5-9-2006

A study of the changing complexion of academic governance in New Jersey community colleges

George J. Hakun
Rowan University

A STUDY OF THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF ACADEMIC

GOVERNANCE IN NEW JERSEY

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

by

George J. Hakun

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
May 9, 2006

Approved By_____,_____._____

Date Approved____*May 9, 2006*____

ABSTRACT

George J. Hakun
A STUDY OF THE CHANGING COMPLEXION OF ACADEMIC
GOVERNANCE IN NEW JERSEY COMMUNITY COLLEGES
2005/2006
Dr. Burton Sisco
Master of Arts in Higher Education

The purpose of this study was to determine the forces of change that will affect community colleges in New Jersey and to capture the attitudes of stakeholders towards the impact of these forces as they relate to the future of the structure of academic governance. The target population of this study was community college administrators and faculty in five community colleges in southern New Jersey (n=90). The study included a random sample of administrators and faculty members, with an overall response rate of 43.5%. In addition to the survey, 12 stakeholders were randomly chosen to participate in interviews, representing a sample of convenience. The survey data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0, which calculated frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Interview data were analyzed by categorizing the comments, predictions, and opinions made by the faculty members and administrators. The research has found that community colleges in New Jersey face many changes that will challenge decision-making processes as autonomy from state control continues to expand, requirements for broader sources of funding for growth and expansion of technologies continue to increase, and internal management continues to migrate to a shared governance structure.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To, Dr. Burton Sisco, you became the one person who consistently reflected the logic needed to complete this graduate program. I refer to you as "the educator", and from my perspective, a person who helps you through the logistics and the sometimes trying situations that are inherent in graduate studies, is truly the one who is just that, your educator.

To my family, who put up with the time I needed to complete this program in addition to the business travel that I am constantly faced with, my sincere gratitude.

To Rowan University, for the educational opportunity presented to my entire family, I am forever a friend, and will forever be a devoted alumnus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Literature suggests that recent changes affecting community colleges will most likely continue and even accelerate over the next several years (Brown, 2000). Many of the changes are influenced by social, economic, and cultural changes within the communities these institutions serve. These changes include the downsizing of many corporations causing displaced workers, reductions in the availability of government funding for public colleges, and changes in technology requiring new skills for workers entering the workforce among others. The literature suggests that the strongest influences are coming from technology and these changes will have long-term affects on student learning and curriculum requirements. Careers in all disciplines will be impacted by technology enhancements, which will generate the need for greater financial resources to keep up with an ever-changing work force environment. "Higher education is an industry that has experienced significant shifts in recent years. Recent economic, demographic, and political changes, however, cast colleges and universities into an ambiguous arena that looks more and more like a competitive marketplace" (Brown, 2000, p. 63).

Statement of the Problem

Government grants and state aid are the traditional sources of funding within most public colleges and universities across the United States. Brown (2000), Alfred, (1998), and the AAUP (2005), suggest that funding needs for colleges and universities are predicted to grow in the future as state and federal government funding sources shrink.

1

Funding issues and technology changes that cause major modifications in post secondary curriculum are projected to cause major changes in college strategic planning and changes in the structure of academic governance over the next several years (Ehrenberg, 2004). Colleges and universities develop annual budget strategies to secure funding for administrative, infrastructure, and academic operations. The current democratic governing structure used by many colleges may limit the ability to secure outside funds. Public higher education institutions are accustomed to receiving funds from traditional sources via state and federal taxes, grants, and loans. Accelerating changes in society suggest the need for an adjustment in the governing structure of colleges and universities to promote new ideas, a broader mission and commitment to diverse students and the larger community, and increasing workforce demands in a global economy (Alfred, 1998).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this research project was to study the state of the art in academic governance in higher education, and to determine through research what the future complexion of academic governance might look like. This project investigated the state of academic governance within American colleges and universities, and focused specifically on academic governance within two-year community colleges in New Jersey. The study analyzed the current academic governance structure of selected New Jersey community colleges and gauged whether changes in the governance structure may be needed in order to meet the changing times of the 21st century. More specifically, the project sought to better understand the creativity and flexibility needed in community colleges in the future.

Assumptions and Limitations

Academic governance is a complex environment. Gathering, interpreting, and analyzing the data for this study is extremely important and can potentially affect the way the governance structure for community colleges is viewed and can lead to improvements in the design and structure of community colleges in the future. Additionally, the research in this study will add to the existing body of literature that is relative to continued analysis of academic governance structure in community colleges.

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that the subjects understood the survey questions and responded in a truthful manner. Additionally, it is assumed that the sample for this study is a viable representation of the entire population of administrators and faculty within the community colleges of southern New Jersey.

As with all research, this study is limited by a few factors. Because of the small numbers of faculty and administrators interviewed, the overall number of interviewees were low. Also, there is some possibility of researcher bias that could have impacted the study as the researcher has taught in the community college environment as a part-time instructor.

Operational Definitions of Important Terms

The following are brief definitions of terms used:

AAUP: The long-standing organization dedicated to the college teaching profession, known as the American Association of University Professors.

Administrator: Term used in this study to describe someone who works in a collegiate setting and has supervisory responsibility; a person who reports directly to the president

and supervises a major division of the institution, or who has substantive policy setting responsibility.

Community College: Two year county college in Atlantic Cape, Burlington, Camden Cumberland, and Gloucester counties in southern New Jersey, offering accredited degree programs as well continuing education and training programs.

Corporate Sponsors: A process by which private corporations become partners with community colleges for funding and educational internships.

Funding Source: Source for providing financial resources for community colleges.

Governance: The political decision making structure of the community college, which includes administrative staff, faculty, and sometimes students.

Higher Education: The college systems delivering education at the undergraduate degree level.

Internships: Working engagements for college students where real-time commitments in corporate environments provide experience and exposure to business and industry practices.

Partnerships: The political and financial alliances developed between colleges and corporate sponsors.

Shared Governance: The cooperation of all college stakeholders including governing boards, administrators, faculty, and students.

Stakeholders: Those within the organization that share in the decision-making processes, and the future planning and strategy building of the college. These include faculty and administrative staff at various levels at Atlantic Cape, Burlington County,

Camden County, Cumberland County, and Gloucester County Community Colleges in southern New Jersey.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. How do the stakeholders in selected New Jersey community colleges (administrators and faculty) view the current and future structure of governance within the community college environment?

2. What are the attitudes of selected community college administrators and faculty towards the forces (technology, funding, and autonomy from state and local government) that may affect the structure of governance in the future?

3. Will advances in technology influence the structure of community college governance in New Jersey and require new sources of funding that are beyond the current state and local funding sources?

Report Organization

Chapter two reviews multiple studies about academic governing structures in two-year community colleges from states within the mid-west, south, southwest, and northeastern regions of the United States. It also includes research about community colleges within the entire state of New Jersey then focuses on southern New Jersey. The research includes strategic plans for these colleges, including sources of funding and plans for growth of the institution.

Chapter three outlines the context of the study, a description of the population and sample, instruments used in the study, data collection procedures, and how the data were analyzed.

Chapter four includes a summary of the findings based on data gathering.

Chapter five includes a summary of the study, an interpretation of the findings,

discussion, conclusions, and finally, recommendations for further studies on the issue of the

future of academic governance in two-year colleges.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The History of Academic Governance in America

Colleges and universities as formal institutions organized as a self-governing body dates back to medieval times (Brown, 2000). In fact, medieval universities created many of the titles and descriptions used in today's collegiate governance structure. Titles such as dean, provost, and proctor date back to those times. Additional influences to the titles, governing structure, and protocol were formed in English colleges during the 16th and 17th centuries. In the early years of United States history, very few individuals made education a full-time career. European colleges and universities arose from guilds; corporations of doctors and masters in towns like London, Paris, Bologna and others (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997). In the early years, colleges and universities in the United States were created by a simple structure including a lay board, and a president. An educational revolution took place in the United States during the four decades following the Civil War, and this led to the formalized structure that marks the design and structure of U.S. colleges and universities today (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The influence that the English structure had on the development of the structure of higher education was evident in the formation of the earliest universities in the United States. Colleges and universities such as Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, and Rutgers, all have charters and charter language that is very similar in tone and structure to the charters of Oxford and Cambridge universities in England (Brown, 2000).

The History of Community Colleges in the United States

From the beginning, the two-year (community college) was developed in response to many social and economic forces within communities across the United States. As an outgrowth of the higher education system, the community college was intended to offer opportunities to those individuals who due to geographical, financial, and academic limitations were left out of the mainstream of higher education. Formed with borrowed space from local high schools and faculty and curriculum shared with local four-year colleges, the principles that formed what we know today as community or junior colleges were established in many American communities as early as 1870 (AACC, 2005). Joliet Junior College established in 1901 and California's Fresno Junior College established in 1910, were two early forms of extended high school curriculum that eventually became known as junior colleges. States were initially reluctant to use the term junior college and more frequently referred to such programs as high school-based college preparatory programs (Goodchild & Wechsler, 1997). It was not until 1907 when California established an act to recognize these programs as junior colleges, and Kansas in 1917 passed similar legislation, that the institution of the junior college began to proliferate across the United States.

