelyn, J. (1998, Aug. 10). Miami-Dade faculty put Padron in the hot seat. Community College Week, 11, 6-12.
- Florida Community College System (2002, Feb.). Putting minds to work: The fact book report for the Florida Community College System. Retrieved July 10, 2002, from http://www.dcc.firn.edu/MIS/fact_book.htm
- Floyd, C. E. (1985). Faculty participation in decision making: Necessity or luxury? ASHE-ERIC Higher education No. 8. Washington, DC: Association for the Study of Higher Education.
- Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction. 6th ed. White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gatlin, G. E. (1980). A comparative study of Florida's public community colleges: Internal governance structures; faculty satisfaction with their roles in decision-making, and their perceptions of collective bargaining. Tallahassee: Florida State University.
- Gilmour, J. (1991). Participative governance bodies in higher education: Report of a national study. In Robert Birnbaum (Ed.), Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making. (pp. 27-39). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gleazer, E. J. (1994). Evolution of junior colleges into community colleges. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 17-27). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

- Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. New York: Academic Press.
- Gollattscheck, J. F. (1985). Developing and maintaining governance. In W. L. Deegan & J. F. Gollattscheck (Eds.), Ensuring effective governance (pp. 83 - 96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guffey, J. S., Rampp, L. C., & Masters, M. (1999, Fall). Barriers and issues for shared governance implementation in academia. The Educational Forum, 64, 14-19.
- Haber, S. (1991). The quest for authority and honor in the American professions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Harvey, D., & Brown, D. R. (2001). An experiential approach to organization development (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kanter, R. (1983). The change masters: Innovation for productivity in the American corporation. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Kaplan, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). The law of higher education (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Koos, L. (1925). The junior college movement. New York: AMS Press.
- Kvale, S. (1996). InterViews. London: Sage.
- Lee, B. A. (1991). Campus leaders and campus senates. In Robert Birnbaum (Ed.), Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making. (pp. 41-61). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. London: Sage Publications.
- Lovas, J. C., & Fryer, T. W. (1991). Leadership in governance : Creating conditions for successful decision making in the community college. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Menges, R. J. (1999). Dilemmas of newly hired faculty. In R. J. Menges, et al. (Eds.) Faculty in new jobs: A guide to settling in, becoming established, and building institutional support. (pp. 19-38). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Miller, M. T. (2003). The status of faculty senates in community colleges. Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 27, 419-428.
- Miller, M. T., & Vacik, S. M. (1998, Oct./Nov.). Community college faculty involvement in institutional governance. Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 22, 645-655. Retrieved May 28, 2002, from EBSCO database.

- Milliron, M. (2002, April 12). Webcast. St. Petersburg College.
- Milosheff, E. (1990, Summer). Factors contributing to job satisfaction at the community college. Community College Review, 18, 12-33.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). The structuring of organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Myran, G., and Howdyshell, L. (1994). Strategic management of community colleges in a dynamic environment. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 589 - 602). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- O'Hara, L. (1990). Faculty self-esteem: The 4th governance paradigm. Community/Junior College Quarterly, 14, 149-154. Retrieved July 10, 2002, from EBSCO database.
- Ouchi, W.G. (1981). Theory z. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research and evaluation methods (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Peterson, M. W., & Dill, D. D. (1997). Understanding the competitive environment of the postsecondary knowledge industry. In Marvin W. Peterson, et al. (Eds.), Planning and management for a changing environment. (pp. 3-29). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Pfeffer, J. (1992). Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations. Boston: Harvard Business School Press, 1992.
- Pope, M., & Miller, M. (2000, Sept.) Community college faculty governance leaders: Results of a national survey. Community College Journal of Research & Practice, 24, 627-739. Retrieved April 6, 2001, from EBSCO database.
- Ratcliff, J. (1994). Seven streams in the historical development of the modern American community college. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 3-16). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Richardson, R.C. (1973, April). Governance and change in the community-junior colleges. Journal of Higher Education, 44, 299-308. Retrieved April 22, 2002, from JSTOR database.
- Rost, J. C. (1993). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger.

