

What's the Impediment?: Structural and Legal Constraints to Shared Governance in the Community College

JOHN S. LEVIN*

The University of Arizona

ABSTRACT

This research examines the legal foundations and bases for shared or co-governance in the community college through an examination of government legislation and institutional collective agreements between colleges and faculty in two countries, Canada and the U.S. This multi-case investigation identifies impediments to shared governance, and concludes that except in one legal jurisdiction, shared governance is either impeded legally or not supported by government legislation.

RÉSUMÉ

Cette recherche examine les bases et fondements légaux pour la codirection ou la direction partagée dans les collèges communautaires à travers une étude de la législation gouvernementale et des accords collectifs institutionnels entre les collèges et les facultés de deux pays: le Canada et les États-Unis. Cette investigation de plusieurs cas identifie les obstacles auxquels la codirection fait face et conclut qu'à l'exception d'une juridiction légale, une codirection soit fait face à des obstacles légaux ou soit n'a pas le soutien de la législation gouvernementale.

* The author acknowledges the assistance of Sue Kater for her persistence with data collection and analysis, and Larry Leslie for his editing advice. The author also acknowledges assistance from the University of Arizona Small Grants Award program. Finally, he is grateful for the comments and suggestions of three anonymous reviewers.

THE PROBLEM

Two parallel conditions have accompanied the development of the community college in both Canada and the United States over that past two decades: the practice of increased hierarchy and managerialism on the one hand (Bryant, 1992; Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Levin, 1995; Raisman, 1990; Seidman, 1985) and the promotion of employee participation in decision-making, on the other hand (Alfred, 1994; Cohen & Brawer, 1996). From one perspective, these conditions appear contradictory; from another perspective, they can be seen as complementary. Recent introductions and promotions of what is referred to as *shared governance*, or equally, *co-governance*, in the community college appear connected to collegiality, and a connection to collegiality suggests possible contradiction with increased hierarchy and managerialism. Yet, shared governance finds its home not in the collegial model of governance but in the political model (Baldrige, Curtis, Ecker, & Riley, 1977). The reasons include the implication of two or more parties, such as administration and faculty, or two systems of authority (Rhoades, 1992), involved in decision-making, as opposed to one unit, the collegium (Baldrige et al., 1977; Goodman, 1962; Hardy, 1996).

Shared governance in the community college is more accurately described as “political” in that there is voluntary exchange of goods, services, and loyalties among self-interested actors (March & Olsen, 1995). College leaders seek to effect organizational responsiveness and effectiveness by altering governance from attention to rules, duties, and tasks — the more bureaucratic and rational approach to governance — to deal-making and collective action. Top-down or autocratic governance and management are castigated, not because they are morally repugnant, but because they are viewed as inefficient, unable to cope with rising external forces and strong internal interests, such as faculty unions (Alfred, 1994; Baker, 1993). Shared governance in community colleges in North America is motivated by advancing corporatism within these institutions, including greater pressure from external forces to compete, to grow, and to survive (Levin, 1998).

There are, however, several impediments to the establishment and functioning of shared governance in the community college. The first and foremost impediment is the legislative framework for the institution and for institutional governance. Second, there are legal agreements, specifically collective bargaining agreements, that bind the institution to certain behaviors. And third, there are a host of moral, practical, and operational factors that may help or hinder the establishment and functioning of shared governance. These include individual behaviors, professional codes and sanctions, and organizational history and culture.

This investigation will examine the first two impediments to shared governance — the legislative framework for institutional governance and the contractual agreements of the institution. The purpose, then, of this research project is to identify the legal foundations and bases for shared or co-governance in the community college through an examination of government legislation and institutional collective agreements between colleges and faculty.

Background

Governance is a widely debated topic in higher education. It is a complex and under-studied issue in the field of higher education research (Bess, 1988); and an area of scholarship and practice where agreement on definitions, preferences, and understanding is unlikely. At the simplest level, governance is seen as decision-making. However, it includes the very structures and processes of institutions, as well as the external bodies that oversee and interact with higher education institutions. Governance is mistaken for administration, and the boundary between the two concepts is often unclear. Governance is both formal and informal, both political and bureaucratic. Sometimes, governance is also equated with leadership, with the workings of governing boards and chief executives. Governance also reflects institutional culture and the institutional context — historical, political, and social. And, governance is both understood and practised differently depending upon the type of institution involved — whether university, four-year or two-year college (Birnbaum, 1988; Corson, 1975; Hardy, 1996; Hardy, 1990; Munitz, 1995; Schuster, Smith, Corak, & Yamada, 1994). Governance has wide

application in higher education, as does the sub-category of governance termed *collegiality*.

While the concept of collegiality is relatively unexplored (Bess, 1988), it is traditionally associated with university governance, and is used for numerous institutional conditions and behaviors, some of which are more appropriately referred to as shared governance. The ideal of collegiality is tied to the view that the university or college is comprised of a community of scholars (Goodman, 1962), with the assumption that decision-making is by consensus, and is performed by professionals who are relatively equal participants given their professional expertise (Hardy, 1990). Closely connected to collegiality is the concept of shared governance or co-governance, which was brought to prominence in 1967 by the American Association of University Professors (1984). That declaration of shared governance explicitly noted the shared responsibility and joint effort involving all major constituencies of the academic community (Birnbaum, 1988). Decision-making authority was the province of a specific group or groups, depending upon the issue under discussion. Faculty were deemed to be responsible for curriculum and instruction, for faculty status, and academic aspects of student life. Thus, in these matters, faculty, not the governing board of the institution, possessed *de facto* authority. Birnbaum critiqued this declaration of shared governance by noting that it ignored the political aspects of institutional life, ignored environmental influences, and assumed that institutional values and goals were shared among the many constituents.

According to Mortimer and McConnell (1978), the emergence of widespread collective bargaining in higher education institutions and its potential impact upon faculty senates in the 1970s gave rise to the concept of *shared authority*. This concept suggested limits upon the scope of shared governance, given the presence of legal agreements such as employer-employee contracts. Whereas formal authority was once the arena of the governing board, and the authority of the faculty through a senate was viewed as functional for Mortimer and McConnell (1978), formal authority now became diffused under union-management collective agreements. The union-senate relationship was judged to be contentious because the union was seen as a primary authority body for

faculty, with the authority of the senate preserved, if at all, by specific inclusion in a contract (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978). *Shared authority* (Mortimer & McConnell, 1978) as a version of shared governance was a tenuous arrangement and one that was proposed, but not necessarily permitted nor practised.