In Joliet, chemistry and Latin programs were offered at the high school as extended accreditation of college courses. These were accepted as advanced credit for specific programs at Michigan State University that were started in 1898. By 1901 Joliet's school board organized a junior college and saw dozens of students already enrolled in these programs in advance of their applying to and attending the university. Although the junior college has origins dating back to the turn of the 20th century, most did not exist as

independent entities with their own governing structure and charter until well beyond the mid 20th century. Prior to this time, the junior college acted more like an extension of the local high school system and although referred to as college preparatory programs were not truly independent until 1960.

A local example of the extension of high school work aimed at becoming preparation for students wishing to get advanced training at the college level is Central High School in Philadelphia, whose programs eventually developed into the base curriculum and foundation for what we know today as the Community College of Philadelphia. Philadelphia's two-year college program was formed as a college preparatory program for those wishing to continue on towards a bachelor's degree and in addition, was developed into a program of certification into other non-degree programs such as the medical field (nursing and medical technician) and other trade type occupations (CCP, 2005).

Many of the early programs developed across America were developed in much the same fashion as Joliet and Philadelphia. Because these programs started slowly in many communities at various times as extension programs to existing high school curriculums, there are limited records available about many of these junior colleges (AACC, 2000). Documented journals or records of board meetings, policy statements, and first drafts of charters that could outline the specific dates that many junior colleges were established or the exact names of the charter's first board of directors are not well documented (Alfred, 1998).

Community Colleges in the United States Today

Today, however, community colleges have formal structures of governance, develop strategies for advanced curriculum and academic program offerings, and elect their governing boards in like fashion to that of four-year public colleges and universities.

There are several southern New Jersey community colleges that were established in similar fashion as Philadelphia. Atlantic–Cape Community College, Burlington County College, Camden County College, Cumberland County College, and Gloucester County College, were all formed by local governments to meet the needs of the community for increased availability to higher education and specialized training. Along with the financial benefits of starting out at a two-year college, a student can experience college life without the need to move away from home or give up part or full-time employment. The opportunity students have to enhance their education at a two-year college could potentially lead to a formal associate's degree and be extended to a four-year college where a bachelor's degree or advanced degree could be achieved, leading to many more career opportunities (Birnbaum, 1988). Beyond accredited courses, community colleges have become a prime source for continuing and life-long education. Certifications for the medical field, the computer networking and operations environments, and others are an in-demand product of today's community college. Customized training available at the colleges or brought to the business location are becoming extremely popular today as corporations eliminate the need for maintaining permanent staff chartered with providing employee training in specific matters. Community colleges are becoming the key source for custom training and repeat business represents a large percentage of their training activity (Alfred, 1998).

Burlington County College specializes in training within the medical field, offering numerous certifications and associate degree programs for nursing, X-ray, and MRI technicians, dental assistants, dental hygiene, and emergency medical technician certifications (BCC, 2005). Gloucester County College offers the area's premier training and certification programs for the safety industry, training hundreds of employees within the oil refinery and chemical processing industry (GCC, 2005). Camden County College features specialized computer system and network technology programs that provide field specific certifications for technologies that include Cisco Networks and voice communications management. These programs speak to the value that the community college brings to the environment today. In addition to the established credited and continuing education non-credited course offerings, many community colleges are now striving to offer four-degrees in many liberal arts and business programs. From its earliest start with borrowed space and instructors, the community college has established itself as a major element within the overall structure of the American higher education system. The curriculum is recognized as strong and current and is representative of the needs of the society it serves. Public and private corporations use the resources and experiences of community colleges to educate employees and to establish benchmarks for advances in technology and for development of programs that will enhance the quality of future graduates. K-12 school systems look to community colleges for the opportunity to advance more students successfully into the higher education system.

The Current State of Governance in Academic Institutions

The governing board of any college or university within the United States is usually the final authority for the decision-making process within the institution. Public institutions are established via statutory provisions within state constitutions and are largely controlled by each state. Private colleges and universities are created by a charter and are governed by the board created in that charter (AAUP, 2005). In private institutions, the board is almost always self-sustaining or self-perpetuating, whereas within public institutions board members may be suggested or nominated by present board membership and are often appointed by a governor, legislature, and local officials. The governing board plays the central role in developing strategies for college or university planning functions and for establishing likely sources for those needs, such as private funding from corporations, and grants for research and program development.

Brown (2000) states that a properly functioning board of directors will insist on long range plans that are developed by faculty and administrators in order to accurately document the institution's long-term strategies. These strategies need to be consistent within the institution's mission statement. The board of directors maintains a general overview of college conduct and manages fiduciary issues. The board delegates administrative responsibilities to the administrative officers, and responsibilities for academic research and teaching to the faculty (Levin, Levin, & Beull, 2002).

Hierarchical Structures

Birnbaum (1988) discusses the collegiate structure by outlining the lines of authority in a hierarchical order. These layers or lines of communications move in a distinct fashion, "flowing up the chart" or uphill in the order of the decision-making process (Birnbaum,

1988). He refers to the structures that contain the least amount of hierarchical steps as flatter and those with numerous steps as taller. This structure of governance is similar to a corporate structure where several reporting layers of reporting create a political structure that is confusing, lacks continuity, is cumbersome to follow, and causes inefficient decision-making. Initiating and navigating ideas through a multi-layered structure is cumbersome, tends to waste time, and causes widespread frustration especially for those seeking to initiate new ideas (Birnbaum, 1988). Birnbaum's structure also details the relationships between the positions of individuals based on location in the organizational chart. The example and reference to People's Community College and its structure illustrates how individuals in close proximity to each other on the governing structure interact more frequently, become personal friends, and are able to implement ideas through each other more effectively than those who are several layers apart.

The collection of data for programs intended to become new proposals, and lead to change in a college's program is normally distributed by the collector. Depending on where the collector is positioned on the organizational chart determines how the data are disseminated and how effectively the data collection is delivered (Brown, 2000). Someone who is closer to student activities may distribute data differently that someone at the college financial and accounting level or someone who reports to the dean of admissions. The point is that information intended to be received, and interpreted in a uniform sense may be misconstrued to the point that aims, focus, and message are lost.

The Governing Structure of Systems and Circles

Thinking in systems and circles provides multiple examples of governance structures that provide an understanding of the various forms of decision-making in academia (Birnbaum, 1988). The collegial institution has three components: membership (in the company of scholars), participation in collegiate or institutional affairs, and equal worth of knowledge (Brown, 2000). The collegial system is based on the relationship between interaction and liking where increased interaction will increase liking and positively affect decision-making (the loop of interaction). The bureaucratic institution is best reflected by a hierarchical system of political layers, each having an affect on the decision-making process leading to red tape and unnecessary delays in the communications process (Allison, 1971). The political institution is described as a system in constant competition for power and resources. The organizational politics involved in a political institution are a combination of power and influence in order to influence the decision-making process. Political systems thrive on personal exchange of information and opinion and are based on mutual dependence. Levels of desired power are acquired by means of coalitions among and between groups (Pfeffer, 1994). The anarchical institution is a collection of counterintuitive concepts and actions that defy commonsense and distort perceptions. This structure has problematic goals (vague goals with no clear direction), unclear technology (not thoroughly understood by anyone), and fluid participation where committee membership and committee leadership changes frequently. Anarchical institutions fall victim to poor decision-making (Cohen, March, & Olsen, 1972). As opposed to detailed discussion, an exchange of opinion, and an equal share of consideration to all issues, the poor/hastily made decision is made by flight or oversight.

Community College Governing Structure

Community colleges like four-year institutions strive to improve internal relationships between divisions, administration, and faculty. Acknowledging that external conditions and forces beyond the direct control of the institution exist and will continue in the future growth, there is still a need for more research on community college governance (Birnbaum, 1988). Although community colleges share a lineage to K-12 schools that include bureaucratic, rational, decision-making processes, governance structures have slowly developed into more participatory processes. Participatory behaviors of faculty in organizational decision-making are common in community colleges in recent years. Successful community college governance structures will be those that reflect organizations that negotiate differences by collective bargaining (Tierney, 1993). Community colleges are frequently viewed as being deeply involved in the local political, economic, and social influences within a community (Levin, 2001). Community college reactions to local conditions and economic forces, meaning their curriculum and programs are built around community job needs, suggest that these institutions are heading in the direction of the governance efficiency model like McDonald's (Ritzer, 1998). Globalization influences the specific actions taken within the economic, cultural, technological, and political structures of organizational behaviors. A specific impact on organizational behavior, which is a direct outcome of globalization, can be seen in community colleges and increased emphasis on economic efficiency. These impacts are manifested by a display of managerial practices that distribute administrative work throughout the entire institution to all units and divisions (Levin, 2001). Levin (2001) suggests that globalization has increased attention to economical behaviors in community colleges in the United States. The results have produced decision-making processes that are

increasingly focused on economic values, which are rationalized through enhanced productivity and improved efficiency. Hardy (1990) suggests that professional bureaucracy in colleges and universities is a sort of structural building block or foundation in academic governance. He also indicates that the basic bureaucracy can be overlaid or restructured by different decision-making processes such as shared governance.

