Title
Enrollment Management and Distributive Leadership in a California Community College

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7r40m42z

Author
Jordan, Matthew Todd

Publication Date
2019

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

Enrollment Management and Distributive Leadership

in a California Community College

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree Doctor of Education

by

Matthew Todd Jordan

2019

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Enrollment Management and Distributive Leadership

in a California Community College

by

Matthew Todd Jordan

Doctor of Education

University of California, Los Angeles, 2019

Professor Christina Christie, Chair

As unemployment rates have declined over the last decade, community college enrollments have also declined (American Association of Community Colleges, 2015; National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017a). Since institutions in the California Community Colleges system are funded based on enrollment, enrollment declines lead to funding reductions for these already cash-strapped institutions. The objective of this research was to understand the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college with a positive enrollment history. The theory of distributed leadership guided the investigation into leadership practices and processes at the institution. A total of 15 semi-structured interviews were conducted with employees at Western Community College (a pseudonym), including six administrators, five faculty members, and four classified staff members. Document analysis

focused on accreditation and enrollment reports, collective bargaining agreements, planning documents, meeting minutes, and the college website.

Three themes emerged from the data: the distribution of leadership, contested top-down leadership, and adaptation to state policy pressures. First, leadership was found to be distributed among senior administrators, deans, department chairs, and Enrollment Management Committee members, but not classified staff members. Followers exerted influence on the leadership around enrollment management. Second, the internal culture of top-down management influenced leadership around enrollment management and was a challenge to the process. And third, adapting to state policy pressures influenced leadership around enrollment management, and administrators saw this as the greatest challenge facing the enrollment management process. The results of this study imply the need for community college administrators to employ collaborative leadership approaches in enrollment management, for campus members to be steadfast in advocating for ethical change, and for system leaders in the California Community Colleges to provide intensive support for colleges adapting to statewide policy changes.

The dissertation of Matthew Todd Jordan is approved.

Diane Durkin

Mark P. Hansen

Robert T. Teranishi

Christina A. Christie, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2019

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents and my husband. My mother, Rafaela Jordan, is a force of nature whose confidence, work ethic, and resilience inspires me. My father, Terry Jordan, is sensitive, reliable, and kindhearted. It was only with their support and teachings that I was able to persevere through this marathon experience. Without the love, kindness, and support of my husband, Michael Nnadi, this study would not have been possible. I dedicate this work to these three seminal figures in my life.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

VITA

2001   B.A., Major in Art

       Yale University

       New Haven, CT

2004   M.F.A., Photography

       University of California, Los Angeles

       Los Angeles, CA

2006   Single Subject Secondary Teaching Credential in Art

       California State University, Northridge

       Northridge, CA

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION

Economic factors strongly influence college enrollment trends. A recent analysis of U.S. unemployment rates and fall semester headcount enrollments at public community colleges revealed that, as unemployment increased, enrollment went up; the reverse was also true—as unemployment decreased, enrollments went down (American Association of Community Colleges [AACC], 2015). The national unemployment rate declined from 9.6 percent in 2010 to 4.9 percent in 2016, which resulted in community colleges nationwide experiencing ongoing enrollment declines (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). In each term between fall 2014 and spring 2017, enrollment at two-year public institutions declined from the prior year—that is, from fall to fall and from spring to spring (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017b). For example, from spring 2014 to spring 2015, two-year public institutions saw their enrollments decline by 4.8 percent. National enrollments have declined at public two-year institutions from 2013 to 2016 by approximately 600,000 students (AACC, 2017).

California has paralleled this trend. The California Community Colleges (CCC) system comprises 114 colleges within 72 districts (California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office [CCCCO], 2017b). Forty-eight out of the 72 districts include a single college, while the remaining 24 are multi-college districts. The colleges within these districts serve 2.1 million students, making the system the largest higher education system in the United States. In fact, one in five U.S. community college students is enrolled in a California community college. More than 68 percent of the students served by the system are non-White, which positions the CCC system as the state's chief mechanism for social mobility for students from

underrepresented and disadvantaged backgrounds. Economic factors significantly affect these students' day-to-day lives, including their decisions about college enrollment.

California mirrors the national unemployment and enrollment trends for two-year colleges. Unemployment rates in California declined from 12.2 percent in 2010 to 4.8 percent in 2017 (State of California Employment Development Department, n.d.). In the 2015–2016 academic year (the most recent year with available finalized enrollment data), 36 percent of CCC districts (26 out of 72) saw declines in their enrollments from the prior year (CCCCO, 2017a).

In addition to a challenging enrollment environment, CCCs are currently struggling to adapt to a series of legislative changes that seek to reform the system to improve student completion. Three of these legislatively mandated initiatives are AB 705, Guided Pathways, and the Student Centered Funding Formula. AB 705 became law in October 2017 with an implementation date of Fall 2019 and required that all incoming students be placed directly into transfer-level English and Math. This is a sea change for the CCC system which began offering remedial classes for "unprepared" students in the late 1990s and early 2000s. In 2017–2018, then-Governor Jerry Brown sought to advance Guided Pathways systemwide in CCC by distributing $150 million to colleges that implemented the initiative (Brown, 2017). Guided Pathways involves (a) restructuring curricula to create clear program pathways; (b) helping students select pathways; (c) supporting them through their progression; and (d) monitoring their learning. The new Student Centered Funding Formula shifted the funding model from one based solely on student enrollments to a hybrid model based on enrollments, demographics, and completion. It is within this evolving context that I set out to study enrollment management leadership at a California community college.

The Problem

The California Community Colleges emerged in the early 20th century as an extension of public high schools (California Postsecondary Education Commission [CPEC], 1998; Little Hoover Commission [LHC], 2012). The 1960 California Master Plan created a tripartite organization for higher education in California consisting of three segments, each with a unique function: the University of California (UC), state colleges (the California State University [CSU] system), and junior colleges (Coons et al., 1960). The junior colleges (later rechristened the California Community Colleges system) offered education up to the 13th- and 14th-grade level in transfer, vocational, and liberal arts courses. The Board of Governors was established in 1967 to oversee the CCC system (LHC, 2012).

As an outgrowth of public high schools, schools within CCC adopted the funding model used by secondary schools, which is based on the number of students and the amount of time they receive instruction (CCCCO, 2017c). The funding model has evolved over time; it is currently in its fourth incarnation, called the Student Centered Funding Formula. The formula bases funding on three factors: instructional time as measured through full-time equivalent students (FTES), counts of low-income students, and performance-based funding as measured through student outcomes (CCCCO, 2018). The ratio for instructional time, low-income student counts, and outcomes in Year 1 of implementation (2018–2019) is 70:20:10; it will shift to 60:20:20 in the final year of implementation (2020–2021). Although the new funding formula decreases the weight of instructional time, it still remains the largest component of the formula and arguably the component that colleges can most readily control.

As noted, districts in the CCC system are largely funded based on the number of FTES[1] that they generate each year. The first year that a district does not match its base FTES—that is, the amount of FTES that the college received funding for in the prior year—it receives stability funding. This means that the difference between the enrollment the district actually achieved and its base FTES is funded (B. A. Dowd & Hardash, 2016). Stabilization prevents a funding decrease in the coming year's budget to allow the district the opportunity to achieve its prior base FTES and to help ease the potential funding loss if the downward trend in enrollment continues. After an initial year of stabilization, the district enters restoration. Restoration lasts a maximum of three years from the year of initial decline and provides a second opportunity for the district to return to its prior base FTES. During restoration, a district does not receive stability funding. If at any point during the three years the district restores its prior base FTES, the restoration period ends. If after three years the district has not returned to its prior enrollment target, then its base FTES is permanently reduced. Thus, since a significant portion of CCC funding is based on enrollment, enrollment declines lead to reduced funding to already underfunded colleges.