While the ideal of shared governance remains alive in higher education, there is little empirical basis for acknowledging its presence in an institutional setting. Recent scholarship on university collegiality (Hardy, 1996) and university governance (Schuster et al., 1994) tends to ignore the issue of shared governance, with Hardy (1996) promoting the political utility of collegial-decision making through committees and Schuster et al. (1994) extolling the virtues of strategic planning for its ability to bring together the two dominant sides of university life and decision-making — the faculty and the administration.

There is also a conceptual division in the understanding of governance. Rhoades (1992) asserts in his review of governance literature that traditional understandings of governance in higher education have a dualistic theme: professional authority and bureaucratic authority. But according to March and Olsen (1995) both sides of the duality belong to the same framework, which they refer to as an *institutional perspective*. Whether based upon professional or bureaucratic authority, governance from this framework assumes that governance behaviors are normative, organized around tasks, and directed by duty, responsibilities, and rules. Rhoades' review does not address the second framework, the *exchange perspective* suggested by March and Olsen (1995). This conception of governance is consistent with a political understanding of both organizations (Morgan, 1986) and of university governance (Baldrige et al., 1977; Birnbaum, 1988).

In the case of higher education institutional decision-making and implementation, the exchange perspective identifies collective action as behavior based upon coalition-building and exchange among self-interested political actors. This perspective of governance is consistent with the perspective of politics described by Bacharach and Lawler (1980): organizations as politically negotiated orders, neither rational bureaucracies nor organized anarchies (Baldrige et al., 1977; Cohen & March,

1986). From this perspective, shared governance, therefore, provides a means whereby formal groups and coalitions can legitimately both serve self-interest and address conflicts through organizational structures and processes. However, is such an exchange possible, or legal, within the legislative framework for institutions? Furthermore, does legislation permit negotiation of authority in unionized institutions?

Community colleges are places where shared governance is promoted, if not as a virtue of new understandings of institutional leadership (Fryer & Lovas, 1991) then as a necessity to improve productivity, increase morale and stave off faculty union militancy (Alfred, 1994). Despite the nature of the environment, there is little empirical research on shared governance. More specifically, there is neither critical analysis of the governance practices of community colleges nor application of conceptual constructs drawn from higher education scholarship on universities. A reasonable assumption for the community college sector might be that faculty power, whether legally attained or achieved by such other means as expertise, is not as valuable or exchangeable as that found in the university sector where the scholarly literature on governance is derived. If this is the case, then it may be a consequence of the low status position of community colleges, or their image as a bureaucratic institution (Birnbaum, 1988), or indeed the very characteristics of community college faculty (Kempner, 1990).

THE STUDY AND ITS METHODS

The potential or actual acceptance of shared or co-governance by a community college, and even the process and negotiation leading toward shared or co-governance, may mark the beginning of a re-definition of the institution, altering the roles and responsibilities of faculty and administrators alike. Are community colleges engaged in shared governance and to what extent? If they are not so engaged, what are the impediments? Are legislative frameworks and legal agreements conducive to shared or co-governance? More specifically, is it legally possible for community colleges to engage in shared governance? And to what extent does the embrace of shared governance suggest the shift

of governance into a political arena (Mintzberg, 1983), where negotiated orders are the norm? That is, does collective bargaining reflect legislative expectations and conditions for governance arrangements?

The review of literature undertaken included books, book chapters, published journal articles, unpublished essays, position papers and speeches and addresses, confined mainly to the past decade. While the works as a whole reflected awareness of structural problems associated with shared governance (e.g., Hardy, 1996; Schuster et al., 1994), there was no consensus on the root of the problems, the impediments to shared governance being one example (e.g., Nussbaum, 1995; Ramo, 1997). The predominant view promoted administrative or managerial dominance in the face of a hostile or turbulent external environment and forceful market (e.g., Benjamin, 1993; Carver, 1998). Most often the acknowledgement of faculty's significant contributions to the decision-making process was obligatory and overshadowed by the various recommendations, proposals, and simplistic guidelines for re-designing governance (e.g., Fryer & Lovas, 1991; Gerber, 1997; Miller, Vacik, & Benton, 1998). Ironically, numerous writers professed their allegiance to shared decision-making, yet there was a noticeable lack of faculty voice in their citations or even in their recommendations for change (e.g., Benjamin & Carroll, 1998; Greer, 1997). Finally, there was a gap in the literature on empirical investigations that examined the presence or absence of shared governance.

This is a comparative, multiple case study that focuses upon community colleges in distinct legal jurisdictions both in Canada and the U.S., and within those countries. In this investigation, the principal use of document analysis deviates from a traditional case study method suggested by several scholars (Eisenhardt, 1989; Yin, 1984). Sources include both Canadian provincial and U.S. state legislation which refer to the management and governance of community colleges and collective agreements from both Canadian community colleges and U.S. community colleges. Collective agreements are analyzed through the identification of negotiated articles within agreements pertaining to the faculty role in governance, including their role and authority in such areas as curriculum, personnel recruitment, and the budget development and approval

process. Additionally, collective agreements are examined to identify articles on management rights and to determine the extent to which these rights define or limit faculty roles. This research identifies which agreements and legislation indicate the presence of shared governance, which indicate a potential (permissive implications) for shared governance, and which forbid shared governance. This research study also identifies characteristics of governance for each case investigated.

Cases

The study involves eight cases. They are drawn from jurisdictions where there are unionized community colleges: the five states — California, Hawaii, Illinois, Oregon, and Washington — and three provinces — Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario. The majority of cases are from the western states and provinces. Two of the cases are chosen because of their geographical differences from the other cases. I have selected the province of Ontario and two colleges within that province and the state of Illinois and 28 colleges within that state. Both of these jurisdictions permit and have unionized colleges. For purposes of comparison, Ontario and Illinois were chosen as non-western jurisdictions, where community colleges may have developed differently from those in the West. It should be pointed out that in the province of Ontario, a province-wide collective agreement covers all public colleges, and this factor explains the small number of agreements from Ontario relative to Illinois. Although individual agreements exist for each college, and local bargaining of some matters are permissible, the agreements at Ontario colleges are virtually identical.

DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Current legislation (in effect up to June, 1998) from the provinces and states pertaining to the jurisdictions' public community colleges was collected, reviewed, and analyzed, as were collective agreements (in effect in the 1990s and up to June 1998) from colleges in each state and province. The sample of agreements was drawn from several sources. The main U.S. source was The Higher Education Contract Analysis

System (HECAS), a collection of agreements of both National Education Association (NEA) member institutions and other non-NEA bargaining unit agreements. All agreements from this source for the states of California, Oregon, and Washington were reviewed. Additionally, the agreements of several other colleges in these states and the state of Hawaii were collected and reviewed. (Hawaii has a single agreement for all community colleges.) For Canadian jurisdictions, a sample of colleges in both British Columbia and Alberta was selected, and data were collected directly from institutions, then reviewed and analyzed. Additionally, the two agreements from the province of Ontario and twenty-eight agreements from the state of Illinois were collected, reviewed, and analyzed.