Leadership Styles in Academic Institutions

Leadership among the governing board in colleges and universities is essential to the success of an institution and may differ in style and delivery based on the location of the institution and its social and economic environment. For example, a southern New Jersey college may focus more on technology education and therefore may attract as its president, someone who is technology driven with a style that leans towards the political environment. A college in the mid-west may attract a leader who is driven by tradition, valuing history, social justice and personal responsibility that characterize the institution (Birnbaum, 1988).

Leadership specifies actions taken to guide and define the directions that a college or university will follow in the future. These directions, goals, and strategies are all aimed at guiding the institution towards a brighter future. Brown (2000) states that there are various styles of academic leadership which include:

- Symbolic leadership: Emphasizes the leader's ability to project the actual character of the college or institution, its goals and its values, very effectively.
- Political leadership: Incorporates the leader's ability to resolve issues great and small, internal and external, by gaining support across organizations.

- Managerial leadership: Represents the leader's ability to direct and coordinate staff and budgets, select the appropriate staff to maintain planning and budgetary functions on an ongoing basis, and to consistently plan for the future of the institution.

- Academic leadership: Highlights the leader's ability to recognize, promote, and maintain the qualities of academic excellence in teaching, research, and learning.

Colleges, led by a president, operate as a unit with the administrative leadership, academic leadership, and student leadership designed to work together towards common strategies and goals.

As the chief executive officer, the president is evaluated by his or her abilities in managing and maintaining institutional leadership. The president must be creative, forward thinking, innovative, and is expected to set direction for the institution. The president is expected to take on critical issues and may be required to renew departments that have lost direction. The effective president is a strong, caring, action-oriented visionary, who is motivated by educated intuition (French & Raven, 1959).

Faculty are responsible for curriculum development, the methodologies employed to deliver subject matter for each discipline offered by the institution, the research undertaken within the institution, the status of the faculty employed by the college or university, as well aspects of student life that relates to the overall educational process (Brown, 2000). Faculty will advise on issues concerning college budgets, college policies, and personnel limitations, and are channeled into the governing board via advisory committees, task forces, and other

means of communications between the board of directors and the faculty (Birnbaum, 1988). Faculty set the requirements and stipulations for degrees offered within the academic disciplines supported by the institution, and should participate in the procedures that govern salary increases.

Student leadership groups represent the student body that desire to be active participants in the responsibilities of university activities and decision-making processes. If an institution desires a deeper relationship with its student body, it should incorporate the views of the students with the overall mission and strategy for future development and growth. The most successful colleges and universities have found that open voice communications between the governing board, the faculty, and the student body provide a direct link to community, student and faculty recruitment, and the success of the institution's pursuit of funding (Brown, 2000).

<center>Shared Authority/Shared Governance</center>

The concept of shared authority became the norm within academic government and the structure of authority with the call for mutual interdependence among governing boards, faculties, administrators, and students. The "practice of shared authority is – or should be – built on shared values that can give rise to consensus" (Brown, 2000, p. 342). The term "shared governance" itself, actually surfaced from AAUP statements in 1966. AAUP called for cooperation of all college stakeholders including governing boards, administrators, faculty, and students (AAUP, 2005). The statement highlighted a consensus approach to addressing issues and making decisions that affect the college and university community as a consolidated body. Consensus is reached via the consultation process. This process allows all parties involved in the academic structure the appropriate time to give

<center>18</center>

input, provide feedback, and communicate results on issues surrounding the college or university's overall decision-making strategies. The consultation process involves joint formulation of procedures, allows appropriate time to formulate responses, guarantees the availability of information, and allows time for adequate feedback and communications of all decisions.

Interrelationships Among Academic Institutions: The Joint Effort

The AAUP believes it is essential for all organizations within colleges and universities to understand the governance structure. Anderson (1977), states that all academic institutions, public or private, have become less autonomous recently primarily due to the diminishing control of their sources and the distribution of funding. Colleges that are aware of their interdependence and who make use of open communications are in the best position to solve academic problems via cooperation and joint action. According to Tierney (2004), there are numerous forces in society impacting the current structure of academic governance. There are forces of change in curriculum to meet the new demands for employment within a changing marketplace, change in student interests and career goals, changes in technology, the financial positioning of a college and its sources of funding, and increasing costs for growth and development in the university infrastructure.

The greatest of all the forces that are changing the tide of college and university governmental structure and organizational topology is finance (Tierney, 2004). With decreased funding from state and local governments, colleges are seeking new sources of funding to accommodate growth in curriculum to meet the demands of the community and to maintain the faculty and facilities needed to meet these demands.

Administrators, staff and faculty see higher education governance in differing ways.

19

Some of the research indicates that changes are taking place within the organizations that make up the physical structure of academic governance, as well as the conceptual structure of colleges and universities as viewed by our overall system of education. Some faculty and administrators follow the research on college and university governance structure very closely and maintain real time connections with the research via journals, workshops, and hands-on research.

<center>Changes in New Jersey State College Governance</center>

The academic governance structure in the state of New Jersey operates under a system created by the *Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994*. The act states that by reducing unnecessary state oversight in the governance of public colleges institutions are allowed to be more creative and innovative, placing decision-making processes and accountability at the institutional level. The act also included major implementation activities including funding for technology infrastructure improvements, operating aid for capital improvements, and funding for a study on the capacity of New Jersey's higher education system. Under the legislation, boards of trustees were formed with direct responsibility for the governance and welfare of each college or university (Brown, 2000). Studies conducted in the years following the restructuring have found some successes and positive visions for the future of academic structure and the autonomy of colleges. According to a report by the New Jersey Commission in Higher Education (Goldsmith, 1999) the five-year results of the restructuring of showed some positive results. Governor Christine Todd Whitman remarked that though results were still too soon to accurately judge, she felt that improved coordination and collaboration within New Jersey's Higher Education System made it more responsive to students, to the business community, and to the state. Panelists in the study agreed that

increasing trustees' responsibility for institution vision, quality, and accountability is
desirable and appropriate, and that more focus is needed on how trustees fulfill their
important role (Goldsmith, 1999). However there are several factors that remain a major
concern for the future management and growth of New Jersey's public colleges and funding
tops the list of concerns. With the primary focus on autonomy, individual institutions have
embraced the opportunity to manage their own affairs with far less governmental oversight.
However, with this independence comes the burden of managing the future growth of the
institution and the budgetary requirements that follow. The strategies developed for
enhancing the growth of curriculum and the means of delivering quality education require
increased funding, and more importantly, a broader array of funding sources.

Current Funding Sources for Colleges and Universities

State funding for New Jersey community colleges has decreased since 1994, as reported
by the New Jersey Commission on Higher Education in their 1999 report. Since the Higher
Education Act in New Jersey in 1994 was implemented, with the price of autonomy of New
Jersey public colleges and universities comes the expectation of managing and growing the
institution. With this possibility came many challenges and opportunities perhaps the largest
being financial. The management of annual budgetary processes and the securing of funds
required to support those budgets is in itself a growing and moving target. Tuition and fees
at New Jersey public institutions have gone up significantly in an attempt to balance the ever-
growing budgetary demands for quality education. There is no sign of state funding increases
in the near future. A 2003 report on New Jersey's long-range plans for higher education said
that state support and steadily increasing university competitiveness for federal and other
research dollars will lead, where consistent with mission, to greater commercialization of

intellectual property and enhanced partnerships between institutions of higher education and industry. In other words the amount of state funding has, and will continue, to decrease for New Jersey public colleges and universities (NJIT, 2005).

Potential Funding Sources for Colleges and Universities

Advanced technology companies such as Eagon & Marino Corporation (EMC) are investing development dollars into new ideas and creative methods of developing a future employee base, educated in the field of data replication and fiber transport engineering for advanced versions of their System Replication Data Facility products (EMC, 2004). Cisco Network Systems is developing a new technology capable of combining multiple transmission protocols within a single data replication frame. Targeted as a five-year project, this project will require more engineering and business management personnel and a substantial investment in educating potential staff (Cisco, 2003). McData Corporation and IBM have entered into an agreement with a new German based technology enterprise to develop the technology to link public Web based information repositories with college and university research laboratories, worldwide (IBM, 2005). This endeavor is projected to create opportunities for nearly 10,000 new research and development engineers, business and management personnel, and lab scientists. The venture will require a substantial investment of over the next decade and will create a new cooperative partnership with college and university educational resources both here in the United States as well as in Germany and other countries in Europe and Asia (McData Technologies Corporation, 2004).