- Schaefer, D., & Dillman, D.A. (1998). Development of a standard e-mail methodology: Results of an experiment. Public Opinion Quarterly, *62*, 378-397.
- Schein, E. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- SISA. Simple statistical interactive analysis. (n.d.). Retrieved October 26, 2002, from <http://home.clara.net/sisa/bonhlp.htm>
- Thaxter, L., & Graham, S. (1999, Nov.-Dec.). Community college faculty involvement in decision-making. Community College Journal of Research and Practice, *23*, 655-675. Retrieved April 6, 2001, from EBSCO database.
- Tierney, W. G. (1991). Symbolism and presidential perceptions of leadership. In Marvin W. Peterson (Ed.), Organization and governance in higher education (4th ed.). (pp. 432-440). Needham Heights, MA: Ginn Press.
- Tierney, W. G., & Bensimon, E. M. (1996). Promotion and tenure: Community and socialization in academe. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Townsend, B. K., & LaPaglia, N. (2000, Summer). Are we marginalized within academe? Perceptions of two-year college faculty. Community College Review, *28*, 41-49. Retrieved July 10, 2002, from EBSCO database.
- Twombly, S. B., & Amey, M. J. (1994). Leadership skills for participative governance. In George A. Baker III (Ed.), A handbook on the community college in America: Its history, mission, and management (pp. 268-283). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
- Vehovar, V., et al. (2002). Nonresponse in web surveys. In Robert M. Groves, et al. (Eds.), Survey nonresponse. (pp. 229-242). New York: Wiley & Sons.
- Weber, M. (1947). The theory of social and economic organization. (T. Parsons, Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Wheatley, M. J. (1999). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Yamada, M. M. (1991). Joint big decision committees and university governance. In Robert Birnbaum (Ed.), Faculty in governance: The role of senates and joint committees in academic decision making. (pp. 79-95). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Yukl, G. A. (1981). Leadership in organizations. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendices

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

I. The purpose of this research is to explore the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance. This study is also investigating the relationship between the level of a faculty member's involvement and his or her gender, age, race, and years of service at the institution. For the purposes of this study, faculty governance body is defined as a forum generally composed of elected faculty representatives organized for the purpose of advising the administration regarding policies affecting faculty. This body is not a collective bargaining unit.

II. Please complete the following demographic information:

Gender _____

Date of birth _____

Race _____ (Black, Hispanic, White, Asian, American Indian, Biracial/Multiracial)

Academic discipline _____

Years of service at the institution _____

Are you planning to retire from your position within the next five years? Yes _____

No _____

III. Level of Involvement in Faculty Governance

1. Have you served as an officer of a faculty governance body (either a campus or college-wide position) within the last three years? Yes _____ No _____

2. How many campus and/or college-wide meetings of your faculty governance body do you attend?

Appendix A (Continued)

- All or almost all
- More than half
- About half
- Less than half
- None or almost none

3. How many campus-wide or college-wide committees have you served on within the past three years? None _____ One _____ Two _____ Three _____ Four or more _____

4. Were you chair or co-chair of any of these committees? Yes _____ No _____

5. If the answer to question #3 is one or more, how frequently did you attend committee meetings during the academic year (excluding summers)?

- At least once a month
- At least twice during each semester
- Less than twice during the academic year

6. If the answer to question #3 is one or more, have you served on a project or committee with a defined role that resulted in significant outcomes or recommendations to the college? Yes _____ No _____

7. How often do you engage in dialogue (e.g., conversation, electronic bulletin boards) with other faculty regarding faculty issues in institutional decision-making?

- Weekly
- Monthly

Appendix A (Continued)

- Twice a semester
 - Never
8. How would you rate your level of involvement in the governance of your institution?
- Highly involved
 - Moderately involved
 - Not much involved
 - Not involved
9. Compared to five years ago, are you more involved in faculty governance activities, less involved, or involved about the same? More involved _____ Less involved _____ Same level of involvement _____ Not applicable _____

IV. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your faculty governance body. Circle one response for each item using the following scale:

SD = Strongly Disagree, D = Disagree, N = Neutral, A = Agree, SA = Strongly Agree, DK = Don't Know

1. Our faculty governance body adequately represents the faculty point of view. SD D N A SA DK
2. Our faculty governance body is well represented on committees making decisions on policy, planning, and allocation of resources. SD D N A SA DK

Appendix A (Continued)