To examine the data, I have developed an analytical framework that identifies legal conditions and parameters for governance. For government legislation, the analysis categorizes legislative articles on college governance as: (a) requiring shared or co-governance; (b) being silent on shared or co-governance; or (c) forbidding shared or co-governance. For collective agreements, the analysis categorizes the articles relevant to governance as: (a) joint action; (b) management (board representatives) only; and (c) faculty participation. Where there is no mention of a category in collective agreements, these sections are categorized as "silent". Additionally, each college agreement is categorized as: (a) college management shared; or (b) faculty participation in governance. Where neither of these two categories are indicated, the absence of faculty participation in governance is assumed: there is no formal faculty involvement in decision-making.

THE JURISDICTIONS: DATA AND ANALYSIS

The states of California, Hawaii, Illinois, Oregon, and Washington and the provinces of Alberta, British Columbia, and Ontario constitute the legal jurisdictions examined for this investigation. A summary of the analysis of state and provincial legislative data is contained in Appendix A. The display of data for collective agreements is contained in Appendix B.

California

California has both a state board for community colleges and a local governing board for each community college district. Thirty-six collective agreements between colleges and faculty unions were reviewed and analyzed.

California legislation (California Education Code, California Government Code, Division 7, 70900-88270) provides for a state board of 13 appointed members, two of whom are tenured faculty members of community colleges. The legislation also prescribes a local or district board of five to seven trustees, elected locally, with a provision to permit, if the district approves, one or more students who are non-voting members.

The legislation requires that each governing board of a community college district ensure that faculty, staff, and students be granted the right to participate in college governance, to establish and exercise a process for board consultation with institutional representatives on policy matters, and to establish procedures to ensure that faculty, students, and staff can express their views and participate in college governance. Furthermore, the legislation prescribes that the local board establish procedures to ensure the right of academic senates to have primary responsibility for making recommendations in the areas of curriculum and academic standards.

State legislation thus requires boards of college districts to permit faculty (as well as staff and students) to "participate" in governance, "to express their opinions," to "participate in the development and review of policy proposals" and to make "recommendations" on curriculum and academic standards. In 1990, the state board of governors adopted regulations that required local boards to "consult collegially" with the academic senate at each college. This consultation includes advice on academic and professional matters (Nussbaum, 1995). The legislation makes clear, however, that the governing board of every community college district is the sole and final body authorized to "establish, maintain, operate, and govern one or more community colleges in accordance with law" (Education Code, Section 70902). That is, while there is legislative

language promoting consultation and advice in governance, there is no language requiring consent from another party aside from the governing board, a body that forbids employees as board members. There is no language that requires, permits, or forbids shared governance. Indeed, shared governance is not mentioned. The legislation does permit the governing board to delegate power to any employee or committee provided that delegation is not expressly "made nondelegable by statute". And, as the employer, the governing board may enter into collective bargaining negotiations with employee groups and bargain items not covered by statutes. Where legislation is silent or ambiguous, collective bargaining may clarify the question of the presence or absence of shared governance.

There is wide-variation over roles and responsibilities for governance in the collective agreements of the California community colleges. In the development and approval of an academic calendar, in faculty evaluation, in decisions on sabbatical leaves and tenure, and even in the governance processes of the college, faculty are legally-negotiated participants at numerous colleges (from 11 colleges for governance to 30 colleges for faculty evaluation). In such areas as faculty hiring and budget development, management is the only party responsible in all 36 college agreements. And the overwhelming majority of agreements are silent on harassment, program change, discipline of employees, establishment of new positions (from a low of 29 colleges for the discipline of employees to a high of 35 colleges for harassment). It appears, therefore, that these areas are considered management rights, i.e., the responsibility of management. Joint action, perhaps the most proximate formal term to shared governance, is noted in collective agreements only in grievance procedures, principally those related to grievance arbitration, a process involving both parties equally.

Of the thirty-six agreements, fourteen make specific reference to faculty involvement in governance. In three colleges (Gavilan, Lake Tahoe, and Santa Monica), participation in governance is deemed an aspect of faculty evaluation. In a fourth college (College of the Redwoods), sabbatical leave applications are based in part upon service to the college, including participation in governance.

Hawaii

The University of Hawaii board of regents is responsible for all public higher education in the state, including community colleges. State legislation thus pertains to the University of Hawaii and its community colleges. All community colleges, as well as the University of Hawaii and its campuses, are covered by a single collective agreement between the faculty and the University of Hawaii. This collective agreement was reviewed and analyzed in the context of the present study.

Hawaii legislation (Hawaii Revised Statutes HRS, Chapter 304, 305, 1964; HRS 305, 1993) provides for an eleven-member board of regents of the University of Hawaii, who shall be appointed and may be removed by the governor. This board has authority to establish and govern community colleges, with the same powers for community colleges as it has for the university. These powers include management and control over the general affairs and exclusive jurisdiction over the internal organization and management of both university and community colleges.

The legislated language is unequivocal. The board's powers are unfettered by any internal organization, body, or person constituting the university or community colleges. Thus, the legislation implicitly forbids sharing power or authority. There is no mention of a faculty role in governance. Indeed, the document states that "faculty of the university shall be under the direction of a president who shall be appointed by the board of regents" (pp. 304-311).

Together with the University of Hawaii, all community colleges are parties to a single collective agreement between the faculty and the university. The collective agreement specifies limited faculty involvement and no faculty authority in institutional decisions. Faculty participation in promotion and tenure takes three forms: (a) a committee that makes recommendations to the provost; (b) a review panel of promotion, appointed by the president and accountable to the president; and (c) an advisory committee with administrators on matters of discipline. The faculty union is involved in layoff, in that it can act in a consultative capacity. On other matters, such as curriculum, faculty hiring, and professional development, the collective agreement is silent, a fact which

signals management rights. The only joint action noted occurs in the grievance procedures leading to binding arbitration in the case of a dispute between the union and the university. There is no mention of governance in relation to faculty in the Hawaii collective agreement.

Illinois

Illinois has both a state board for community colleges and local governing boards for each local jurisdiction, or district. This study entailed review and analysis of twenty-eight separate collective agreements.

Illinois legislation (Illinois Public Community College Act, Chapter 110, 1996) provides for a state board of 12 members, including 11 members appointed by the governor and one non-voting student, selected by a student advisory committee. District boards are elected in a general election, to consist of seven members and one student non-voting member, who is elected in a campus referendum.