Between 1970 and 2006, California public higher education funding became an increasingly smaller percentage of the state budget—from a high of 16.6 percent of total state expenditures to a low of 11.4 percent (Rhoads, Wagoner, & Ryan, 2009). The most dramatic decrease occurred in the 1990s, when it dropped by 19.9 percent in a single decade. This funding

---

[1] FTES is based on the number of instructional hours that a hypothetical full-time college student would attend over a fall and spring term combined (Mullen & Regalado, 2011). A full-time student attends a minimum of 15 hours per week over two 17.5-week terms. Thus, one FTES is equivalent to 525 instructional hours (1 student x 15 hours per week x 2 terms x 17.5 weeks per term = 525). Unlike a simple headcount, FTES provides a method to quantify the amount of instruction that a district provides that factors in both full-time and part-time enrolled students. In other words, one FTES can be generated by a combination of full- and part-time enrollments. FTES is reported at the district level to the CCCCO in the Apportionment Attendance Report, colloquially referred to as the 320 Report. FTES determines both base funding and funding for special programs, such as lottery revenue and various state-funded categorical programs.

decline coincided with the advent of neoliberalism, which was characterized by a shift in the role of government from seeking to address inequality to the role of promoting corporate-friendly open markets. Moreover, funding for CCC institutions is consistently lower than funding for the other educational sectors in California (Bohn, Reyes, & Johnson, 2013; Rhoads et al., 2009). In 2010–2011, funding for each California K–12 student was approximately $7,500, and funding for each UC or CSU student was approximately $15,000. In this same year, California community colleges received only $5,000 per student. The 26 districts on stabilization in 2015–2016 together fell over 35,000 FTES short of enrollment targets (CCCCO, 2017a). This could potentially result in a massive funding reduction to those 26 districts, funding that could otherwise support operations, faculty professional development, and student success initiatives. To prevent these funding declines, colleges hope to optimize their enrollment management processes.

The term *enrollment management* was first used in the mid-1970s by university admissions officers facing a problem: the need to maintain the number of students in the face of declining numbers of high school graduates (Bontrager & Hossler, 2015). Enrollment management is the process used by a college to realize the ideal student recruitment, retention, and graduation rates, which are determined within the context of each institution (Dolence, 1993). The open-access nature of and reliance on state and federal financial aid by community colleges prevents the use of traditional enrollment management strategies used by four-year colleges, such as adjustments to admission criteria and financial aid practices. Instead, community colleges implement enrollment management strategies, which may include the use of data, success and retention strategies, course scheduling practices, modifications to academic

programs (including addition and cancellation of programs), and marketing and outreach techniques, among others.

As colleges mobilize to develop and implement enrollment strategies, leadership practices become essential to their success. Community college leaders have evolved from using a directive approach to a more collaborative style (Kezar, 1998; Sullivan, 2001). Indeed, multiple studies on community college leadership have identified the importance of teamwork (Malm, 2008; Neumann & Bensimon, 1990; Price, Schneider, & Quick, 2016). Distributed leadership, which I discuss next, is one leadership theory that emphasizes teamwork.

Distributed Leadership

There are multiple definitions of distributed leadership (also referred to as team, collaborative, democratic, participative, or shared leadership). One such definition posits that distributed leadership occurs when a team forms to address common goals (Northouse, 2015). An individual comes forward to lead when appropriate, and eventually recedes so another team member can lead in an area to which he or she is well suited. Many authors use the term distributed leadership to generally refer to a leader dispersing leadership across an organization (Adıgüzelli, 2016; Burke, 2010; Grasmick, Davies, & Harbour, 2012; Smylie, Mayrowetz, Murphy, & Louis, 2007). For this study, I draw upon James Spillane's foundational model of distributed leadership (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001).

For Spillane, distributed leadership encompasses more than multiple people sharing leadership (Spillane, 2006). Rather, it is the complex interactions among leaders, followers, and a given situation (Gronn, 2000; Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane, Halverson, & Diamond, 2001). A fundamental assumption of Spillane's model is that a single person does

6

not have all of the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed to perform every leadership function within an organization (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Therefore, to achieve institutional goals, leadership activities must be dispersed among a variety of organizational agents. Spillane calls this the leader plus aspect of distributed leadership.

While the role of leaders is key in distributed leadership practice, equally important are followers and situation. For example, influence in Spillane's model is not a one-way conduit from leader to follower. He understands leadership as a process of influence (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Leaders influence followers; followers influence leaders. Moreover, one's role as leader or follower may shift within different organizational contexts. A positional leader may be a follower depending on the situation. Spillane argues that situation is not a secondary influencer on leadership, but rather a fundamental component that shapes leadership practice (Spillane, 2006). Situation includes institutional routines, practices, and resources, among other factors.

Distributed leadership serves as the theoretical frame for this study. It is singularly appropriate because participatory governance, which is legally mandated for California's community colleges (Community College Reform Act, 1988), structurally requires this leadership model to function well. Both participatory governance and distributive leadership are collaborative models that provide a structure for constituents, regardless of positional authority, to provide leadership.

The Problem Statement

The objective of this research was to understand the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college. I focused specifically on a single college in a

CCC district that has a positive enrollment history. I studied the issues through three research questions, which I list in the next section.

Research Questions

1. What role, if any, does teamwork play in the enrollment management process at a California community college with a positive enrollment history?

    a. What are the different leadership activities practiced around enrollment management, and who performs them?

    b. How do followers contribute to the leadership process around enrollment management?

2. What contextual factors influence leadership as it relates to enrollment management?

    a. What are the internal factors?

    b. What are the external factors?

3. What were the perceived sources of success and challenges in the college's enrollment management process?

Research Design

I employed a qualitative research design in the form of an in-depth case study to understand the processes used by a single college district with a positive enrollment history. Qualitative research is uniquely suited to understand processes, including the people, actions, and events that influence them (Maxwell, 2013). Case study research is an appropriate method when one seeks to understand a contemporary phenomenon that is likely influenced by the specific context of the case (Yin, 2014). Nearly everything on college campuses is shaped by the particular context of the individual campus. Variations between colleges can include differences in faculty cultures; relationships between faculty, staff, and administrators; and available

resources. What works on one campus may fail dismally at another. A qualitative case study supported a close examination of the context at the individual site and how this context influenced leadership around enrollment management.

Research Site and Population

Arguably, multi-college districts are able to balance FTES shortfalls at one of their colleges with FTES increases at other colleges within the district. Since FTES reporting occurs at the district level, this balancing act is obscured in the Apportionment Attendance Report—the document used by a district to report FTES to CCCCO that is colloquially referred to as the 320 Report. For these reasons, I focused on a single-college district. I utilized a purposeful selection approach when choosing the site. To identify single-college districts with a positive enrollment history, I identified those that increased their FTES generation from the academic years 2013–2014 to 2016–2017, a time of systemwide enrollment declines. Colleges that were able to buck the national trend of shrinking enrollments during this time may have been able to do so because of enrollment management leadership, which is the focus of this study. I conducted a document analysis of accreditation reports to verify that the colleges had a participatory governance structure in place. I ranked the remaining colleges by the percentage FTES increase from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017. I then contacted the colleges in rank order until a college agreed to participate.