The need to acquire and manage funding is an issue faced by all colleges and universities in New Jersey, and the community college environment will have an increased need for both academic-credited programs funding as well as life-long learning and continuing education

programs where certifications in various fields will increase in demand. Private colleges are directly affected by the need for growth in their ability to provide more quality education to an ever-increasing number of students. However, many of the private institutions have long managed their endowments and have significant experience in donor development. Public colleges, who have relied on funding provided by the state, are now facing decreasing state funds and rising tuition and fee structures. Some public colleges in New Jersey such as Rowan University have established endowments to continually seek additional funding, while having to raise tuition and fees to keep up with demand.

Summary of Literature Review

There is a clear need to change the current structure of academic governance in community colleges. There is also a demonstrated desire by community colleges to re-evaluate the manner in which decision-making is orchestrated and the level of participation by administrators, faculty, and stakeholders in the decision-making process.

Research has been done in considering the factors that influence decision-making within academic governance. Several forces have stressed the need for change in academic governance structure including the *New Jersey Higher Education Act of 1994* which decentralized control of colleges and universities in New Jersey, the reduced funding to colleges that has resulted from the 1994 ruling, and the need to establish newer sources of funding for future growth.

Although there is a significant amount of research done about academic governance and the factors affecting change to its current structure, the data needs further analysis. Continued studies of the decision-making processes within New Jersey community colleges

needs to be done to further understand the changes required to meet the need for growth and

funding and the future complexion of academic governance.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Context of the Study

The study was conducted at five community colleges located in southern New Jersey's

Atlantic-Cape, Burlington, Camden, Cumberland, and Gloucester counties. These colleges

are all public institutions and have some differences in student population from varied

backgrounds across the five-county area of southern New Jersey. However, student, faculty,

administrative, community, and financial profiles for each of the five community colleges are

similar as they each serve their respective environments in much the same fashion, focusing

on academic and life-long learning curriculums.

Each of the colleges offer similar programs for associate degrees in business and liberal

arts disciplines, as well as continuing education in various fields including computer training,

trade certifications in technical, medical, and business functions, and adult programs for

personal interests and individual learning and self-satisfaction. Each college has an

enrollment of between 2500 and 4000 full-time and part-time students with the higher

percentage of students entering the college with the intention of achieving associates degree.

Burlington County College specializes in training within the medical field, offering

numerous certifications and associate degree programs, Gloucester County College offers the

area's premier training and certification programs for the safety industry, training hundreds

of employees within the oil refinery and chemical processing industry, Camden County

College features specialized computer system and network technology programs that provide

field specific certifications for technologies that include Cisco Networks and voice

communications management. Both Atlantic-Cape and Cumberland County Colleges offer

training in the hospitality industry, training students for the Atlantic City casino industry. The larger percentage of each college's attendees are enrolled in the accredited programs and are pursuing an associate's degree, while the non-credit side of each college is growing as the number of certification, professional training, and special trade students is growing. Each of the colleges maintains a strategy to increase student enrollment across the academic and non-credit certification programs. Industry training that is brought directly into the corporate environment and taught on-site at the corporate location is another growing program for these colleges, and is completed annually as part of an industries ongoing training and recertification maintenance program.

Population and Sample Selection

The target population of this study included selected community college faculty and administrative staff. Of the five colleges included in the survey, there are approximately 255 full-time tenured faculty members and approximately 100 full-time administrative employees. As stated earlier, administrators are defined as college presidents, board members, directors, vice-presidents, and assistant directors. A random sampling process was used to gather the participants for this study. A total 147 surveys were distributed to faculty members with 65 returned for a response rate of 44.2%. A total of 60 surveys were distributed to administrative stakeholders with 25 returned for a response rate of 41.7%. The researcher then selected 12 survey participants to participate in a follow-up interview. The participants were chosen as a sample of convenience.

Instrumentation

A survey titled *The Changing Complexion of Academic Governance in New Jersey Community Colleges* (Appendix A), was designed by the researcher and the questions within the survey were developed as a result of research into literature available about college governance, government and private funding, and changes that are affecting the autonomy of New Jersey community colleges. The survey inquired about three areas: (a) how stakeholders view the current structure of academic governance, (b) stakeholder attitudes towards the forces (funding, technology, autonomy from state government) that may affect the future structure of academic governance, and (c) how will advances in technology affect funding for community colleges in the future. The format of the survey includes Likert-scale responses (5-Strongly Agree, 4-Agree, 3-Neutral, 2-Disagree, and 1-Strongly Disagree). The pilot survey was administered in November, 2005 and changes were made based on the response. The survey was then sent to the Institutional Review Board on January 17, 2006 and notice of approval was received on January 20, 2006 (Appendix E).

The responses gathered from the initial survey determined the questions used for the in-person interviews. In order to obtain a deeper understanding of stakeholder attitudes, the interview asked open-ended questions based on the research questions. Stakeholders were asked a series of six questions that were similar to those found in the survey. The focus of the interview, however, was to identify how community college stakeholders viewed issues like government and private funding, the role of technology in the future of community college curriculum, and the affect of autonomy from state government. The interview questions are located in Appendix B.

Data Collection Procedures

Following approval from the Institutional Review Board of Rowan University (Appendix

E), the survey was sent via e-mail to community college stakeholders. The surveys were

addressed to full-time faculty and administrators within the five community colleges. Upon

receiving an initial response rate of less than 10%, an additional survey was sent via US mail,

and some of those who were sent the survey were also e-mailed as a follow-up. In the end

41.7% of the 60 administrators and 44.2% of the 147 faculty members completed the

surveys.

Several administrators and faculty were randomly selected, contacted directly via

telephone, and asked to participate in an in-person interview. Seven administrators and five

faculty members agreed to participate in the interview process.

Data Analysis

After the surveys were administered, the data were analyzed in three parts based on the

research questions. The first "How do the stakeholders in selected New Jersey community

colleges (administrators and faculty) view the current and future structure of governance

within the community college environment" was analyzed by looking at the Likert-scale

responses from survey statements 1, 3, 5, 6, 15, 18, and 20. These survey questions collected

stakeholder attitudes about current governance structure, faculty and administrator roles in

decision-making, and the perceived affect of college autonomy from state government. The

second "What are the attitudes of selected community college administrators and faculty

towards the forces (technology, funding, and autonomy from state and local government) that

may affect the structure of governance in the future" was analyzed by looking at the Likert-

scale responses from survey statements 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25. These

survey questions collected stakeholder attitudes about the forces affecting the future growth

of community colleges including government control over public colleges, and shared-governance. Finally, the third research question "Will advances in technology influence the structure of community college governance in New Jersey and require new sources of funding that are beyond the current state and local funding sources" was analyzed by looking at the Likert-scale responses from survey statements 7, 8, 9, 16, 21, and 24. These survey questions collected stakeholder attitudes about the role of technology, and the need for private funding. The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 12.0, which calculated frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The findings of the data analysis were then used to create a set of open-ended questions for the in-person interviews. The questions in the in-person interviews followed the same set of research questions, but attempted to attain a more focused understanding of the survey findings. Upon completion of the interviews, the answers were analyzed by categorizing the comments and opinions made by the faculty members and administrators.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Profile of the Sample

The target population of this study was community college administrators and faculty in

five community colleges in southern New Jersey. Atlantic-Cape, Burlington County,

Camden County, Cumberland County, and Gloucester County Colleges were the

participating colleges. The sample for the survey consisted of 147 faculty and 60

administrators, which constitutes a random survey. The total number of faculty who

completed the survey was 65, which represented 44.2% response rate. The total number of

administrators who completed the survey was 25, which represents a 41.7% response rate.

The total number of participants who completed the survey was 90 out of a total of 207

surveys, which represented an overall response rate of 43.5%.

Table 4.1 provides the demographics of the survey participants. Fifty-five percent of the

participants were male, and 45% were female. Seventy-two percent of those who

participated in the survey were full-time faculty members teaching in the accredited division

of each college (not the life-long learning division of the institution). Twenty-eight percent

were full-time administrators who held positions such as college presidents, vice-presidents,

directors, and assistant directors. Eighteen percent of participants were in their positions less

than five years and 82% in their positions greater than five years, with an average time in

position of 9.4 years. Time in position ranged from as little as three years to as much as 37

years, with nine percent of all participants indicating that over the course of their community

college careers, they held both administrative and faculty positions. The ages of all

participants ranged from 27 years to 69 years, with an average age for all participants of 44 years.