The state board has powers and duties for state-wide co-ordination, for establishing and maintaining state-wide standards, and for approving and discontinuing programs. It has a planning and policy role, as well as a role to oversee district budgets, which includes an ability to implement its emergency powers "to approve and require revisions of the district's budgets" (805, 2-15, 3).

The duties of the district board are numerous, including the appointment of a chief administrative officer, administrative personnel and all teachers. The district board has power over employment of personnel, including matters related to tenure, policies about employment and dismissal, and compensation (805, 13-42). The board also has power over the establishment of new units.

While the legislation states the general powers of the board, including its permissive right "...to exercise all other powers not inconsistent with the Act, that may be requisite or proper for the maintenance, operation and development of any college or colleges under the jurisdiction of the board" (805/3-30), it is silent on the matter of a faculty role in governance. Indeed, the legislation omits the use of the words "govern" or "governance". The district board, for example, has the power to establish tenure policies for employment of teachers and administrative personnel, but the

development of policy, the implementation of policy and the role of faculty in the process is neither stated nor implied. Conceivably, a tenure policy could leave a tenure decision in the hands of a faculty committee.

With respect to a faculty role in governance, collective agreements reflect some variation among the institutions and within the categories where a faculty role might be expected. Faculty participation in college decisions are most prominent in sabbatical leaves (18 of 28 agreements), development and establishment of an academic calendar (17/28), and evaluation of faculty (12/28). Again, only in the grievance process is there joint action (27/28), with one collective agreement silent on the faculty role. Nine (9) institutions have agreed upon specific areas outside of the traditional categories of curriculum, sabbatical leaves, evaluation, and the like where faculty have an advisory role: for example, faculty participation on a recommending committee on enrollment management (City Colleges of Chicago), participation on a recommending committee on the use of part-time faculty (Illinois Central College), and participation on a planning committee for building alterations (McHenry County College).

However, faculty participation is limited in curriculum decisions, where management has sole authority in five institutions and faculty participation is agreed to in six institutions. As far as faculty hiring is concerned, seven institutions agree to faculty participation, whereas in ten institutions, management holds sole responsibility for hiring.

Collective agreements in Illinois colleges are consistent on one matter: the faculty role in governance is advisory. These agreements are not consistent, however, in their position on faculty participation in governance. There is wide variation among the colleges in the areas where faculty participation in governance and decision-making is permissible. Three of the colleges have specific articles that refer to governance: at Spoon River Community College, there is indication of a governance structure where the internal community may come together to participate in the governance system. At McHenry County College, reference is made to a shared responsibility of faculty and administration for academic policies. And at Triton College, there is the lone reference, among all of the state's colleges, to "the shared governance process".

Oregon

Oregon legislation (Oregon Revised Statutes, 1997, Chapter 326) provides for a State Board of Education for public elementary and secondary schools, as well as community colleges. The Board has seven members, appointed by the governor, with none of its members permitted to hold a teaching or administrative position in any public school. Legislation (Oregon Revised Statutes, 1995, Chapter 341) provides for both the co-ordinating authority of the State Board of Education and the policy-making function of a governing board for each community college district.

The governing board of a district has seven members who are elected within a district, with none of its members permitted to be an employee of a district community college. The governing board has both managerial and governing authority, including the hiring of all personnel, the prescribing of educational programs, the enactment of governance rules, and the general supervision of all district community colleges.

There is no specific reference within the legislation to a role for faculty in governance, either at a state or district, institutional level. The legislation is silent on both shared or participatory governance. The district board has powers to “enact rules for the government of community colleges”, and in both explicit and implicit terms, a faculty role in governance is neither prescribed nor forbidden.

Eleven collective agreements were reviewed and analyzed. Collective agreements indicate that faculty participation in decision-making is required in numerous areas for several colleges, and in some cases a majority of the colleges. Except for the grievance procedures, however, no collective agreement specifies joint action. Nonetheless, in two colleges’ agreements (Linn-Benton and Mount Hood), there is specific reference to a faculty role in governance. In the Linn-Benton agreement, faculty inclusion “in decision-making processes that affect work-related issues” is part of the agreement’s preamble, and in the Mount Hood Community College agreement, there is reference to faculty participation in committee structures. Additionally, at Southwestern Oregon Community College, the collective agreement refers to a faculty senate, suggesting that this body is part of college governance.

In seven of fourteen, or 50%, of the agreements, faculty participation is stipulated in the areas of curricular change, evaluation, and layoff. In six of the fourteen agreements, faculty participation is stipulated in processes related to faculty hiring, professional development, and sabbatical leaves. The appearance of these articles indicates that faculty participation, while not universal in all aspects of decision-making, is contractually required at several Oregon colleges in a number of specific areas.

In general, faculty participation in decision-making is relatively limited to specific areas. Given the silence of numerous articles in collective agreements on particular issues and given the lack of specificity in state legislation on a faculty role in governance, however, there is potential for an enlarged faculty role in governance. Nonetheless, legislation does not encourage faculty participation. Exclusion of employees from serving on elected governing boards is a case in point. Moreover, neither collective agreements nor legislation engage in any contemplation of shared governance.

Washington

Washington legislation formalizes a state-wide co-ordinating board for higher education (RCW, Chapter 28B.80), a college board for community and technical colleges (WAC 131), and district boards of trustees (RCW, Chapter 28B.50). The Higher Education Co-ordinating board has nine members who are appointed by the governor. Its duties are broad and directed to policy, including developing and establishing a role and a mission statement for the community and technical college system, identifying the state's higher education goals, and preparing a comprehensive higher education master plan for the state. There is no apparent role for faculty except in advisory committees.

The Board for Community and Technical Colleges has nine members, appointed by the governor. Its powers include general supervision and control over the state's system of community and technical colleges. Responsibilities include budgetary oversight, system planning, establishment of minimum standards for such matters as curriculum content, admissions, qualifications of instruction and administrative personnel

and internal budgeting. At this level of governance, legislation is silent on a role for faculty, even in an advisory role.

The board of trustees of each community college district is appointed by the governor, and its five members may not include an employee of the community and technical college system. However, in determining college curricula and programs, the board is required to obtain "the assistance of the faculty". In addition, the legislation that directs a college governing board notes that in matters of tenure for faculty, a review committee shall make recommendations on decisions toward awarding tenure. This review committee, comprised of administrative staff, one student, and teaching faculty must have teaching faculty as its majority membership (RCW 28B.50.852). Other than these two exceptions, the legislation is silent on the faculty role in governance and decision-making. These two cases clearly identify an advisory (i.e., assisting and recommending) role for faculty.