3. Faculty members are adequately rewarded for their participation in the governance process.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
4. Our faculty governance body operates efficiently.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
5. Our faculty governance body attracts the most capable people as members.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
6. Our faculty governance body's operating budget is adequate.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
7. Communication is good between our faculty governance body and academic administrators.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
8. Communication is good between our governance body and the Board of Trustees.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
9. Faculty governance body members and academic administrators meet regularly.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
10. Faculty governance body representatives and the Board of Trustees meet regularly.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
11. Our faculty governance body is involved in important decisions about the way the institution is run.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK

Appendix A (Continued)

12. Academic administrators' and faculty governance body's expectations regarding the governance body's role are the same.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
13. It is difficult to get people to serve on faculty governance body standing and/or ad-hoc committees.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
14. Management information is readily provided to the faculty governance body concerning issues it considers.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
15. Our faculty governance body leaders are well prepared to assume their positions.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
16. Issues considered by our faculty governance body are important.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
<u>Characteristics of an ideal governance process</u>						
17. Faculty are empowered to question policy decisions through a well-articulated process.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
18. The faculty governance body is utilized as a conduit through which faculty participation is solicited.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
19. Institutional procedures involve faculty governance early in the decision-making process.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK

Appendix A (Continued)

20. Neutral “consultants” are utilized to mediate faculty-administration dealings.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
<u>Role of the faculty in an ideal governance process</u>						
21. Faculty should convince the administration that the faculty “voice” is a valuable component in decision-making.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
22. Faculty must insist on rights and responsibilities in appropriate governance roles (such as curriculum, graduation requirements, etc.).	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
23. Faculty committees should work harder to cooperate with the administration.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
24. Faculty should assist in clarifying roles of administrators so that they know they are to administer policy and not impose their own.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
25. Faculty should be more involved in developing specific outcomes for budgetary expenditures.	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK

Appendix B

Interview Guide/Questions

I. Introduction

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research study. Please be assured that all of your responses will be confidential. I also want to remind you that this interview will be recorded on tape. The purposes of this interview are to explore your involvement as a faculty member in the governance of your institution, to investigate the involvement of your faculty governance body in institutional decision-making, and to discover your ideas about an ideal faculty governance process.

II. Demographics

- A. How many years have you served as a full-time faculty member at this institution?
- B. Are you planning to retire from your position within the next five years?
Yes_____ No_____

III. Level of involvement

- A. How involved are you in the faculty governance activities of your institution?
- B. Would you describe your current level of involvement as greater, less, or about the same as your level of involvement five years ago? If a change has taken place, describe some reasons for this change.
- C. Describe how you first became involved in faculty governance at your institution.

Appendix B (Continued)

- D. What are some of the characteristics of your institution that facilitate and encourage your involvement in faculty governance activities?
- E. What are some of the characteristics of your institution that hinder your involvement in faculty governance?

IV. Communication

- A. Describe some of the opportunities that your faculty governance body has to interact in a decision-making role with members of the administration.
- B. Does your institution encourage your interaction with the Board of Trustees?
- C. Can you recall a time when your faculty governance body effectively represented faculty's concerns on a specific issue to the administration?
- D. Can you recall a time when your faculty governance body did not effectively represent the faculty's concerns to the administration?
- E. In what ways does your institution communicate its expectations to new faculty regarding their participation in faculty governance?

V. Decision-Making

- A. How well is your faculty represented on college-wide committees responsible for making decisions on policy, planning, and budgeting?
- B. Can you give an example of some important institutional decision that was made by your faculty advisory body and administration working together?
- C. What are the most important issues that your faculty governance body discusses? (To interviewer: Listen for issues involving salary and

Appendix B (Continued)

benefits, working conditions, faculty development, institutional budgeting, institutional planning, institutional program policy, academic policy decisions)

- D. Which of these issues do you consider most important? Why?
- E. Which of these issues do you consider least important? Why?
- F. What process does your faculty governance body use to discover faculty opinions about these issues?

VI. Ideal Governance Process

- A. In an ideal governance process, what would be the relationship between the faculty's representative body and the administration?
- B. In an ideal governance process, what issues would be decided by the faculty's representative body and the administration working together?

VII. Concluding Questions

- A. Would you like to add anything to our discussion?
- B. What question should I have asked that I didn't?