Data Collection Strategies

Data collection strategies included interviews and document analysis. I conducted a total of 15 interviews with individuals including the administrator who leads enrollment management at the college, other administrators who participate in enrollment management, faculty, classified staff, and those who served on enrollment management committees. I also reviewed

apportionment reports submitted by the district to the state, institutional plans pertaining to enrollment and overall strategy, documentation of enrollment management processes and enrollment strategies at the college, and the college website.

Significance of the Research and Public Engagement

The study aimed to shed light on the leadership practices employed at a California community college with a positive enrollment history. As colleges in California—and the entire United States—are experiencing enrollment difficulties, there will be significant interest in the findings. Insights gained from this study can potentially inform college leaders' leadership strategies and enrollment practices, which could lead to stabilized or increased revenues to support student success initiatives and services.

CHAPTER TWO:

LITERATURE REVIEW

Community colleges have experienced substantial enrollment declines in recent years. Among two-year colleges nationwide, enrollments declined 4.3 percent from fall 2015 to fall 2017 (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017a). As the largest system of higher education in the United States, the CCC system has experienced significant financial impacts as a result of these declines (CCCCO, 2017b). This study examined the enrollment practices and role of teamwork in enrollment management at a California community college with a positive enrollment history.

To establish context for the investigation, I begin this chapter with a review of community college funding, including its history of instability and the advent of performance-based funding. Then I explore community college leadership by reviewing participatory governance research and the existing body of leadership research on two-year colleges. Finally, I focus on distributive leadership as a model for cooperative leadership that is well suited for community colleges. I begin this final section with an overview of the existing research on distributive leadership and conclude by describing Spillane's model of distributive leadership, which serves as the theoretical frame of this study.

History of Community College Funding

Community colleges are funded by a mix of federal funds, state funds, local property taxes, student tuition and fees, and other minor assorted sources (Phelan, 2014). The exact mix of funding sources has varied from state to state, reflecting the goals and philosophies of legislatures and the public. Initially, community colleges were funded through either a state board or the K–12 system (Mullin & Honeyman, 2007). The number of community colleges

11

dramatically increased in the mid-20th century as a result of the G.I. Bill, the maturation of baby boomers, and the open-door policy; in the absence of federal guidelines, states began to individually develop funding formulas (Breneman & Nelson, 1981; Mullin & Honeyman, 2007).

In 1950, four states were using funding formulas. The number of states utilizing funding formulas for community college revenue appropriations increased to 16 in 1964, 25 in 1973, 33 in 1992, and 48 in 2007. Through online document review, Mullin and Honeyman (2007) analyzed the funding formulas in these 48 states and created a funding formula typology. While the intent of the many funding formulas is certainly to equitably distribute existing resources, the authors pointed out that they may succeed in only creating the appearance of equity, because they do not address the underlying issue of inadequate community college funding. For example in 2010–2011, California community college students were funded at one-third the rate of UC and CSU students (Rhoads et al., 2009). Inadequate and unstable funding threatens the foundational principles of community college.

The open-door policy of community colleges rests on the American ideals that an educated population is a virtue in civil society, and that individuals should have the opportunity to traverse class boundaries through hard work (Hendrick, Hightower, & Gregory, 2006). Inadequate funding threatens the open-door policy. From 1970 to 2006, higher education spending in California as a percentage of total state expenditures decreased by 5.2 percent (Rhoads et al., 2009). The steepest decline in California higher education funding occurred in the 1990s, coinciding with the advent of neoliberalism. Policies that colleges may implement in response to funding cuts that may weaken the open-door policy include limiting admission to high demand programs, instituting waiting lists for admission, redirecting students into noncredit

programs, prioritizing enrollment, and narrowing community colleges missions (Hendrick et al., 2006).

Collins, Leitzel, Morgan, and Stalcup (1994) surveyed 27 institutions from a stratified random sample in states where the community college state director reported declining revenues as well as either enrollment increases or that the state was looking at potentially limiting enrollment. Of these 27 institutions, 81.3 percent reported they were presently experiencing budget shortfalls. More than three-quarters (77.8 percent) of respondents had received reductions in state funding, while 30.8 percent received local funding reductions. All respondents reported enrollment increases. Nearly 90 percent of the institutions increased tuition and fees. Fluctuations in funding lead to reduced revenue for community colleges who, in turn, raise tuition and fees. Higher fees may discourage enrollment, as lower income students feel these increases most intensely. For example, from 2009 to 2012 (following the onset of the Great Recession), California increased community college tuition by 70 percent and experienced a 12 percent enrollment decline (A. C. Dowd & Shieh, 2014)

Community college funding instability is caused by the interplay of multiple factors, including demographic shifts, fluctuations in state aid, incentive-based funding from states and the federal government that is not sustained, unfunded mandates, rising costs, and fluctuations in the economy (Phelan, 2014). Since enrollments are an integral component of most funding formulas, changes in enrollments brought on by economic fluctuations result in significant funding instability for community colleges. Next, I examine the research on the relationship between the economy and enrollments.

Economic influences on enrollment. A common belief among community college administrators is that when the economy is bad, community college enrollment increases, and

vice versa (Betts & McFarland, 1995; Hillman & Orians, 2013; Pennington, McGinty, & Williams, 2002). In an analysis of unemployment and enrollment rates in community colleges from the late 1960s to the mid-1980s, Betts and McFarland (1995) found that enrollment rates rose and fell largely in alignment with downturns and upticks in the unemployment rate. They point out that these unemployment-induced enrollment increases are accompanied by decreases in state appropriations, another effect of a struggling economy. So, when the greatest demand for community college exists, community colleges have the least amount of funding to provide instruction and services. A later study by Pennington et al. (2002) compared national enrollment data with six economic indicators, including the unemployment rate and gross domestic product. The results were consistent with prior research and included a positive correlation between unemployment and enrollment.

Where previous studies aggregated economic indicators and enrollment data to the state or national levels, Hillman and Orians (2013) conducted research using enrollment data at the institutional level and economic data at the local level. Their results confirmed prior studies: They found that a 1 percent increase in unemployment results in an approximate 3.3 percent increase in full-time enrollments and an approximate 1.1 to 1.6 percent increase in part-time enrollments. Additionally, their work extended prior knowledge with its finding that community college enrollments in towns with over 50,000 residents were more responsive than smaller towns to unemployment rate fluctuations.

A positive correlation between unemployment rates and community college enrollments is well established (Betts & McFarland, 1995; Hillman & Orians, 2013; Pennington et al., 2002). This relationship has been clear in the United States in the last decade: The national unemployment rate has decreased every year from 2010 to 2018, and community colleges have

14

experienced a 4.3 percent enrollment decline from 2015 to 2017 (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.; National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017a). As community colleges seek to stave off these enrollment declines, they do so in a highly politicized context with rising demands for accountability.

Neoliberalism and Performance-Based Funding

Calls for higher education accountability have increased since the mid-1960s (Mehta, 2013). This increase is in part a response to a growing public awareness of the underperformance of educational institutions. The public wants publicly funded institutions to produce evidence of the impact of their work (Zumeta, 2011). Thus, lawmakers are moving to address the low completion rates at public colleges (Kirst, 2008). Growing calls for accountability have not occurred in a political vacuum, however; they have grown in concert with a neoliberal-driven demand for performance assessment accompanied by dwindling support for public services like education (Rhoads, Saenz, & Carducci, 2004). This demand is embodied in the ever-growing popularity of performance-based funding, or PBF. While lawmakers appear convinced of the potential of PBF, the research is less optimistic.