Nineteen collective agreements were reviewed and analyzed. The agreements show considerable consistency, with several exceptions across the state. All 19 collective agreements require joint action by faculty and the management in the grievance process; all but one requires specific faculty participation in tenure decisions (one college is silent on tenure). Faculty participation is stipulated for discipline of faculty (17/19), layoff of faculty (17/19), academic calendar (14/19), faculty hiring (13/19), and faculty professional development (13/19). The following special cases are noteworthy: joint participation of faculty in the establishment of academic standards occurs at Edmonds Community College; there are joint faculty and administrative committees to review the agreement and to recommend resolution of associated problems at Pierce Community College, Skagit Valley Community College, and Tacoma Community College; Highline and Seattle stipulate joint action on curriculum matters; and a memorandum of understanding at Everett Community College stipulates an open discussion between the parties about governance.

Nine of the 19 agreements make reference to faculty participation in governance. Bellevue Community College, for example, notes that "administrative structures shall provide for faculty involvement and

participation in institutional affairs". Clark College notes that the college "subscribes to and practices collegiality". Highline Community College refers to "areas of shared decision making", noting change in grading policy or degree requirements, and also noting that faculty have responsibility "to participate in governance". These latter examples suggest that the distinction between participating in governance as well as decision-making on the one hand, and sharing in decision-making on the other hand is not clear.

Alberta

Provincial legislation covers both public colleges and vocational colleges. Both sectors have individual governing boards for individual institutions. There is no provincial governing board. Collective agreements of three colleges were reviewed and analyzed.

Membership on college boards includes one academic staff member (i.e., faculty), one student, and one non-academic staff (i.e., support staff), initially nominated by an appropriate peer body, and all appointed by the Minister (of Advanced Education and Career Development). In addition, seven members are appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, and the college president is also a board member (Colleges Act, 1997).

The board's powers and duties are broad, including the provision of courses and programs, establishment of admissions requirements for students, and the power to manage and control a college and its property, revenue, business, and affairs (Colleges Act 9.1). The board is also legislated to appoint college officers and employees, including the college president.

The legislation provides for an academic council, comprised of administrators, academic staff, students, and five additional board-appointed members to "make recommendations or reports to the college board respecting any matter that the college board refers to the academic council, including academic policy..." (25,1) and "any other matter the academic council considers advisable". With no less than one-third, and as much as 40% of the academic council's membership consisting of academic staff, the act suggests a clear, advisory role for faculty in governance. Since faculty are not a majority on this council, they cannot dominate decision-making. Nonetheless, the administrative staff or

management has a minority membership on the council, and thus management cannot dominate decision-making in this recommending body.

The three collective agreements were relatively consistent on the faculty role in items dealing with governance, with only Grant MacEwan Community College specifying a faculty role in governance through academic council. Grant MacEwan's agreement specifically notes that the college endorses participation in decision-making. All three colleges require faculty participation in faculty hiring and faculty professional development decisions. Grant MacEwan Community College and Mount Royal College require faculty participation in tenure and sabbatical leave decisions. Grant MacEwan and Lethbridge Community College require faculty participation in the establishment of an academic calendar. Lethbridge requires faculty participation in faculty evaluation. All three colleges require faculty participation in the grievance process. None of the colleges has contractual language on a faculty role in curriculum or on program change. Such language is also absent from matters relating to budget development, harassment, management hirings, and the establishment of new faculty positions.

With both legislation encouraging faculty participation through the academic council and the presence of several articles in collective agreements that require faculty participation, there is evidence of a faculty role in governance and decision-making. This role, however, is advisory in the legislation and participatory in college agreements. Only in grievance proceedings are there legal grounds for joint action or shared governance.

British Columbia

Provincial legislation covers both colleges and provincial institutes. Both sectors have individual governing boards for individual institutions. There is no provincial governing board. Four collective agreements from four colleges were reviewed and analyzed (one of the colleges separates vocational and non-vocational faculty, and thus has more than one collective agreement for faculty; another college has a single agreement for both faculty and support staff).

For college governing boards, legislation (College and Institute Act, 1989; College and Institute Amendment Act, 1994) provides for eight or

more members appointed by the Lt. Governor, one elected faculty member, two elected students, one elected support staff member, the college president and the chair of the education council. Neither the college president nor the chair of the education council has a vote on the board. The powers and duties of the board include the management, administration and direction of the college, decisions on courses or programs to be offered or canceled, and appointment of a president or chief executive officer for the institution.

The Act stipulates the establishment of an education council, comprised of 20 voting members, with the president as a non-voting member, and permission for the board to appoint a non-voting member. The education council has an advisory role on numerous matters and a decision-making role on several matters. There is also a requirement for the educational council to advise the board, and a requirement for the governing board to seek the advice of the educational council. In a small number of matters, the education council has joint authority, with the board.

The composition of the education council, especially its voting members, suggests equal representation for faculty. Of 20 voting members, ten are faculty, four students, four educational administrators, and two support staff. The council has an advisory role on educational policy (e.g., policies on faculty qualifications, college mission statements and educational goals). Furthermore, the council has powers to set policies on student examinations and evaluations, to set academic standards, and to set curriculum content for courses, all powers being conditional on their alignment with the government minister's policies or directives for post-secondary education or training in the province. Finally, in some specific cases and in whatever cases the board indicates and the board and the education council agree, the council and the board have joint authority, "joint approval". The specific cases pertain to evaluation of curriculum to determine equivalency of courses, programs or course credit, either within the institution or between other institutions and the college.

The legislation entails clearly defined roles for faculty, not just in participating in institutional governance but in sharing authority in several domains in institutional governance. Although faculty do not act

alone as a body, they do constitute the majority group on education council and they have representation on the board.

Collective agreements in British Columbia have a clearly identified role for faculty to participate in institutional decision-making. In the four collective agreements reviewed, faculty have a participatory role in faculty evaluation, layoff, and management hirings in all four agreements, and in faculty discipline, faculty hiring, harassment, and professional development in three of the four agreements. At Capilano College, faculty and management are jointly responsible for workload review. At Malaspina University-College, faculty and management are jointly responsible for determination of scholarly activity. Joint action on grievances, however, is the only area where shared authority is recognized.

In British Columbia, not only collective agreements, but also legislation, recognize a considerable role for faculty participating in institutional decision-making. Moreover, legislation, and especially the legislated role of education council, unequivocally specifies a role for faculty in governance. In specific cases, this role is shared with the board, and in others, it represents the preeminent authority in the institution.

Ontario

Ontario has a provincial governing board for colleges — the Council of Regents — and local governing boards for each of the province's colleges. Collective bargaining occurs within a provincial structure for all colleges. Collective agreements from two colleges were reviewed and analyzed.