Appendix C

Email Cover Letter

Dear Florida Community College Faculty Member:

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The purpose of this research is to determine:

- the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance
- their perceptions of the roles that faculty governance bodies play in institutional decision-making
- the characteristics of an ideal governance process.

Plan of Study

You will be asked, with your informed consent, to provide demographic information and complete a survey about your involvement in institutional governance and your faculty governance body's participation in institutional decision-making. The survey can be completed in 10 minutes or less.

Payment for Participation

You will not receive compensation for participation in this study.

Benefits of Being a Part of this Research Study

Although you will not likely receive a direct benefit from this study, participation may help you to understand your current level of involvement in the governance of your institution as well as the participation of your faculty governance body. Such an

Appendix C (Continued)

understanding may help you improve the processes and structures for decision-making in your institution.

Risks of Being a Part of This Research Study

The research does not anticipate any physical, psychological, and/or social risk for participation in this study. Precautions to minimize these risks include informed consent, voluntary participation, and confidentiality ensured through anonymity.

Confidentiality of Your Records

Your privacy and research records will be kept confidential to the extent of the law. Authorized personnel, employees of the Department of Health and Human Services, and the USF Institutional Board may inspect the records from this research project.

The results of this study may be published. However, the data obtained from you will be combined with that from other people in the publication. The published results will not include your name or any information that would in any way personally identify you.

Responses to the survey will be written to a database and maintained by the principal investigator. Only authorized persons will be granted access to the files.

Survey responses will be reported in the aggregate, not as individual responses.

Volunteering to be Part of this Research Study

Your decision to participate in this research study is completely voluntary. You are free to participate in this research study or to withdraw at any time. If you choose not to participate, or if you withdraw, there will be no penalty.

Appendix C (Continued)

Questions and Contacts

If you have any questions about this research study, contact Martha E. Campbell. 727-712-5703 (work) or campbellm@spjc.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a person who is taking part in a research study, you may contact a member of the Division of Research Compliance of the University of South Florida at 813-974-5638.

I agree to the following:

- I have fully read this informed consent form describing a research project.
- I have had the opportunity to question one of the persons in charge of this research and have received satisfactory answers.
- I understand that I am being asked to participate in research. I understand the risks and benefits, and I freely give my consent to participate in the research project outlined in this form, under the conditions indicated in it.
- I understand that proceeding to the survey will serve in lieu of signing a copy of this informed consent form.
- I understand that I can print out a copy of this consent form for my safekeeping.

To access the survey, click on the following link:

www.spjc.edu/docwebsurvey/MCsurvey.htm

Thank you for participating in this study.

Martha Campbell

Professor, Communications

St. Petersburg College

Appendix D

Online Survey

Online Survey

The purpose of this research is to explore the level of involvement of Florida's full-time community college faculty in institutional governance. This study is also investigating the relationship between the level of a faculty member's involvement and his or her gender, age, race, and years of service at the institution. For the purposes of this study, *faculty governance body* is defined as a forum generally composed of elected faculty representatives organized for the purpose of advising the administration regarding policies affecting faculty. This body is **not** a collective bargaining unit.

Section I Please complete the following demographic information:

Gender	Male <input type="checkbox"/> Female <input type="checkbox"/>
Years of service at the institution	<input type="text"/> (numeric)
Date of birth	Month <input type="text"/> Day <input type="text"/> Year <input type="text"/>
Race	<input type="text"/> - Click Here - <input type="text"/>
Community College	<input type="text"/> - Click Here - <input type="text"/>
Academic discipline	<input type="text"/> - Click Here - <input type="text"/>
Are you planning to retire from your position within the next five years?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>

Section II Level of Involvement in Faculty Governance:

1. Have you served as an officer of a faculty governance body (either a campus or college-wide position) within the last three years? Yes No
2. How many campus and/or college-wide meetings of your faculty governance body do you attend?
 - All or almost all
 - More than half
 - About half
 - Less than half
 - None or almost none

Appendix D (Continued)

- 3.** How many campus-wide or college-wide committees have you served on within the past three years?
- If you've answered None, jump to **4.**
- None
 - One
 - Two
 - Three
 - Four or more