Table 4.1

Selected Demographics

Variable		n=90 Frequency	%
Gender			
	Male	50	55
	Female	40	45
Administrator		25	28
Faculty		65	72
Time in position			
	<5 Years	16	18
	>5 Years	74	82

Research Questions

Research Question 1: How do the stakeholders in selected New Jersey community colleges (administrators and faculty) view the current and future structure of governance within the community college environment?

Tables 4.2 and 4.3 provide information regarding research question 1. These tables show the attitudes that stakeholders reported for survey statements 1, 3, 5, 6, 15, 18, and 20. The respondents were given the choice to answer: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree," representing a Likert-scale measurement. The tables present the attitudes of administrators and faculty separately.

Table 4.2

Administrator Attitudes on Structure of Governance in New Jersey Community Colleges

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Adequate Current Structure n=25, SD=.332 M=4.12	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	88.0	3	12.0
Maintain Status Quo n= 25, SD=.200 M=4.96	0	0	0		0	0	1	4.0	24	96.0
Equal Share of Authority n= 25, SD=.374 M=1.16	21	84.0	4	16.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty Administrator Interaction n= 25, SD=.000 M=1.00	25	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improvement since 1994 Higher Education Act n= 25, SD=.277 M=2.08	0	0	23	92.0	2	8.0	0	0	0	0
1994 Higher Education Act Hurt Community Colleges n= 25, SD=.277 M=2.08	0	0	23	92.0	2	8.0	0	0	0	0
Current governance structure should stay the same n= 25, SD=.000 M=5.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	100.0

Table 4.3

Faculty Attitudes on Structure of Governance in New Jersey Community Colleges

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Current governance structure is adequate n= 65, SD= .174 M=4.97	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	63	96.9
Maintain Status Quo n= 65, SD= .174 M=4.97	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	63	96.9
Equal Share of Authority n= 65, SD= .124 M=1.02	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Faculty Administrator Interaction n= 65, SD= .000 M=1.00	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Improve-ment since 1994 Higher Education Act n= 65, SD= .174 M=2.03	0	0	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0
1994 Higher Education Act Hurt Community Colleges n= 65, SD= .174 M=2.03	0	0	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0
Current governance structure should stay the same n= 65, SD= .000 M=5.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	100.0

When asked about their attitudes towards the adequacy of the current structure of academic governance within New Jersey community colleges, 12% of administrators strongly disagreed that the current governance structure was adequate, while 88.0% percent disagreed. Of the faculty, 3.1% disagreed with the current structure's adequacy, while 96.9% strongly disagreed.

When asked about the idea of maintaining the status quo when it comes to their professional relationships, administrators overwhelmingly strongly disagreed at 96.0% and 4.0% disagreed. Faculty strongly disagreed at a rate of 96.9% and 3.1% disagreed.

When asked if administrators and faculty concur with the idea of sharing equally in authority and in the decision-making processes, administrators strongly agreed 84.0% and agreed 16.0%. Faculty strongly agreed 98.5% and agreed 1.5%.

Faculty and administrators were then asked about their attitudes towards the idea of interacting more frequently on a daily basis. There was a 100% response of strongly agree for this survey item and the theme of improved inclusiveness of faculty and administration in all processes within the community college environment was an obvious consensus throughout all of the research interviews conducted for this study.

Faculty and administrators were asked about whether New Jersey community colleges have improved since the state passed the 1994 Higher Education Restructuring Act, which abolished direct control of institutions of higher education by state government. The majority of administrators 92.0% and faculty 96.9% indicated that they agreed that overall community colleges in New Jersey have improved since receiving greater autonomy. There were, however, 3.1% of faculty and 8.0% of administrators who were undecided about this question, showing a slight hesitation of some faculty and administrators about their attitudes

concerning the true effectiveness of the state government action. In a corresponding survey question, faculty and administrators were asked if they felt that New Jersey community colleges suffered from the affects of the 1994 Higher Education Restructuring Act and the results were identical, whereas 92.0% of administrators and 96.9% of faculty indicated that they agreed that they did not suffer any negative affects, and 3.1% of faculty and 8.0% of administrators were undecided about this issue.

Faculty and administrator were then asked for their attitudes about the concept of allowing the current New Jersey community college governance structure to remain unchanged. The results were a unanimous 100% strongly disagreed.

Research Question 2: What are the attitudes of selected community college administrators and faculty towards the forces (technology, funding, and autonomy from state and local government) that may affect the structure of governance in the future?

Tables 4.4 and 4.5 provide information regarding research question 2. These tables show the attitudes that stakeholders reported for survey statements 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 19, 22, 23, and 25. The respondents were given the choice to answer: "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree," representing a Likert-scale measurement.

Table 4.4

Administrator Attitudes Toward Forces of Change

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Government funding to continue n=25, SD= .332 M=4.88	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12.0	22	88.0
Private funding important n= 25, SD= .277 M=1.08	23	92.0	2	8.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Broader sources of funding needed n= 25, SD= .277 M=1.08	23	92.0	2	8.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government funding will grow n= 25, SD= .277 M=1.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8.0	23	92.0
Autonomy in decision-making will be more important n= 25, SD= .440 M=1.88	4	16.0	20	80.0	1	4.0	0	0	0	0
Shared governance will be more important n= 25, SD= .200 M=1.96	1	4.0	24	96.0	2	8.0	0	0	0	0
Need a consistent and direct communications link between faculty administrators and students n= 25, SD= .374 M=1.84	4	16.0	21	84.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.4 (*continued*)
Administrator Attitudes Toward Forces of Change (continued)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
More government changes are needed n=25, SD= .663 M=2.24	0	0	22	88.0	0	0	3	12.0	0	0
Most students desire to complete BA degree at the community college level n= 25, SD= .000 M=2.00	0	0	25	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A new form of governance is needed involving all stakeholders in decision-making n= 25, SD= .332 M=1.88	3	12.0	22	88.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A shared governance structure would be most effective n= 25, SD= .332 M=1.88	3	12.0	22	88.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equal share in decision-making is required between faculty, administrators, and alumni n= 25, SD= .332 M=2.12	0	0	22	88.0	3	12.0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.5
Faculty Attitudes Toward Forces of Change

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Government funding to continue n=65, SD= .174 M=4.97	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.0	63	96.9
Private funding important n= 65, SD= .174 M=1.04	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Broader sources of funding needed n= 65, SD= .331 M=1.12	57	87.7	2	12.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Government funding will grow n= 65, SD= .174 M=1.03	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3.1	63	96.9
Autonomy in decision-making will be more important n= 65, SD= .390 M=1.06	63	96.9	1	1.5	0	0	1	1.5	0	0
Shared governance will be more important n= 65, SD= .000 M=2.00	0	0	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Need a consistent and direct communications link between faculty administrators and students n= 65, SD= .174 M=1.03	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.5 *(continued)*
Administrator Attitudes Toward Forces of Change (continued)

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
More government changes are needed n=65, SD= .348 M=3.94	0	0	2	3.1	0	0	63	96.9	0	0
Most students desire to complete BA degree at the community college level n= 65, SD= .000 M=2.00	0	0	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
A new form of governance is needed involving all stakeholders in decision-making n= 65, SD= .174 M=1.03	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
A shared governance structure would be most effective n= 65, SD= .174 M=1.03	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equal share in decision-making is required between faculty, administrators, and alumni n= 65, SD= .174 M=2.03	0	0	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0

Faculty and administrator were asked for their attitudes about whether government

funding for community colleges will remain, at current levels. According to the survey

results, 88% of administrators strongly disagreed, while 12% disagreed and 96.9% of faculty

strongly disagreed and 3.1% disagreed.

Faculty and administrators were then asked about the importance of locating private

funding sources for community colleges. Both faculty and administrators felt that private

39

funding was essential, as the survey statement showed that 92.0% of administrators strongly agreed, and 8.0% agreed, while 96.9% of faculty strongly agreed, and 3.1% agreed. In a corresponding survey item about finding broader sources of funding for community colleges, 92.0% of administrators strongly agreed, and 8.0% agreed, while 87.7% of faculty strongly agreed, and 12.3% agreed that additional funding sources were will most likely be a critical issue in the future. Related to funding, an additional survey statement about faculty and administrator attitudes concerning whether government funding will increase as requirements dictate, showed that 92.0% of administrators strongly disagreed, and 8.0%disagreed, while 96.9% of faculty strongly disagreed, and 3.1% disagreed that government funding will increase with requirements.

The next survey item gathered attitudes of faculty and administrators towards the importance of New Jersey community college decision-making autonomy. The results of this survey item were somewhat mixed as 16.0% of administrators strongly agreed, 80.0% agreed, and 4.0% were undecided about the importance of community college decision-making autonomy. Faculty attitudes were also mixed as 96.9% strongly agreed, 1.5% agreed, and 1.5% disagreed about the importance of autonomy.