Ontario legislation (Ministry of Colleges and Universities Act R.S.O. 1990, Chap. M19: Regulation 770) provides for a Council of Regents and local boards of governors. The Council of Regents advises and assists the Minister in “the planning, establishment and co-ordination of programs of instruction and service for...colleges” in the province. The Council also has “the exclusive responsibility for all negotiations on behalf of employers”, that is boards of governors of colleges (Colleges Collective Bargaining Act, Ch. 15, September 1992). The Council's members are appointed by the Lt. Governor, and include a chair and up to 17 members.

The board of governors for each college has powers over all personnel matters such as appointment and removal, except that actions directed at a college president are subject to the approval of the Minister. The board is also directed to appoint advisory committees for each instructional program and to establish a college council "through which college staff and students may provide advice to the president of the college." The members of the board include 12 members appointed by the Council of Regents, none of whom "shall be a full-time employee or a spouse of a full-time employee of a college" and the president of the college. Furthermore, the legislation permits board membership for one student, one academic staff member, one administrative staff member, and one support staff member, all elected. These members may not serve as either chair or vice-chair of the board.

The role of faculty on the board is limited to one member, out of a potential total of 17, and the role of the faculty on a college council is advisory. The legislation indicates that the powers of the governing board are limited, with the Council of Regents retaining some powers traditionally held by boards, such as responsibility for collective bargaining. The Minister retains numerous powers, including approval of college programs, prescription of students' admission requirements, and prescription of qualification of teaching staffs at colleges. Legislation, therefore, curtails both the actual and potential role of faculty in governance.

Ontario's colleges operate under a provincial-wide bargaining structure, thus agreements are nearly identical, with minor variations possible for local conditions. Collective agreements are silent on a broad range of items, such as the academic calendar, curriculum, faculty evaluation, and faculty hiring, not specifying responsibilities or authority. Joint authority is noted for the grievance process, and faculty participation is cited in articles on faculty layoff and faculty professional development. For internal college complaints, there is an agreement to form a joint faculty union and college committee to discuss complaints. Finally, there is a potential for joint action on workload of faculty, where the faculty union and the college agree on faculty workload.

Overall, agreements reflect a limited role for faculty even in participating in the affairs and operations of the institution. While other

structures and arenas may provide for faculty engagement in institutional decision-making, the legal role of faculty in governance either in legislation or in collective agreements is minimal, perhaps limited to one vote on a seventeen-member governing board.

OBSERVATIONS

With the exception of British Columbia and California, no jurisdiction requires or encourages shared or participatory governance. In California, shared governance is promoted implicitly, and legislation is enabling rather than prescriptive — only participation of faculty in governance is prescriptive. In British Columbia, legislation is prescriptive with respect to the role of an educational council and board membership, both of which contribute to the sharing of governing authority among parties. Both Alberta and Ontario have a role for faculty on a governing board, but it would be tenuous to argue that a single member on one governing body equates to group participation or a sharing of authority.

Where there are academic councils, as in Alberta, or senates, as in California, or advisory committees, as in Washington, these bodies make recommendations, but do not function as decision-making authorities. Only in British Columbia is a body, the education council, with a majority of faculty members, empowered legislatively to have decision-making authority. This body can be viewed as sharing authority with the governing board, albeit in different domains, the academic being a prime example.

Collective agreements tend to be definitive about the role of faculty in governance: that role is limited, with joint action confined to the grievance process, specifically to grievance arbitration. While faculty negotiated rights to participate in such institutional processes as faculty hiring, faculty evaluation, and even the hiring of managers, participation does not mean the legal power to decide, even in conjunction with management. That is, in spite of the potential in collective bargaining for the two parties to negotiate legal authority for a faculty union, or its members to possess either sole decision-making authority or to share authority with management, the role of faculty is advisory or participatory.

CONCLUSIONS: NOT SHARED GOVERNANCE

One might argue that, with few exceptions, and one jurisdictional exception in this investigation, there is no shared governance in community colleges. Legislation is clearly an impediment in all jurisdictions except the province of British Columbia. Collective agreements between faculty unions and their colleges are impediments in a majority of applicable articles. It is reasonable to conclude that the concept of shared governance applied to community colleges is a misapplication, because legally shared governance or co-governance means something quite different from what the appeals and calls and interpretations suggest. For example, Piland and Bublitz (1998) confuse participatory with shared governance in their examination. They acknowledge that the final institutional authority is the governing board, yet they refer to shared governance in these institutions and survey faculty to obtain their perceptions of shared governance in their institutions. In fact, Piland and Bublitz do not mean shared governance; they mean, instead, participatory governance, where faculty have a role, but do not hold legal power or authority to decide.

One might equally argue, however, that the limited practice of shared governance, as evident in collective agreements, is a consequence of a limited legal framework. That is, legislation either specifically ignores sharing of authority or provides no latitude for boards to delegate authority, the result being that sharing of authority is not legally possible. In order to assist in an alteration of collective agreements, affording the parties the potential to negotiate shared governance, legislation must specify either a requirement for the sharing of authority or permission to share authority. Legislation not only sets the tone but also provides the legal framework for colleges, their faculty unions and their management or board, to engage in shared governance. In doing so, it requires two parties to accept joint responsibility for institutional actions. Until that legislative act, shared governance is an unrealistic goal and a misnomer for what is, at best, modest faculty participation in decision-making.

Implications

This investigation suggests that, in the context of an exchange perspective of governance, community college faculty have limited power. Their lack of power can be ascribed to their resources and/or services not being recognized as valuable, to either legislators or employers. These resources and/or services have not been exchanged for authority. Faculty expertise and value are not recognized in that faculty are not accorded an equal role, or even a shared role, in institutional decision-making. This unequal role spans many domains, from the hiring of colleagues to curricular and program change. Without a shared role in decision-making for faculty, especially in the educational aspects of institutional life, community colleges are formally and legally bureaucratic institutions dominated by managerial authority. From a political perspective, managers and others who promote shared governance in community colleges act for their self-interest in as much as shared governance is either not legal or not encouraged in legislative law.