3a. Were you chair or co-chair of any of these committees? Yes No

- 3b.** How frequently did you attend committee meetings during the academic year (excluding summers)?
- At least once a month
 - At least twice during each semester
 - Less than twice during the academic year

3c. Have you served on a project or committee with a defined role that resulted in significant outcomes or recommendations to the college? Yes No

- 4.** How often do you engage in dialogue (e.g., conversation, electronic bulletin boards) with other faculty regarding faculty issues in institutional decision-making?
- Weekly
 - Monthly
 - Twice a semester
 - Never

- 5.** How would you rate your level of involvement in the governance of your institution?
- Highly involved
 - Moderately involved
 - Not much involved
 - Not involved

Appendix D (Continued)

6. Compared to five years ago, are you more involved in faculty governance activities, less involved, or involved about the same?

- More involved
- Less involved
- Same level of involvement
- Not applicable

Section III Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about your faculty governance body. Click one response for each item using the following scale:

Level of agreement

- SD** = Strongly Disagree
- D** = Disagree
- N** = Neutral
- A** = Agree
- SA** = Strongly Agree
- DK** = Don't Know

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
1. Our faculty governance body adequately represents the faculty point of view.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
2. Our faculty governance body is well represented on committees making decisions on policy, planning, and allocation of resources.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
3. Faculty members are adequately rewarded for their participation in the governance process.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4. Our faculty governance body operates efficiently.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
5. Our faculty governance body attracts the most capable people as members.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

Appendix D (Continued)

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
6. Our faculty governance body's operating budget is adequate.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
7. Communication is good between our faculty governance body and academic administrators.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
8. Communication is good between our governance body and the Board of Trustees.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
9. Faculty governance body members and academic administrators meet regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
10. Faculty governance body representatives and the Board of Trustees meet regularly.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
11. Our faculty governance body is involved in important decisions about the way the institution is run.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
12. Academic administrators' and faculty governance body's expectations regarding the governance body's role are the same.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
13. It is difficult to get people to serve on faculty governance body standing and/or ad-hoc committees.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
14. Management information is readily provided to the faculty governance body concerning issues it considers.	<input type="checkbox"/>					
15. Our faculty governance body leaders are well prepared to assume their positions.	<input type="checkbox"/>					

Appendix D (Continued)

	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
16. Issues considered by our faculty governance body are important.	<input type="radio"/>					
17. Faculty are empowered to question policy decisions through a well-articulated process.	<input type="radio"/>					
18. The faculty governance body is utilized as a conduit through which faculty participation is solicited.	<input type="radio"/>					
19. Institutional procedures involve faculty governance early in the decision-making process.	<input type="radio"/>					
20. Neutral “consultants” are utilized to mediate faculty-administration dealings.	<input type="radio"/>					
	SD	D	N	A	SA	DK
21. Faculty should convince the administration that the faculty “voice” is a valuable component in decision-making.	<input type="radio"/>					
22. Faculty must insist on rights and responsibilities in appropriate governance roles (such as curriculum, graduation requirements, etc.).	<input type="radio"/>					
23. Faculty committees should work harder to cooperate with the administration.	<input type="radio"/>					
24. Faculty should assist in clarifying roles of administrators so that they know they are to administer policy and not impose their own.	<input type="radio"/>					
25. Faculty should be more involved in developing specific outcomes for budgetary expenditures.	<input type="radio"/>					

Appendix D (Continued)

Section IV Additional comments are greatly appreciated:



Please be patient while your information is being processed:

About the Author

A South Carolina native, Martha Etheredge Campbell received a bachelor's degree in English from Furman University in 1972 and a master's degree of arts in English from Duke University in 1973. She is entering her thirtieth year of teaching with twenty-eight of those years in the community college teaching English, humanities, and instructional technology. She taught two years at Mountain View College in Dallas, Texas, nine years at DeKalb College in Atlanta, Georgia; and the past seventeen years at St. Petersburg College—Tarpon Springs Campus in Palm Harbor, Florida.

She is the author of two developmental writing textbooks, *Focus: From Sentence to Paragraph* (Prentice Hall, 1999) and *Focus: From Paragraph to Essay 2E* (Prentice Hall, 2000). While in the Ed.D. program at the University of South Florida, she served for three years as the President of the Faculty Governance Organization of St. Petersburg College.