Tennessee was the first state to implement PBF, in 1979 (D'Amico, Friedel, Katsinas, & Thornton, 2014). A 2012 survey administered to the members of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges had a near 100 percent response rate and found that 19 states were currently using a PBF model; by 2018, the number was 35 (Hillman, Fryar, & Crespín-Trujillo, 2018). Hillman et al. (2018) examined the effects of PBF on certificate, associate degree, and bachelor's degree completions in two states with developed PBF models—Ohio and Tennessee. They found no positive effects on associate or bachelor's degree productivity, but they did find a positive effect on certificate productivity in community colleges (and a decrease

15

in the awarding of associate degrees). These findings align with the results of a similar analysis in the state of Washington, which concluded that the increase in short-term certificates was an unintended consequence of PBF that is not necessarily positive, as these certificates have less value in the labor market than associate degrees (Hillman, Tandberg, & Fryar, 2015).

An analysis of 1990–2013 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System data from 751 community colleges revealed that, overall, PBF produced no significant changes in short- or medium-term certificates or associate degrees (Li & Kennedy, 2018). However, when a greater degree of funding was tied to the base budget, underrepresented student metrics were included in the formula, or metrics accounted for individual college missions, there was an increase in short-term certificates. These scholars concurred with prior researchers that the increase in short-term certificates is a negative consequence of PBF, as they have limited labor market value. Other research on PBF has found that it may further exacerbate systemic race and income inequities (McKinney & Hagedorn, 2017) and that it may disadvantage small, rural colleges (Thornton & Friedel, 2016).

Neoliberal tendencies have been strong in California. In 2011, the Board of Governors convened a Student Success Task Force to evaluate the CCC system and to recommend ways to improve student completion. In 2012, the task force issued 22 recommendations, many of which were legislatively implemented in the following years. In 2012, the Student Success Act, or Senate Bill (SB) 1456, was the first such legislation. SB 1456 rewards students who make progress toward completion by completing education plans and making satisfactory academic progress with priority registration (Levin, Martin, López Damián, & Hoggatt, 2018). Conversely, when a student does not follow this path to completion, SB 1456 penalizes the institution with reduced funding and the student with loss of priority registration.

One study investigated the ways that three community colleges responded to neoliberal policies between 2000 and 2014 (Levin et al., 2018). The researchers conducted document analysis, observations, and interviews at a single community college in each of three states: California, Washington, and Hawaii. The findings from the California case are most relevant to this discussion. Levin and colleagues identified the 2012 Student Success Act and accrediting agency requirements for student learning outcomes assessment as prime examples of neoliberal policies that move the community college mission away from access and toward a business-like focus on efficiency and completion. The authors found that the college employees resentfully complied with the new mandates because they were tied to funding, but they did not accept or support them. They also observed that, in response to the new policies, the college increased class sizes and began to focus on completion rather than instructional quality. They concluded that this resulted in the college no longer being able to fulfill its mission to the community.

In spite of the research on the lackluster outcomes of PBF and the many critics of neoliberal policies, continued calls for accountability endure. In July 2018, California implemented PBF for its community colleges (CCCCO, 2018). Beginning in the 2018–2019 academic year, a new funding formula was phased in that shifts from solely enrollment based to three components: enrollments, counts of low-income students, and outcomes. When fully implemented in the 2020–2021 academic year, enrollments will account for 60 percent of funding, while counts of low-income students and outcomes will each account for 20 percent of funding.

One study supports this new formula's mix of both equity and efficiency goals. Specifically, Melguizo, Witham, Fong, and Chi (2017) conducted simulations of four funding formulas using California community college data to evaluate the formulas in relation to equity

and efficiency. They defined efficiency as the production of student outcomes and equity as the distribution of resources to those with the greatest need. The four funding formulas included versions that were primarily efficiency focused, primarily equity focused, and hybrids. They found that a hybrid model that balances outcomes performance indicators with consideration of the numbers of disadvantaged students is most likely to result in funding adequacy for community colleges. While their study provides tentative grounds for optimism when considering California's new funding model, continued attention and study are needed to evaluate its effects. As the funding landscape changes, community college leaders will need to employ effective leadership practices to guide their institutions. I discuss these practices next.

Community College Leadership

Considering the substantial challenges posed by a long history of unstable and inadequate funding, successful leadership at community colleges is key. To understand the environment in which community college leadership occurs, one must first become cognizant of participatory governance. In this section, I provide a brief history of participatory governance before reviewing the research on its challenges. Then, I provide a survey of the literature on community college leadership.

A Brief Overview of Participatory Governance

Participatory or shared governance in higher education stems from the work of faculty professional organizations in the early 20th century (Burke, 2010; Pierce, 2014). The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was formed in 1914 in response to several encroachments on academic freedom (Pierce, 2014). In the following year, the AAUP issued its *1915 Declaration of Principles on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure,* which laid out the

concept that boards, presidents, and faculty members should share in the governance of colleges (Joughin, 1969).

Over the last one hundred years, participatory governance has come to refer to the processes and structures by which various constituent groups (faculty, students, and classified staff) participate in decision making. Constituents make recommendations to the college president through participatory governance committees. In 1988, the passage of AB 1725 required the Board of Governors to establish guidelines for faculty, staff, and students to participate in community college decision making (Community College Reform Act, 1988). In Title 5, Section 53200, of the California Code of Regulation, the Board of Governors identified 11 areas in which boards of trustees were to "consult collegially" with academic senates, including curriculum, governance structures, program review, and any other area that a governing board and faculty senate agreed upon. While the intent of governance changes in AB 1725 was to improve community college effectiveness, at times they have had the opposite effect: Constituent groups have been driven apart, rather than brought together (Schuetz, 1999). To understand this effect, I will next examine the research on the challenges of participatory governance.

Challenges of Participatory Governance

Stresses surrounding the governance of colleges and universities have existed at least since the beginning of the 19th century (Pierce, 2014). Over time, these challenges have evolved and been documented in the literature. In this section I discuss several key challenges in participatory governance, including economic and political pressures, as well as the effects of increased use of adjunct faculty and faculty members' perceptions of this governance model.

Economic pressures. Economic recessions, most recently experienced in the 2007–2012 Great Recession, have dramatically impacted funding for community colleges. These downturns in the economy, which led to funding reductions for public colleges, have led some presidents to circumvent consultative processes by making unilateral decisions (Pierce, 2014). Difficult decisions about program prioritization and discontinuance strain the collaborative intent of participatory governance, pitting program members, constituent groups, and administrators against each other. Although these situations are trying, one study established that participatory governance can be effective in making difficult decisions for the institution (Eckel, 2000). Using an interest-group framework, Eckel performed four case studies at research universities that had discontinued at least one program in the last seven years. The research indicated that participatory governance was an effective vehicle to make high-stakes decisions and that faculty members did participate constructively in these decisions.

Political pressures. A "conservative restoration" in education has advanced in U.S. politics because of the alliance of various factions, including neoliberals and neoconservatives (Apple, 1999, p. 59). This restoration is founded on the assumptions that our current educational institutions are failing and that the only path to recovery is through increased efficiency and responsiveness to the private sector. It is characterized by an emphasis on standards and testing in an era of declining educational funding. Although this conservative restoration is in part driven by the fear of losing the nation's place in the world and by the unstated goal of maintaining existing racial, gender, and income inequalities, its calls for accountability persist nonetheless.