This condition may help to explain why community college faculty are not viewed consistently as professionals (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Seidman, 1985), and why community colleges have less prestige than universities. More importantly, the presence of rhetoric about shared governance and the absence of the reality point to an arrested development of the institution: it remains in the formative years of the 1970s (Dennison & Gallagher, 1986; Tillery & Deegan, 1985) and clings to a pattern of behaviors where those at the top of the hierarchy decide, and the rest abide, submitting to the will of authority. Without legislative changes and alterations to the structure of union-management relations, through collective bargaining and contractual change, community colleges in Canada and the United States, with few exceptions, may not live up to their promise of contributing critically to the social, cultural and economic development of their nations (Dennison, 1995), or providing educational opportunity for those pursuing social and economic advancement (Brint & Karabel, 1989).✻

References

- Alfred, R. (1994). Research practice on shared governance and participatory decision making. In G. Baker III (Ed.), *A handbook on the community college in America* (pp. 245–258). Westport, CN: Greenwood Press.
- American Association of University Professors. (1984). *Policy documents and reports, 1984 edition*. Washington, DC: American Association of University Professors.
- Bacharach, S., & Lawler, E. (1980). *Power and politics in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Baker, G., & Associates. (1993). *Cultural leadership: Inside America's community colleges*. Washington, DC: The Community College Press.
- Baldrige, J., Curtis, D., Ecker, G., & Riley, G. (1977). Alternative models of governance in higher education. In G. Riley & J. Baldrige (Eds.), *Governing academic organizations* (pp. 2–25). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.
- Benjamin, R. (1993). *The redesign of governance in higher education*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Benjamin, R., & Carroll, S. (1998). Implications of the changed environment for governance in higher education. In W. Tierney (Ed.), *The responsive university*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Bess, J. (1988). *Collegiality and bureaucracy in the modern university*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Birnbaum, R. (1988). *How colleges work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Brint, S., & Karabel, J. (1989). *The diverted dream: Community colleges and the promise of educational opportunity in America, 1900-1985*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bryant, D. (1992). New leadership considerations for old realities. *Community/Junior College Quarterly*, 16, 77–84.
- Carver, J. (1998). *Boards that make a difference: A new design for leadership in nonprofit and public organizations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1996). *The American community college*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cohen M., & March, J. (1986). *Leadership and ambiguity*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 2nd edition.

Corson, J. (1975). *The governance of colleges and universities*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.

Dennison, J. (1995). Conclusion. In J. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity*, (pp. 275–284). Vancouver, BC: The University of British Columbia Press.

Dennison, J., & Gallagher, P. (1986). *Canada's community colleges*. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Eisenhardt, K. (1989). Building theories from case study research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14,(4): 532–550.

Fryer, T., & Lovas, J. (1991). *Leadership in governance*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Gerber, L. (1997). Reaffirming the value of shared governance. *Academe*, 83, 14–18 (September/October).

Goodman, P. (1962). *The community of scholars*. New York, NY: Random House.

Greer, D. (1997). *Prospective governance*. Occasional paper #31. Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges.

Hardy, C. (1996). *The politics of collegiality: Retrenchment strategies in Canadian universities*. Buffalo, NY: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hardy, C. (1990). Putting power into university governance. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, Volume VI, (pp. 393–426). New York, NY: Agathon Press.

Kanter, M. (1994). Instructional programs. In A. Cohen, F. Brawer, & Associates, *Managing community colleges* (pp. 219–246). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Kempner, K. (1990). Faculty culture in the community college: Facilitating or hindering learning? *The Review of Higher Education (Winter)*, 13(2), 215–235.

Levin, J. (1995). The challenge of leadership. In J.D. Dennison (Ed.), *Challenge and opportunity* (pp. 105–120). Vancouver BC: The University of British Columbia Press.

Levin, J. (1998). *Globalization and the community college: Alterations to mission and structures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA, April.

March, J., & Olsen, J. (1995). *Democratic governance*. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Miller, M., Vacik, S., & Benton, C. (1998). Community college faculty involvement in institutional governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22, 645–654.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Morgan, G. (1986). *Images of organization*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publishing.

Mortimer, K., & McConnell, T. (1978). *Sharing authority effectively*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Munitz, B. (1995). Wanted: New leadership for higher education. *Planning for Higher Education*, 24, 9–16.

Nussbaum, T. (1995). *Evolving community college shared governance to better serve the public interest*. Unpublished paper, California.

Piland, W., & Bublitz, R. (1998). Faculty perceptions of shared governance in California community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 22, 99–110.

Raisman, N. (1990). Moving into the fifth generation. *Community College Review*, 18(2), 15–22.

Ramo, K. (1997). Reforming shared governance: Do the arguments hold up? *Academe*, 83, 38–43 (September/October).

Rhoades, G. (1992). Governance models. In B. Clark & G. Neave (Eds.), *The encyclopedia of higher education*, Vol. 2, (pp. 1376–1384). New York, NY: Pergamon Press.

Schuster, J., Smith, D., Corak, K., & Yamada, M. (1994). *Strategic governance: How to make big decisions better*. Phoenix, AZ: American Council on Education and Oryx Press.

Seidman, E. (1985). *In the words of the faculty*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Tillery, D., & Deegan, W. (1985). The evolution of two-year colleges through five generations. In W. Deegan, D. Tillery, & associates (Eds.), *Renewing the American community college* (pp. 3-33). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Yin, R. (1984). *Case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Appendix A

Legislation for state and provincial jurisdictions

State/Province	Requires	Forbids	Silent	Participation
Alberta				
British Columbia				
Ontario				
California				
Illinois				
Hawaii				
Oregon				
Washington				

- 1 Legal jurisdiction, legislative acts
- 2 Legislation requires, explicitly or implicitly, shared authority in college management or decision-making
- 3 Legislation forbids, explicitly or implicitly, shared authority in college management or decision-making
- 4 Legislation is either silent or has no implications about sharing of authority
- 5 Legislation promotes or requires participation of employees (e.g., faculty) in decision-making processes

Appendix B

Collective Agreement Articles

Key for Coding:

S – Silent

M – management
 (includes board)

JA – Joint Action
 (management
 & faculty)

FP – Faculty Participation

• – relevant other issues

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
CALIFORNIA																			
Antelope Valley CC	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	
Barstow CCD	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	M	FP	M	FP	
Butte CC	S	M	FP	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Chaffey CC	M	FP	S	FP	M	FP	M	FP	S	JA	S	M	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Citrus CC	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	S	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Coast CCD (PT)	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S	N	S	S	S	
College of the Canyons	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
College of the Redwoods	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	M	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Contra Costa CC	FP	FP	S	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	S	•
Desert CC	M	FP	FP	S	S	FP	M	FP	S	JA	S	S	S	M	FP	S	FP	FP	
El Camino CC	M	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	M	JA	S	FP	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	•