Stakeholders were then asked about the importance of establishing a shared-governance in New Jersey community colleges. The results were 4.0% of administrators strongly agreed and 96.0% agreed, while 100% of faculty agreed that a shared-governance structure was essential.

Stakeholders were then asked about their attitudes towards the need for open communications between faculty, administrators and students. The results showed that 16%

of administrators strongly agreed and 84% agreed, while 96.9% of faculty strongly- agreed, and 3.1% agreed that open and consistent communications were important.

A survey item was then asked about stakeholder attitudes towards the need for more government changes. Twelve percent of administrators disagreed that more government changes were necessary for New Jersey community colleges while 88% agreed. Faculty attitudes showed that 96.9% disagreed and 3.1% agreed, showing somewhat of a divide between administrator and faculty attitudes on the issue of the need for continued government changes in New Jersey community colleges.

In a survey statement about student goals in attending community college, 100% of all of the stakeholders surveyed agreed that a student's primary goal for attending a New Jersey community college included the desire to eventually complete their bachelor's degree.

Stakeholders were asked about the decision-making process in New Jersey community colleges and 88% of administrators agreed and 12% strongly agreed, that decision-making processes should be shared by all stakeholders in New Jersey community colleges. Faculty responded that they strongly agreed with 96.9%, and agreed with 3.1%, in this issue.

Stakeholder attitudes towards the effectiveness of a shared-governance structure within New Jersey community colleges showed that the administrators surveyed agreed 88% with a shared-governance structure while 12% strongly agreed. Faculty results showed that 96.9% strongly agreed and 3.1% agreed. When asked about shared decision-making processes between all stakeholders, 88.0% of administrators agreed and 12.0% were undecided, while 96.9% of faculty agreed and 3.1% were undecided about the need for an equally shared decision-making structure.

Research Question 3: Will advances in technology influence the structure of community college governance in New Jersey and require new sources of funding that are beyond the current state and local funding sources?

Tables 4.6 and 4.7 provide information regarding research question 3. These tables show the attitudes that stakeholders reported for survey statements 7, 8, 9, 16, 21, and 24. The respondents were given the choice to answer: "strongly agree," "agree," undecided," "disagree," or "strongly disagree," representing a Likert-scale measurement.

Table 4.6

Administrator Attitudes Toward Technology Influences

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Growth decisions made by administrators and faculty n=25, SD= .332 M=1.88	3	12.0	22	88.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology advances are important n= 25, SD= .332 M=1.88	3	12.0	22	88.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student enrollment will impact the need for technology n= 25, SD= .000 M=1.00	25	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funding for technology is extremely important n= 25, SD= .374 M=1.84	4	16.0	21	84.0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Technology plays a key role

Table 4.6 (*continued*)

	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
in college growth n= 25, SD= .000 M=2.00	0	0	25	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Little interest in technology among college administrators n= 25, SD= .000 M=5.00	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	100.0

Table 4.7

Faculty Attitudes Toward Technology Influences

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Undecided		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%	Freq	%
Growth decisions made by administrators and faculty n=65, SD= .332 M=4.12	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology advances are important n= 65, SD= .200 M=4.96	63	96.9	2	3.1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student enrollment will impact the need for technology n= 65, SD= .374 M=1.16	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funding for technology is extremely important n= 65, SD= .000 M=1.00	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Technology plays a key role in college growth n= 65, SD= .277 M=2.08	0	0	65	100.0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Little interest in technology among college administrators n= 65, SD= .277 M=2.08	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	100.0

Stakeholders were asked how decisions affecting community college growth should be made. Twelve percent of administrators strongly agreed and 88.0% agreed, that decisions concerning growth issues should be made by both administrators and faculty, while 96.9% of faculty strongly agreed and 3.1% agreed with this issue.

Eighty-eight percent of administrators agreed and 12% strongly agreed that technology is very important to the future of community colleges. Faculty results showed that 96.9% strongly agreed and 3.1% agreed.

One hundred percent of all administrators and faculty strongly agreed that student enrollment levels at New Jersey community colleges will have a direct impact on the growing need for technology in New Jersey community colleges.

When asked if funding required for technology will be an extremely important issue, administrators surveyed 16% strongly agreed and 84% agreed with the need for more funding for technology. Faculty, however, strongly agreed 100% on the issue of the need for additional funding for technology.

One hundred percent of faculty and administrators agreed that technology will play a very important role in the growth of community colleges in New Jersey. In a similar survey question, 100% of all faculty and administrators indicated that they strongly disagreed with the notion that there is little interest in technology among college administrators.

In-person Interviews

In addition to the survey, in-person interviews were conducted with selected stakeholders. The interviews provided additional ideas and predictions of stakeholders towards the interview questions, and gained further insight about their ideas relative to shared governance, decision-making autonomy from government, and shared decision-making

among administrators and faculty. The interviews also provided valuable insights towards stakeholder attitudes about the importance of technology today and in the future, and the need for broader sources of funding for community colleges in New Jersey.

Profile of the In-person Interviews

Twelve stakeholders were randomly chosen to participate in the in-person interviews, which represented a sample of convenience. The stakeholders interviewed by the researcher included 7 faculty members and 5 administrators. Table 4.8 represents the demographics of the in-person interview participants. Fifty-eight percent of the interview participants were faculty members and 42% were administrators. Fifty percent were male and 50% were female. Twenty-five percent of interview participants were in their position less than 5 years, while 75% were in their respective positions greater than 5 years.

Table 4.8

Selected Demographics for In-person Interview Sample

Variable		n=12 Frequency	%
Gender			
	Male	6	50
	Female	6	50
Administrator		5	42
Faculty		7	58
Time in position			
	<5 Years	3	25
	>5 Years	9	75

Analysis of the In-person Interviews

The goal of the in-person interviews was to gather additional insights as to the personal

thoughts and visions of stakeholders towards the interview questions. It is interesting to note

the reactions to specific questions were only visible in a personal interview as body language

speaks volumes about the personal feelings that some stakeholders have towards these issues.

The aspect of further autonomy from state government seemed to have a very interesting

reaction from the stakeholders interviewed. The faculty members interviewed voiced their

opinion of needing to be more autonomous from state decision making with what appeared to

be a slight tone of anger, which led the researcher to believe that autonomy in decision-

making by community colleges must have been on the minds of faculty for a long time.

Administrators in turn, seemed to all pause for a moment before answering this question, but

indicated an equal desire to see more autonomy for the colleges. A director at one college

expressed that "…it was about time (referring to the *New Jersey Higher Education Act of*

1994) that the state either took further action toward more closely managing community

colleges, or let go completely." Both administrators and faculty saw value in a shared

governance structure, and thought the continued pursuit of shared governance was essential.

Additionally, all stakeholders expressed an equal desire to continue efforts towards shared

decision-making processes among faculty and administrators. The issue of funding seemed

to light-up the eyes of all interviewees. Faculty and administrators all felt strongly about the

need to seek broader sources of funding and that government funding was probably going to

continue to decrease, if not disappear altogether.

Finally, the researcher listened to ideas from all stakeholders about how technology will

create opportunity for community colleges, and how the use of technology will create growth

capabilities and improved curriculum for New Jersey's community colleges. Both faculty and administrators voiced ideas about enhanced use of on-line course studies, Web-cast facilities for delivering course content and student participation in real-time mode, and how technology will allow instructors to help more students achieve their goals by providing a wider means of access to information.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS

AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

The forces that challenge New Jersey community colleges and their ability to grow have created a state of ongoing change within the academic governance structure of these institutions. The release of state control and the added autonomy created for New Jersey community colleges by the *Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994,* has forced the colleges to review the governance structure within their own organizations and has moved many of these colleges to adapt a shared-governance structure that promotes communications and idea sharing among and between administrators and faculty.

This study was designed to determine the forces that will affect community colleges in New Jersey and to capture the attitudes of stakeholders towards the impact of these forces as they relate to the future of the structure of academic governance.

Purpose of the Study

Community colleges will continue to be challenged by funding, technology, and student attendance requirements as they move further away from state control and closer to the communities they serve. As counties become increasingly more diverse, new forces will challenge community colleges to keep up with the demands of the students enrolling in both academic and life-learning programs. The purpose of this study was to analyze the forces associated with future growth and to capture the affects that these forces will have on the changing complexion of the academic governance structure within New Jersey community colleges.

Methodology

Ninety New Jersey community college administrators and faculty participated in this study. An Institutional Review Board (IRB) application (Appendix E) was completed on December 15, 2005 and submitted to Rowan University IRB for approval. Notice of approval was given by the IRB on January 20, 2006. The survey was then distributed to participants.

The survey was designed to capture the attitudes of selected community college stakeholders on issues related to the need for change in governance structure, community college autonomy from state control, the affects of technology on future growth, and the need for funding to provide resources for meeting the needs of students in the future. These questions were developed as a direct result of the literature search completed for this study.