Compared to K–12, higher education has been historically insulated from the accountability movement for a variety of reasons, chief among them its higher degree of

professionalization (Mehta, 2013). Professionalization, or the degree to which a profession is able to internally organize and regulate itself, functions as a tool to hold external critics at bay and fosters the public perception that, to operate effectively, higher education must be allowed to self-govern. Self-government in higher education is manifested in participatory governance.

Although higher education has traditionally fared better than K–12 in repelling calls for accountability, its ability to successfully do so has eroded over the last 50 years. Higher education institutions have been called to answer rising questions about their effectiveness, which has problematized participatory governance on campuses (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Growing calls for accountability have led boards of trustees to micromanage the work of administrators and faculty (Pierce, 2014). A byproduct of accountability is an unstated, but perceived, atmosphere of blame and mistrust, which complicates effective collaboration on college campuses. This is felt most strongly by faculty members, who often perceive the accountability movement as an implicit criticism of their effectiveness in the classroom. Adjunct faculty are perhaps the largest and most vulnerable group of faculty members.

Increased use of adjunct faculty. Tenure-track faculty positions have declined while adjunct faculty positions have grown (Kezar, Lester, & Anderson, 2006). As the numbers of adjunct faculty members increase, shared governance may be compromised, as these faculty members are historically not allowed to participate in governance (Kezar, Lester, & Anderson, 2006; Pierce, 2014). In one case study at a college that had experienced dramatic growth in the number of adjunct faculty members and was considering increasing their role in governance, it was observed that some full-time faculty members questioned their adjunct counterparts' independence from administration and identity as faculty members (Kezar et al., 2006). This creates a complex problem: Numbers of adjunct faculty members are growing, and tenured

faculty members are largely the decisionmakers on whether adjuncts are allowed to participate in participatory governance, yet the tenured faculty members do not trust the allegiance of their adjunct colleagues. Kezar et al. advocated that these stereotypes of adjunct faculty members must be challenged to create new governance structures reflective of the faculty at large. In addition to tenured faculty members' perceptions of adjuncts, faculty perceptions of participatory governance are another obstacle.

Faculty perceptions of participatory governance. Faculty members across institutional types perceive that a business management model is eroding the collaborative model (Pierce, 2014). To better understand faculty perceptions of participatory governance 10 years after it was implemented by AB 1725, Piland and Bublitz (1998) collected surveys from faculty in a randomly selected group of 25 California community colleges. On one hand, some of the results indicated an understanding of the governance model: Faculty members accepted that participatory governance was about collaboration, not control by a single group. However, some of the results revealed confusion surrounding the model. For example, faculty members were undecided on whether participatory governance meant that the board of trustees and faculty had equal roles in decision making. In fact, AB 1725 requires that faculty members be consulted on academic and professional matters; it does not give them broad decision-making power. Confusion on this issue leads to power struggles and conflict.

Another survey found that while faculty perceive that participatory governance facilitates cooperation with administration, faculty members are not adequately rewarded for their participation (Miller, Vacik, & Benton, 1998). When power struggles arise in participatory governance, many look to structural solutions for improvement. Research reveals this is largely

22

ineffective in repairing these rifts (Kezar & Eckel, 2004). Instead of structural solutions, effective leadership strategies are needed to address this unique context.

Empirical Study of Community College Leadership

According to Sullivan (2001), there have been four generations of community college leaders. The first generation of leaders comprised the founding fathers who led community colleges during the years of their creation at the beginning of the 20th century. The second generation led community colleges through the time of rapid expansion and growth that began in the post-World War II era. These first two generations were primarily men with doctorates who were White, married, and in their 50s. They exhibited directive leadership styles and favored hierarchical organizational structures. The third generation, which had ascended by the early 1990s, was significantly more diverse in terms of ethnicity, race, and gender, and they employed a collaborative leadership style. Sullivan observed a fourth generation emerging in the early 2000s. These leaders largely maintained the collaborative leadership style and diversity of the third generation, but they exhibited a greater awareness of workforce development. This aligns with neoliberal approaches to education that were popularized in the preceding decades.

Most of the research on community college leadership has focused on the role of presidents. Neumann and Bensimon (1990) qualitatively explored the leadership of college and university presidents. They conducted extensive interviews with the presidents of eight universities, eight state colleges, eight community colleges, and eight independent colleges; they also interviewed other campus leaders to gather contextual information. Although they could not establish causality, they found that presidents of institutions that were relatively fiscally stable were more connected to their institutions and more likely to delegate responsibilities to

institutional members; faculty morale was also higher at these presidents' colleges. Delegating responsibility is akin to sharing responsibility and a collaborative approach.

Other studies of community colleges have established a connection between community college leadership and teamwork (Malm, 2008; Price, Schneider, & Quick, 2016). Malm (2008), for example, applied a qualitative ethnomethodological approach in his 2008 study. He interviewed six Maryland community college presidents on organizational change and leadership, asking about organizational challenges, their change processes, and their leadership approaches. Collectively, the six presidents identified three leadership approaches; only one was identified by all six—collaborative leadership. The presidents recounted collaborative leadership actions, including soliciting multiple perspectives, building consensus, trusting, and maintaining flexibility.

Similarly, in their quantitative study examining the leadership style of community college presidents, Price et al. (2016) found that a focus on people and teamwork was key. They surveyed all 58 community college presidents in the North Carolina Community College System. The survey contained items from the Blake and Mouton Managerial Grid, which measures a respondent's perception of their concern for people as well as their concern for production. Based on survey item responses, respondents were grouped into one of five leadership styles contained in the grid. Forty-one surveys were returned, for a response rate of 70.7 percent. One hundred percent of the North Carolina community college presidents perceived themselves as having the team management leadership style, with a high concern for people and a high concern for production. The authors theorized that this could be a result of the requisite qualities to be an effective community college president—namely, that they must be people oriented to build

effective relationships on campus (especially in a participatory governance environment) and they must be production oriented to be responsive to community and economic needs.

Unlike the aforementioned research, a study by Tedrow and Rhoads (1999) illustrated that a relational approach could be a liability for women leaders. They interviewed 30 female senior community college administrators. The data were examined through the frames of instrumental (rational, strategic, male-associated) and relational (inclusive, collaborative, female-associated) leadership styles. The researchers identified three types of responses to gender expectations among the women leaders: adaptation (instrumental), reconciliation (instrumental or relational dependent on context), and resistance (relational). Regardless of the type, the researchers concluded that gender expectations psychologically and emotionally burden women leaders because they must constantly negotiate and react within a male-dominated environment.

Other research has examined how specific leadership theories and strategies play out in two-year colleges. Community college presidents' understanding of and approaches to leadership constantly evolve as they learn from their experiences (Eddy, 2005). Appreciative inquiry strategies that focus on what works best within an organization may facilitate the transition process from a community college leader to their successor (Royer & Latz, 2016). Community college presidents who practice reflective leadership seek personal growth through being mindful of their internal and external environments (Stoeckel & Davies, 2007). Anticipatory leadership strategies like engaging others and leader communication are essential to facilitating change at the community college (Johnson & Jones, 2018).

Unlike all of the prior research noted above, Pate and Angell (2013) approached the topic of community college administrative leadership from the vantage point of faculty members. To determine the factors that community college faculty consider important in academic leadership,

they administered a survey to all full-time faculty at six of the 16 Kentucky community colleges. Faculty returned 162 surveys, for a response rate of 21.2 percent. The top five most important academic leadership attributes for faculty were communication, honesty, integrity, listening, and ethical behavior. Faculty rated blaming others, being dishonest, taking credit for others' ideas, unethical behavior, and a poor work ethic as the biggest mistakes an academic administrator could make. These potential mistakes speak to the pitfalls for community college leaders in a participatory governance setting.