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
Feather River CC	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	JA	FP	FP	S	M	S	S	FP	S	S	S	
Foothills-DeAnza CCD	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	M	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	
Gavilan CC	M	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Glendale CC	FP	S	FP	M	S	FP	M	FP	S	JA	S	S	M	M	S	S	FP	FP	•
Hartnell CC	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	M	S	S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Imperial CC	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	M	S	S	M	S	FP	M	S	S	S	S	S	
Lake Tahoe CC	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	M	S	S	FP	S	S	S	•
Lassen CC	M	FP	S	M	M	FP	S	S	S	M	S	FP	M	S	S	S	FP	S	•
Long Beach CC	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	M	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	•
Los Angeles CCS	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	M	M	S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	•
Merced CC	S	M	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	FP	
Monterey Peninsula CCD	M	S	FP	S	S	FP	M	S	S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	S	FP	S	
Mt. San Antonio CCD	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
Napa Valley CC	M	FP	FP	S	S	S	M	S	S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	S	FP	S	
Ohlone CC	M	S	S	S	S	FP	M	S	S	M	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	•
Rio Hondo CC	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	•
San Bernardino CC	M	FP	S	FP	S	FP	M	FP	S	JA	M	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
San Diego CC	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	M	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
San Joaquin Delta CCD	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	
Santa Barbara CC	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	S	M	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
Santa Monica CC	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Shasta-Tehama-Trinity																			
Joint CCD	M	S	S	S	M	FP	S	M	S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP
Solano County CCD	FP	FP	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S
State Center CC	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S
Victor Valley CC	M	S	S	FP	M	FP	M	S	S	JA	S	S	M	S	FP	S	FP	S	•

NOTE: California is the only state with the column "Faculty Service Area" per the collective agreement language

HAWAII

Kapi'olani CC	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S		S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	M	FP	•
---------------	---	---	---	---	----	---	---	--	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	----	---

ILLINOIS

Belleville Area CC	S	FP	S	FP	S	FP	FP		S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
Black Hawk CC	S	FP	S	M	M	FP	M		S	JA	S	M	M	MS	FP	M	S	S	
City Colleges of Chicago	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP		S	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	•
Danville Area CC	S	S	S	S	M	S	M		JA	S	M	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Dupage CC	S	FP	S	JA	S	S	S		S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	FP	S	
Highland CC	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S		S	JA	S	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	
Illinois Central College	S	FP	S	FP	S	FP	FP		S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Illinois Eastern CC	M	M	S	S	S	S	M		S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	•

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
Illinois Valley CC	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	M	S	
John A. Logan College	S	S	S	S	S	FP	M		S	JA	S	M	M	S	S	S	FP	M	•
Joliet Junior College	S	FP	S	FP	FP	M	S		S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	•
Kishwaukee College	M	M	S	M	S	M	M		S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	M	FP	S	
Lake Land College	M	FP	S	M	FP	FP	M		S	JA	S	FP	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	•
Lincoln Land CC	M	FP	S	M	S	M	M		S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	M	FP	S	
McHenry CC	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	M	S		S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	S	•
Moraine Valley CC	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP	FP		S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	S	FP	M	
Morton College	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP		S	JA	S	S	FP	S	S	S	M	S	•
Oakton CC (FT)	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
Oakton CC (PT)	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S		S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	
Parkland CC	S	M	S	S	S	FP	M		S	JA	S	FP	M	S	M	S	S	S	
Prairie State College	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP	S		S	JA	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	M	S	
Rend Lake College	M	FP	S	D	D	FP	M		S	JA	S	S	M	S	S	M	FP	S	•
Sauk Valley CC	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S		S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	M	
Shawnee CC	M	FP	S	M	S	M	M		S	JA	S	M	M	MS	S	M	S	S	
Southeastern Illinois College	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S		S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
Spoon River College	S	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP		S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	
Triton College	S	S	FP	FP	JA	S	FP		S	JA	S	M	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S	•
William Rainey Harper CC	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S		S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	S	

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
OREGON																			
Blue Mountain CC	M	M	S	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	JA	S	S	S	M	S	S	S	FP	S
Chemeketa CC (PT)	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP	FP	M	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Clackamas CC (FT)	S	M	S	S	FP	M	FP	S	FP	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S
Clackamas CC (PT)	S	S	S	S	S	FP	M	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Clatsop CC	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	FP	S	M
Lane CC	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	M	S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	S	S	S	S
Linn-Benton CC	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S
Mt. Hood CC (FT)	S	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	FP	S	FP
Mt. Hood CC (PT)	S	S	FP	FP	M	S	M	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	M	S	S	S
Portland CC (FT)	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	S
Portland CC (PT)	S	S	S	S	FP	M	M	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
Rogue CC	FP	M	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	S
Southwestern Oregon CC	FP	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	FP
Treasure Valley CC	S	S	S	S	S	M	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S
WASHINGTON																			
Bellevue CC	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP
Big Bend CC	S	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	FP	S	FP	•
Clark College	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	FP

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
Columbia Basin College	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
CC of Spokane	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	M	S	M	FP	
Edmonds CC	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	FP	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	FP	•
Everett CC	FP	FP	S	S	FP	M	FP	S	S	JA	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S	FP	•
Highline CC	FP	FP	FP	JA	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	
Lower Columbia College	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	S	M	FP	
Olympic College	S	FP	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	M	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Peninsula CC	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	
Pierce College	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	•
Seattle CCD	FP	S	S	JA	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	•
Shoreline CC	S	S	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Skagit Valley College	S	S	S	S	S	FP	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	S	FP	•
South Puget Sound CC	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	
Tacoma CC	M	FP	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	JA	S	FP	M	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	•
Whatcom CC	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	S	S	FP	
Yakima Valley CC	S	FP	S	FP	FP	S	S	S	JA	S	FP	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP	

	Budget	Calendar	Co-Governance	Curriculum	Discipline	Evaluation	Faculty Hiring	Faculty Service Area	Gen. Prob.	Grievance	Harassment	Layoff	Management Hiring	New Positions	Prof. Dev't.	Program Changes	Sabbatical	Tenure	Other
ALBERTA																			
Grant MacEwan CC	S	FP	FP	S	M	S	FP		S	JA	S	M	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	•
Lethbridge CC	S	FP	S	S	M	FP	FP		S	JA	S	M	S	S	FP	S	S	S	•
Mount Royal College	S	S	S	S	S	S	FP		S	JA	S	M	S	S	FP	S	FP	FP	•
BRITISH COLUMBIA																			
Capilano College	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	S		FP	JA	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	•
Malaspina UC	FP	S	S	FP	FP	FP	FP		S	JA	FP	FP	FP	S	FP	FP	FP	FP	•
UC of Fraser Valley	S	S	FP	S	S	FP	FP		S	JA	S	FP	FP	S	FP	S	S	S	•
Vancouver CC	S	S	S	S	FP	FP	FP		S	JA	FP	FP	FP	S	S	S	FP	S	•
ONTARIO																			
St. Clair	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		FP	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	•
Sir Sanford Fleming	S	S	S	S	S	S	S		FP	JA	S	FP	S	S	FP	S	S	S	•