At the conclusion of administering the surveys, in-person interviews were conducted to gather additional insights as to the personal thoughts and visions of stakeholders towards the interview questions that focused on governance structure, decision-making processes, technology, and funding concerns, all of the similar categories of questions found in the survey. The primary focus of the in-person interviews, however, was to gain broader knowledge of personal experiences from faculty and administrators, and to listen to their personal ideas and visions for shared governance, decision-making autonomy from government, and shared decision-making processes among and between administrators and faculty.

Data Analysis

After completion of the surveys, the survey data were analyzed in three categories: (a) stakeholder attitudes about current community college academic governance structures, (b)

the need for changes in decision-making processes by community college stakeholders and (c) the need for a broader source of funding to accommodate growth, and an increasing requirement for new technology. The survey statements and each of the categories of analysis were developed based on research findings. Each of the stakeholder's answers to the 25 statements was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 12.0). Additionally, an in-person interview with selected stakeholders gave the researcher further insight into faculty and administrator attitudes, views, and predictions about academic governance structures, and the need for change.

<div align="center">Findings and Discussion</div>

Research Question 1: How do the stakeholders in selected New Jersey community colleges (administrators and faculty) view the current and future structure of governance within the community college environment?

To analyze the findings for the first research question, the researcher looked at survey results for statements relative to the current structure of academic governance in New Jersey community colleges and the stakeholder attitudes towards the need for changes in the current environment. Stakeholders overwhelmingly agreed that changes were required and that the current structure was inadequate. Stakeholders felt that more open communications were necessary between faculty and administrators with 100% of all stakeholders responding that they agreed that more interaction on a daily basis was required and that administrators and faculty should share decision-making processes. This finding is in line with the research by Tierney (1993), which suggested that successful community college structures are those that use collective bargaining. Stakeholders also responded that maintaining the status quo in

<div align="center">50</div>

their current relationships was not desirable and that more open discussions and shared decision-making was a goal for the future.

Research Question #2: What are the attitudes of selected community college administrators and faculty towards the forces (technology, funding, and autonomy from state and local government) that may affect the structure of governance in the future?

Stakeholders responded that the *New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994* was a step in the right direction for community college governance and that greater autonomy from state control was desired in the future. Moving towards a shared governance structure within the institution would be a direct result of greater autonomy from government control. According to the attitudes of stakeholders gathered from the survey and the in-person interviews, faculty and administrators viewed shared governance as the most effective means of managing the affairs of the institution. Stakeholders viewed the forces affecting change in community college governance structure would become increasingly demanding in the future. This finding corresponds with research findings, which indicate external conditions beyond the direct control of the institution will continue to grow (Birnbaum, 1988). When asked about government funding for community colleges in New Jersey, stakeholders strongly agreed on an average of 94% that government funding levels will most likely decrease over time and that broader sources of funding to meet the growth needs of their institutions will become increasingly important in the future. Stakeholders viewed changes in local government and local community demographics as a crucial source for the college to meet the demands of students and industry in the future. During in-person interviews, several administrative stakeholders highlighted the need to establish additional funding sources. Some offered ideas about creating long-term relationships with organizations that

have common needs for education which could lead to continuous sources of funding by developing programs with common goals such as specialized associates degrees, beyond basic certifications in medical, technical, and industrial fields of interest.

Research Question #3: Will advances in technology influence the structure of community college governance in New Jersey and require new sources of funding that are beyond the current state and local funding sources?

Stakeholders viewed technology as crucial to the ability of their institution to meet the demands of students in the future. Several faculty members gave examples during the in-person interviews of recent course enhancements that were possible only because of new technology that was adapted by the college for a specific curriculum. Administrators and faculty mutually agreed that keeping up with technology was essential to the success of their institution's ability to service the local communities. Several administrators elaborated during the in-person interviews about how student's educational requirements move in a direct line with advances in technology. On-line courses were created to allow remote access to curriculum that could be taught without the need for classroom presence, and that this requirement has grown in proportion to the numbers of students seeking to complete portions of their curriculum without travel. Faculty members expressed a desire to include more advance Web-cast type courses where the instructor is present and accessible to all students via the Internet and telephone simultaneously while the course material is being covered. During the in-person interviews faculty members sited examples of industry techniques that they were able to experience first-hand at recently attended technology seminars. All stakeholders expressed personal concern for funding to meet the challenges of projected college growth. The ability to deliver the level of technology that could enhance the

curriculum enough to allow their institution the resources needed to accommodate these

growth requirements was a primary concern. This finding coincides with research findings

reported by Tierney (2004), which showed the forces of change in curriculum to meet the

new demands for employment within a changing marketplace. Change in student interests

and career goals, changes in technology, the financial positioning of a college and its sources

of funding, and increasing costs for growth and development in the university infrastructure

represent the greatest of all the forces that are changing the tide of college and university

governmental structure and organizational topology. With decreased funding from state and

local governments, colleges are seeking new sources of funding to accommodate growth in

curriculum to meet the demands of the community and to maintain the faculty and facilities

needed to meet these demands.

<div align="center">Conclusions and Recommendations</div>

New Jersey community colleges face many challenges and opportunities in the future.

Their position within the local county environment is one of respect as they are held in high

regard because of the historic ability to meet the education, training, and employment needs

of increasingly diverse communities. As the demands of the communities change, so will the

demands on community colleges, but with these demands come the opportunity to expand

curriculum and enhance the capabilities to deliver first-rate training and accessibility to all

educational resources. Over 90% of the stakeholders involved in this study recognize the

need to seek alternate sources of funding, and noted the long-term benefits of establishing

relationships with outside sources such as technology companies who can create funding and

training programs for long-range educational opportunities. One hundred percent of

stakeholders agree that government funding will decrease or become non-existent in the near

<div align="center">53</div>

future. With further autonomy from state government the complexion of academic governance for community colleges will undoubtedly change to a form that allows the colleges to function with greater independence. By virtue of this increased independence, community colleges should focus on establishing relationships with corporations and industry focus groups, where the interface and the communications with these organizations can become part of their own strategic planning exercises. Including partner relationships in planning exercises and strategy development functions could strengthen the possibilities for long-term success and broader sources of long-term funding opportunities.

Implications and Recommendations for Further Research

The purpose of this study was to provide research, insight, and information about the state of academic governance within New Jersey community colleges since the *New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act of 1994,* and to research the affects of outside forces (defined as technology, funding, and autonomy from state and local government) that may affect the structure of community college governance in the future. The following recommendations are made for further research:

1. In order to gain a wider understanding of how community college governance structure might change in the future, a larger study involving all 19 community colleges within the state of New Jersey should be conducted.

2. This study found that broader sources of outside or private funding will be an important factor to New Jersey community colleges in the future. Further research should be done that focuses on private funding sources and corporate sponsorships and how community colleges can identify and take advantage of these sources.

3. This study identified new technology as a key factor that will have major implications for community college growth and curriculum enhancement. Further study should be done to identify those technologies that are recognized as best practices that could be most expeditiously implemented within the community college environment.

4. An assessment tool should be developed to help identify community college student interests, education needs, and career development needs, based on changing times. Such a tool might help community colleges strategically plan future curriculum, technology, and faculty requirements.

REFERENCES

Alfred, R. L. (1998). Redesigning community colleges to compete for the future.

Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 22 (4), 315-333.

Allison, G.T. (1971). Essence of decision: Explaining the Cuban missile crisis. Boston:

Little, Brown.

American Association of Community Colleges AACC. (2005). Retrieved September

2005 from www.aacc.nche.edu

American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2005). Retrieved June 3, 2005

from www.aaup.org/statements.

Anderson, R.E. (1977). Strategic policy changes in private colleges. New York:

Teachers College Press.

Birnbaum, R. (1988). How colleges work: The cybernetics of academic

organization and leadership. Needham Heights, MA: Simon & Schuster.

Brown, C. (2000). Organization & governance. ASHE Reader Series.

Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Burlington County College (2005). Retrieved November 21, 2005 from www.bcc.nj.edu.

Cisco Network Systems Corporation. (2005). Retrieved June 2005 from

www.cisco.com.

Cohen, A., & Brawer, F. (1996). The American community college. New York:

McGraw Hill.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., & Olsen, J.P. (1972). Garbage can model of organizational

choice. *Administrative Science Quarterl, 16* (1), 37-38. Boston, MA: Pearson

Custom Publishing.

Community College of Philadelphia (CCP). (2005). Retrieved September 12, 2005

from www.ccp.edu.

Eagan & Marino Corporation (EMC). (2005). Retrieved July 7, 2005 from

www.emc.com.

Erhenberg, R. (2004). *Governing academia.* New York: Cornell University

Press.