At the transition into the 21st century, there was a gradual shift from hierarchical forms of leadership to more participative models (Kezar, 1998). At the same time, however, there was a growing consensus that participatory governance was not effective (Kezar, 2004; Kezar & Eckel, 2004). The common sense solution was to fundamentally transform governance structures and formal processes; in a comprehensive review of the literature on governance from the 1960s to 2004, Kezar and Eckel (2004) argued that previous scholarship has over-emphasized structural theories, which emphasize organization, authority, reporting lines, and procedures. The literature shows that governance structure has little effect on outcomes or effectiveness, however. Furthermore, case study research has shown that trust, leadership, and relationships are the determining factors in the effectiveness of participatory governance (Kezar, 2004). One leadership model that facilitates the development of relationships and trust is distributed leadership (Adıgüzelli, 2016; Coleman, 2012; Smylie et al., 2007). I discuss this next.

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership goes by many names. It is sometimes referred to as collaborative, democratic, or shared leadership. A single definition of distributed leadership is elusive, as

26

various researchers and authors use it in distinct ways. It is common, however, to see *distributed leadership* generally used to refer to a leader dispersing leadership across an organization (Adıgüzelli, 2016; Burke, 2010; Grasmick et al., 2012; Smylie et al., 2007). In this section I provide an overview of the research on distributive leadership; I conclude with a description of James Spillane's model of distributed leadership, which serves as the theoretical frame for this study.

Research on Distributed Leadership

In a comprehensive survey of the scholarly work on distributed leadership, Mayrowetz (2008) observed that its usage has evolved into varied applications that make comparison of the research problematic. The model of distributed leadership initially established by Peter Gronn and James Spillane, working separately, in the early 2000s, was a descriptive framework used to describe leadership activities as the interaction between leaders who were dispersed throughout the organization, followers, and contextual factors (Gronn, 2000; Spillane, 2006; Spillane et al., 2001). Later usages abandoned this clear theoretical model and instead used the general notion of sharing leadership as a means to accomplish various goals (Mayrowetz, 2008). The three strains of this usage are distributed leadership as a means to (a) promote democracy in organizations, (b) increase efficiency and effectiveness, and (c) build capacity among organizational members. As none of the usages have yet established a link to improving outcomes (Harris, 2004; Mayrowetz, 2008), Mayrowetz advocated that all of the strains should continue to work toward empirical evidence that supports their ability to improve outcomes.

Much of the research into distributive leadership has investigated its connection to instruction. Distributing leadership to teacher leaders facilitates instructional change because teachers are more likely to access support from fellow teachers (Camburn & Han, 2009).

27

Distributed leadership supports capacity building among teachers (Harris, 2004) and positively affects their self-efficacy and morale (MacBeath, 1988; Mitchell & Sackney, 2000). An evaluation of the Quality Teaching Action Learning program in Australia included 82 primary and secondary schools. The researchers found that distributed leadership was a prerequisite for teacher action learning as well as an outcome of engaging in action learning (Dinham, 2009). While much research has examined the interaction between distributive leadership and instruction, clear links between distributive leadership and student learning outcomes have yet to be established (Harris, 2004; Mayrowetz, 2008).

Another vein of distributive leadership research has examined the roles of principals and school districts. School principals share leadership in their areas of responsibility with other managers and with teachers who have no formal leadership positions (Spillane, 2006; Spillane, Camburn, & Pareja, 2009). Teacher leaders and districts share leadership for providing instructional materials, monitoring instruction, and developing teachers (Spillane et al., 2009). One study investigated how formal school leaders built capacity for distributive leadership in their schools (Klar, Huggins, Hammonds, & Buskey, 2016). The authors found that school principals with reputations for fostering leadership capacity among formal and informal leaders intentionally took actions that could be categorized in four phases: identifying leaders, creating leadership opportunities, facilitating role transition, and providing continual support. This study highlights the importance of leadership development for school leaders if distributive leadership is to be successful.

Several studies have examined the relationship between distributive leadership and the school environment. One case study investigated the relationship between distributive leadership and social justice and found strong linkages between the leadership model and participants'

perceptions of participative justice in the school (Woods & Roberts, 2016). Teachers'
perceptions of the presence of distributive leadership and how specifically leadership was
distributed were found to be a significant predictor of academic optimism—that is, the collective
belief at a school that students can meet high academic standards (Cansoy & Parlar, 2018;
Mascall, Leithwood, Strauss, & Sacks, 2009).

Using Spillane's model for distributed leadership as a theoretical frame, a study used
2013 Teaching and Learning International Survey (TALIS) data to explore the effects of school
context and school employee characteristics on distributed leadership (Liu, Bellibas, & Printy,
2018). Based on principal and teacher survey responses from over 6,000 secondary schools in
34 countries, mutual respect was found to be an antecedent condition for distributed leadership.
Likewise, multiple studies have established a relationship between distributed leadership and a
culture of trust (Adıgüzelli, 2016; Cansoy & Parlar, 2018; Coleman, 2012; Smylie et al., 2007)

Most of the existing research on distributive leadership in educational settings has
examined how leadership activities are distributed in primary and secondary schools. There is
scant research on distributed leadership in community colleges, and I have located no research
on distributed leadership around enrollment management. Thus, this study will fill a gap in the
literature by exploring the role of distributive leadership in enrollment management at a
California community college. As mentioned above, researchers have used various approaches
to the investigation of distributed leadership. For this study, I employed James Spillane's
foundational model of distributive leadership, which, as I discuss next, is singularly useful as a
tool to evaluate leadership in practice.

Spillane's Model of Distributed Leadership

Distributive leadership is a schema for understanding leadership and management (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). According to Spillane, it comprises two components: the "leader plus" aspect and the practice aspect. The leader plus aspect acknowledges that leadership is an activity performed by people in formal leadership positions as well as by those who are not in such positions. The distributive leadership framework requires examination of who performs which leadership functions and cautions against only examining the work of those in official leadership positions. The practice aspect, of course, focuses on the practice of leadership, but conceives of practice as the interplay between leaders, followers, and a given situation (Gronn, 2000; Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007; Spillane et al., 2001).

Leaders. Distributive leadership assumes that a single actor does not possess all of the skills, knowledge, and capacity to perform all or even the majority of leadership activities necessary in an organization (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). These leadership activities must be shared with various actors in the organization to achieve institutional goals. There are three ways that leadership is distributed: collaboratively, collectively, and in a coordinated way. Collaborated distribution involves multiple leaders working jointly at the same time and place, for example in a participatory governance enrollment management committee meeting to review data and to plan. In contrast, collective distribution does not take place with the actors simultaneously together. Rather, with collective distribution, various leaders perform leadership activities toward accomplishing a common goal at different times and contexts, yet their actions are interdependent. For example, an academic administrator may be tasked with providing leadership on enrollment management. One component of this would include training department chairs. Those department chairs also demonstrate leadership in enrollment

management when they work with faculty in their department by informing them of the needed actions and explaining why the actions are necessary. The quality of the department chairs' leadership is partially dependent on the quality of the academic administrator's leadership; both are equally important in achieving the goals.