French, J.R.P., Jr., & Raven, B. (1959). *Studies in social power.* Ann Arbor: Institute

for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Gloucester County College (2005). Retrieved November 21, 2005 from

www.gcc.nj.edu.

Goldsmith, R. (1999). *The five year assessment of higher education restructuring.*

Trenton, New Jersey.

Goodchild, L. & Wechsler, H. (1997). *The history of higher education.* ASHE

Reader Series. Boston, MA: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Hardy, C. (1990). *Putting power into university governance.* New York: Agathon

Press.

IBM Corporation. (2005). Retrieved July 2, 2005 from www.ibm.com.

Levin, J.S. (2001). *Globalizing the community college: Strategies for change in the*

twenty-first century. New York: Palgrave.

Levin, S., Levin, J., & Beull, J. (2002). Curriculum, technology, and educational reform. *Tech Trends, 46* (3), 8 - 30.

McData Technologies Corporation. (2005). Retrieved June 21, 2005 from www.mcdata.com.

New Jersey Institute of Technology (NJIT). (2005). Retrieved November 21, 2005 from www.njit.edu/publicinfo/

Pfeffer, J. (1994). *Managing with power: Politics and influence in organizations.* Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Ritzer, G. (1998). *The McDonaldization thesis: Exploration and tensions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tierney, W. (2004). *Competing conceptions of academic governance: Negotiating the perfect storm.* Baltimore, MD: The John's Hopkins University Press.

Tierney, W. (1993). Critical leadership and decision making in a postmodern world. In M.C. Brown (Ed.). *Organization and governance in higher education (* 5th ed., pp. 537-540). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

APPENDIX A

Stakeholder Survey

Attitudes About Academic Governance in New Jersey Community Colleges

This survey is being administered as part of a master's degree research project. While your participation is voluntary and you are not required to answer any of the questions herein, your cooperation and participation are important to the success of the project and are greatly appreciated. If you choose to participate, please understand that all responses are strictly confidential and no personally identifiable information is being requested.

This survey measures your attitudes towards the current state of academic governance within community colleges, the potential for change in the structure of community college governance, and the impact that funding and technology may have on the future of community college governance structure.

Section I – Background Information:
Please fill out each section as it pertains to yourself and your position within the college.

Age:_____   Male:_____   Female:_____

Education: Bachelor's degree:_____   Master's degree:_____   Doctoral degree:_____

Current Position:_____

How many years in this position:_____

How many years experience as a community college administrator:_____

How many years experience as a community college faculty member:_____

Section II – Attitudes about Academic Governance in Community Colleges:
As an administrator or faculty member, the following questions reflect your attitude about the state of academic governance within the community college environment and how potential changes may impact the structure of community college governance over the next decade.

Listed below are statements that reflect attitudes towards academic governance within community colleges in southern New Jersey. For each statement circle whether you: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), or Strongly Disagree (SD).

1. The current community college governing structure is adequate, as it exists today.
   (SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

2. Government funding to community colleges will continue at current levels.
   (SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

3. Community college administrators and faculty should maintain the status quo when it comes to their professional relationship.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

4. Private funding for community colleges will be an important source in the future.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

5. Faculty and administrators should have equal share of authority and decision-making in financial matters.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

6. Faculty and administrators need to interact more frequently.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

7. Decisions impacting college growth should be made by both administrators and faculty.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

8. Advancements in technology are important to community colleges.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

9. Student enrollment will impact the level of technology needed in the future.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

10. Broader sources of funding are necessary for community colleges.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

11. Government funding will grow as requirements dictate.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

12. Decision-making autonomy for community colleges will become more important in the future.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

13. Shared governance involving all college stakeholders will become an important force in the future.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

14. There should be a consistent and direct communication link between administrators, faculty, and the student body.
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

15. Community colleges have improved since the *1994 New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act.*
(SA)   (A)   (U)   (D)   (SD)

16. Funding for technology is extremely important.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

17. More changes are needed by state government to improve higher education in New Jersey.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

18. New Jersey community colleges suffered from the *1994 New Jersey Higher Education Restructuring Act.*
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

19. Most of the students attending community colleges desire to eventually complete a bachelor's degree.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

20. The current governance structure in New Jersey community colleges should stay the same.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

21. Technology plays a key role in the growth of community colleges.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

22. A new form of governance should be implemented that involves all stakeholders in the decision-making process.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

23. A shared governing structure is most effective in managing a community college.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

24. There is little interest in technology by college administrators.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

25. New Jersey community colleges should equally share decision-making processes between alumni, faculty, and administrators.
    (SA)   **(A)**   **(U)**   **(D)**   **(SD)**

APPENDIX B

In-person Interview Questions

Academic Governance Study

Questions for stakeholders during in-person interview:

1. What do you think about the current structure of academic governance in New Jersey community colleges?

2. What changes need to be made in the current academic governance structure?

3. In your opinion what are the top 3 issues facing community colleges in New Jersey?

4. What recommendations would you make about improving decision-making in New Jersey community colleges?

5. What recommendations would you suggest for improving communications within New Jersey community colleges?

6. What primary technology or technological advance do you feel will play the biggest role in the future of New Jersey community colleges?

APPENDIX C

Letter of Introduction

George J. Hakun
12 Langley Drive
Sewell, New Jersey 08080
#(609) 670-7964
georgehakun@alumni.rowan.edu

Dear Faculty or Staff Member:

I am in the process of completing my master's degree in higher education at Rowan University. I am asking for your assistance in collecting data for my thesis on understanding the attitudes towards academic governance in New Jersey community colleges. I will be scheduling an interview with several faculty and staff administrators and as part of the interview I will ask that the attached survey be completed. Your response is critical to ensure the validity of the survey results.

It is my hope that the information collected here will provide valuable insights into the attitudes held by academics and decision makers toward the current structure of academic governance and the changes that various forces might bring to the future structure of community college governance in New Jersey.

Thank you in advance and if you have any questions about this research please feel free to contact Dr. Burton Sisco (856-256-4500 ext. 3717) my academic program advisor or me directly.

Sincerely,

George J. Hakun

APPENDIX D

Letter of Consent

Informed Consent Form

I agree to participate in a research project entitled "A Study of the Changing Complexion of Academic Governance in New Jersey Community Colleges", which is being conducted by George Hakun as an assignment in partial fulfillment of the Master's Degree in Higher Education Administration. The purpose of this study is to explore the forces that may have a changing affect on the governance structure within New Jersey community colleges. The data collected in this study will be combined with data from previous studies, as well as research, and will be submitted as part of a research paper.

I understand that my responses will be anonymous and that all the data gathered will be confidential. I agree that any information obtained from this study may be used in any way thought best for publication or education provided that I am in no way identified and my name is not used.

I understand that there are no physical or psychological risks involved in this study, and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

I understand that my participation does not imply employment with the state of New Jersey, Rowan University, the principal investigator, or any other project facilitator.

If I have any questions or problems concerning my participation in this study I may contact George Hakun at (856) 582-2443 or Dr. Burt Sisco at (856) 256-3717.

(Signature of Participant)   (Date)

(Signature of Investigator)   (Date)

APPENDIX E

IRB Survey Instrument Approval

Rowan University
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
HUMAN RESEARCH REVIEW APPLICATION

INSTRUCTIONS: Check all appropriate boxes, answer all questions completely, include attachments, and obtain appropriate signatures. Submit an **original and two copies** of the completed application to the Office of the. Associate Provost for Research Expediter(s): Be sure to make a copy for your files.

FOR IRB USE ONLY:
Protocol Number: IRB- 2006 - 005
Received:_____ Reviewed:_____
Exemption: _X_ Yes ___ No
Category(ies):_____
Approved _____ (date) 1/20/06

Step 1: Is the proposed research subject to IRB review?

All research involving human participants conducted by Rowan University faculty and staff is subject to IRB review. Some, but not all, student-conducted studies that involve human participants are considered research and are subject to IRB review. Check the accompanying instructions for more information. Then check with your class instructor for guidance as to whether you must submit your research protocol for IRB review. If you determine that your research meets the above criteria and is not subject to IRB review, **STOP.** You do not need to apply. If you or your instructor have any doubts, apply for an IRB review.

Step 2: If you have determined that the proposed research is subject to IRB review, complete the identifying information below.

Project Title: New Jersey Community College Governance Study

Researcher: ~~George J. Hakun~~

Department: Educational Leadership   Location Rowan University

Mailing Address: ~~12 Langley Drive~~   (Street)
~~Sewell, New Jersey 08080~~-2608   (Town/State/Zip)

E-Mail: georgehakun@alumni.rowan.edu   Telephone: (856)-582-2443

Co-Investigator/s:

Faculty Sponsor (if student)* Dr. Burton Sisco
Department: Educational Leadership Location: Education Building
E-Mail: sisco@rowan.edu   Telephone: 856-256-4500 x3717

Approved For Use by Rowan IRB: 7/04