Coordinated distribution occurs when leadership activities are broken down into a series of sequential steps performed by differing actors. For instance, to make data-based enrollment decisions, data are generated by a research office; the data are then validated and refined by an academic administrator who oversees enrollment management; and, finally, department chairs and additional academic administrators use the data to produce class schedules. Leadership within the distributive model can be shared in these three manners. Regardless of how leadership is shared, followers are an integral part of constructing leadership.

Followers. Spillane's chosen definition of leadership is as a process of influence, specifically when organizational leaders influence the actions, knowledge, and practice of others within the organization—that is, their followers (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007). The roles of leader and follower are not fixed, however (Spillane & Diamond, 2007). Organizational members' roles will shift, dependent upon the situation. How they behave in context-specific situations determines if and how they are perceived as leaders; followers designate leaders as such based on how the followers see them (Spillane, Hallett, & Diamond, 2003). Thus, followers are as vital a part of leadership practice as leaders, and as a third factor, situation (Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

Situation. It is a logical assumption that situation influences leadership. The distributive model, however, holds that situation is not simply an external influencer of leadership, but rather is a fundamental component of leadership (Spillane, 2006; Spillane & Diamond, 2007).

Situation defines how and what the leader does as well as how followers perceive leader actions. Situation includes institutional routines, practices, and resources, among other factors. Oftentimes, the execution of leadership involves the leader shaping routines, practices, and resources. In this regard, situation does not influence leadership but rather defines it.

There is a natural relationship between distributive leadership and participatory governance (Burke, 2010). They both decentralize power and responsibilities. Distributive leadership accomplishes this decentralization by allowing for multiple leaders; participatory governance achieves it through the inclusion of constituent groups in the decision-making process. Because California community college enrollment management occurs within the campus environment, which is largely defined by participatory governance, it is appropriate that this investigation used distributed leadership as a lens through which to analyze enrollment management processes and the implementation of related strategies.

Conclusion

As the U.S. economy has recovered from the Great Recession, the unemployment rate has gradually declined (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). An improved economy has led to shrinking national community college enrollments (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2017a). Since funding in California's community colleges is based on enrollments, this has led to funding declines across the CCC system (CCCCO, 2017b). While colleges seek to improve their enrollment performance, they do so in the unique context of participatory governance. Because of its focus on collaboration, distributed leadership theory is well suited to an examination of enrollment management processes and leadership in a participatory governance setting (Burke, 2010; Malm, 2008; Sullivan, 2001). Considering the financial strain enrollment declines inflict on already financially burdened colleges and the limited research on

32

distributive leadership in the community college, this study contributes needed information on

the strategies and leadership that have been used by a single California community college with a

positive enrollment history. It is my intent that this research be used to strengthen California

community colleges.

CHAPTER THREE:

RESEARCH METHODS

The objective of this research was to understand the role of teamwork in enrollment management at a California community college with a positive enrollment history. Drawing from interviews with key college stakeholders and from document analysis, and guided by the theory of distributed leadership, I investigated the leadership practices and processes at this institution. In the current chapter I describe the research methods and reflect on related ethical issues and on the credibility and trustworthiness of the findings.

Research Design and Rationale

To explore the guiding research questions (outlined in Chapter One), I employed a qualitative research design in the form of an in-depth case study. Qualitative research is uniquely suited to understand processes, including the people, actions, and events that influence them (Maxwell, 2013). Case studies are most appropriate when asking "how" or "why" questions about contemporary events that the researcher has no control over (Yin, 2014). Case study research involves investigating a chosen phenomenon in depth, in its real world context. Examining the phenomenon in the real world context is particularly important when the boundary between phenomenon and context is unclear (Yin, 2014), as is the case here.

What occurs on college campuses is shaped by the specific context of the individual campus. Variations between campuses can include differences in the cultures of constituents; relationships between faculty, staff, and administrators; available resources; and other elements. What works on one campus may fail dismally at another. A qualitative case study supported a close examination of the contexts at the individual site and how these contexts influenced leadership around enrollment management (Yin, 2014).

A distinctive feature of qualitative case studies is their ability to access the perspectives of the participants (Yin, 2014). Understanding how participants made meaning of what occurred on their campus and how their perspectives influenced their attitudes and behaviors provided a nuanced view; the distinctions this provided are needed, as college campuses have multiple constituent groups with oftentimes opposing cultures, values, and goals.

Strategies of Inquiry

Site Selection

The CCC system includes single- and multi-college districts. In multi-college districts, enrollment management and participatory governance practices can vary significantly between colleges. Moreover, multi-college districts are able to balance an FTES shortfall at one college with FTES increases at other colleges within the district. Since FTES reporting occurs at the district level, this balancing act is obscured in Apportionment Attendance Reports. For these reasons, I focused on a single-college district.

I utilized a purposeful selection approach to select the site for this study. Selecting a unique site is a type of purposeful selection that is valuable for its potential to glean useful information (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Considering that, as of June 2018, 81 percent of CCC districts had been on stabilization in one of the last two years, a district that had not experienced enrollment declines was atypical (Hope, 2018a). To identify single-college districts with positive enrollment histories, I isolated those that increased their FTES generation from academic year 2013–2014 to 2016–2017, a time of systemwide enrollment declines. I reviewed Apportionment Attendance Reports (also known as 320 Reports) from this time frame. Districts submit four such reports for a given fiscal year: the first Principal Apportionment Report (P1) is due on January 15 for the current fiscal year; the second (P2) is due in mid- to late April for the

current fiscal year; the Annual Report is due on July 15 for the current fiscal year; and the

Recalculation Report is due in February of the year following the fiscal year. Because P1 and P2

are submitted during the fiscal year that is being reported on, districts submit a combination of

actual and projected enrollment numbers. Each subsequent report after P1 allows the college to

correct enrollment estimates in prior reports. The Recalculation Report provides the final

opportunity to correct enrollment numbers for a fiscal year. Enrollment reporting for a fiscal

year is not finalized until the Recalculation Report is submitted. As such, I only examined

Recalculation Reports because they were most likely to be accurate.

The four academic years from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017 provided a suitable time frame

because of what was happening to enrollments. In spring 2013, the CCC system received

increased funding from the state—funds that were available as the result of the recovery from the

Great Recession, which occurred in the United States from 2007 to 2009. This allowed colleges

the flexibility to implement enrollment strategies. Moreover, FTES generation in California

community colleges decreased 10 percent from 2008–2009 to 2015–2016, so if a school

maintained or increased FTES generation in this time period, it was likely not attributable to

improvements in the overall enrollment environment (CCCCO, 2010, 2017a). Colleges that

were able to buck the national trend of shrinking enrollments during this time were atypical and

may have been able to do so because of enrollment management leadership, which is the focus of

this study. Finally, 2016–2017 was the end of the time frame, because 2017–2018 could not be

included since the Recalculation Reports were not available within the time frame of the study.

Using this method, I generated a list of potential sites. I ranked the colleges on the list by

the percentage increase in FTES from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017. Starting at the top of the list, I

reviewed the accreditation reports of the site to verify the existence of a participatory governance

36

structure at the college. If the accreditation reports confirmed that the college had a participatory

governance structure in place, I contacted either the college vice president of instruction or the

administrator that supervised institutional research to solicit participation. I followed this

procedure until a site agreed to participate in the study.

Site Description

Through the president at my current college, I was put in contact with the vice president

of instruction at the selected site, Western Community College (a pseudonym). He and I met and

discussed the study. He agreed that the college would participate and offered to help facilitate

the interviews. WCC is demographically similar in most regards to the California community

college system, with minor variances in demographic categories like ethnicity, gender, and

citizenship status.[2] Located in a picturesque suburban area, the campus comprises both older and

newer buildings, all of which are fastidiously maintained.

WCC's most recent accreditation review occurred in 2014. As a part of that review, a

team of peer evaluators visited the college and documented what they found in an external

evaluation report. This report explained that WCC had an effective participatory governance

structure in place and met all the accreditation standards for governance.

Once I had selected the study site, I completed the Institutional Review Board (IRB)

process at UCLA. Once that had been approved, I completed the IRB process at the site of the

study. After receiving IRB approval from the site, I began scheduling and conducting

interviews.

---

[2] Demographic variances are not discussed to maintain the confidentiality of the site.

Study Population

To select study participants at the college, I employed a purposeful sampling approach with the aim of securing interviewees who were knowledgeable about the college's enrollment management strategies, processes, and leadership. It is common for faculty, staff members, and some administrators to perform their duties while being largely unaware of enrollment management issues. For this reason, I aimed to interview the administrator who led enrollment management at the district, other administrators who participated in enrollment management, faculty leaders, classified staff leaders, and those who served on enrollment management committees. (Faculty and classified staff leaders are more likely to be aware of enrollment management issues because of their greater involvement in college participatory governance.) I used snowball sampling to identify participants who were knowledgeable about enrollment management at the site. This was necessary because involvement in enrollment management can vary from site to site. Interviewing faculty, classified staff, and administrators allowed me to compare perceptions among different employee types.

The 15 study participants included six administrators, five faculty members, and four classified staff members. Of the six administrators, two held positions as instructional deans, two held positions as senior administrators, and two held positions in between instructional dean and senior administrator.[3] All of the administrators served on the Enrollment Management Committee. Of the five faculty members interviewed, two were current or former leaders of WCC's academic senate, four were current or former department chairs, and all served on the Enrollment Management Committee. Of the four classified staff members interviewed, one

---

[3] Specific titles are not listed to maintain the confidentiality of the site.

served on the Enrollment Management Committee and three were current or former leaders of WCC's classified senate.

Data Collection Strategies

      Interviews. I conducted 15 interviews over a two-week time frame. All of the interviews were semi-structured and explored the role of teamwork in leadership around enrollment management. Questions were constructed to elicit descriptions of the leadership process and to ascertain the perceived effect of leadership on enrollment efforts. (See Appendix A for the interview protocol.) The interviews ranged from 15 to 68 minutes long, with an average length of 43 minutes. All were conducted at the college site in the offices of the interviewees or in neutral locations, such as conference rooms. I recorded the dialogues on a digital audio recorder and on an iPhone, for back-up. The audio recorded interviews were transcribed through an online transcription service and checked for accuracy.

      Documents. I utilized documents as a secondary method of data collection. Specifically, I reviewed apportionment reports submitted by the district to the state; institutional plans (i.e., enrollment management plans, educational master plans, strategic plans, etc.); documentation of enrollment management processes at the college (i.e., union contracts, Enrollment Management Committee materials, etc.); documentation of enrollment strategies (i.e., program descriptions, marketing materials, class schedules, data used for enrollment management, etc.); and the college website. Document analysis data were used for site selection, to familiarize myself with the sites, and to validate what arose from the interviews.

Analytic Procedures

      I analyzed the data collected for this study using a variety of coding techniques. I drew from Saldaña's (2013) First and Second Cycle coding categorizations. First Cycle coding

methods occur in the initial rounds of coding and are relatively straight forward. Second Cycle coding methods seek to synthesize the data after First Cycle coding. In this section I describe the analytic procedures I employed.

First Cycle coding. I used several coding techniques in the initial round of coding. I began with attribute coding of each data source. These attributes included date of data collection, gender of participant, employee group affiliation (administrator, faculty, or classified), and any special role held by the participant. Special roles included codes such as Enrollment Management Committee member, department chair, dean, senior administrator, academic senate leader, and classified senate leader. After completing three interviews, I applied a holistic coding approach as I read through each transcript. This allowed me to build an awareness of the themes and issues present in the data sources. With this preparation completed, I proceeded with two additional First Cycle coding techniques: provisional and descriptive.

Research Questions 1 and 2 (see Chapter One) were largely based on Spillane's (2006) model of distributive leadership. Thus, I developed provisional codes from the literature based on this model. These provisional codes were modified during their initial application to best fit the data set. To develop codes for Research Question 3, which focused on participant perceptions, I used descriptive coding to assign words or short phrases to the data to organize it by topic. I then applied both the provisional and descriptive codes to six interviews. Next, I created descriptive subcodes to further categorize the transcripts and recoded all the data. I applied simultaneous coding when a datum had a strong connection to more than one code. Upon completion of First Cycle coding, I began Second Cycle coding.

Second Cycle coding. The primary Second Cycle coding strategy I utilized was pattern coding. Pattern coding is appropriate after First Cycle coding to develop major themes that

explain the data (Saldaña, 2013). I reviewed the First Cycle codes, looking for their similarities and connection points. During data collection and First Cycle coding, I wrote analytical memos to record my impressions of what I was learning. These analytical memos informed the Second Cycle pattern coding process. From the pattern codes, I developed statements, which eventually became the themes of the study.

Ethical Issues

The primary ethical consideration arising from this study was the potential for participants' responses to adversely affect their employment conditions. As the focus of the study was leadership around enrollment management, there was potential for participants to provide critical viewpoints about their colleagues, their supervisors, or their college. To address any fear of retaliation, I emphasized the confidential nature of this study. Transcripts and tapes of the interviews were stored online in a cloud storage site. These files were labeled only with pseudonyms. A key, which showed the real names and pseudonyms, was stored separate from the transcripts and tapes in a safe in my home. Participants' names were not included in any write-ups of the study. Finally, participants and the college were given pseudonyms to decrease the likelihood that readers would ascertain the true identity of the participating site.

I held multiple roles in conducting this study: graduate student researcher, community college administrator, and former community college faculty member. I believed that it was appropriate to emphasize all of these roles in my interactions. My 12 years of experience in the CCC system helped establish my credibility with participants, as it is common for those outside of the system to be viewed as not really understanding its unique challenges. Considering that faculty members may distrust administrators, I emphasized my six years of experience as a full-time, tenured CCC faculty member when working with faculty.

Participants were asked to provide their perceptions of the impact of leadership on enrollment on their college. For this reason, confidentiality was paramount. I stressed that the identity of all interviewees would be kept confidential and that comments that could be traced back to specific people would not be included in any documents that were made public. Finally, I underscored that the intent of the study was to gather information from the college, which would benefit colleges throughout the state.

Credibility and Trustworthiness

I took steps to mitigate potential threats to the credibility of this study. A potential threat was my bias. As someone who had worked in enrollment management for several years, I had opinions about enrollment strategies and leadership styles. I field tested the interview protocol to refine it so that it led to the acquisition of quality data. I used a standardized coding procedure to prevent this bias from determining the themes that I discovered in the data. Furthermore, in the write-up of the results, I provide rich, thick descriptions that include numerous quotes to support the conclusions.

Triangulation further strengthened the trustworthiness of the study. For the interviews, I triangulated across data sources by speaking with members of three constituent groups: administrators, faculty, and classified staff. This helped balance any biases among a particular constituent group. I also triangulated across methods. Specifically, I triangulated the interview data with data derived from document analysis. These approaches helped diminish the degree to which participant reactivity influenced the results of the study.

After I generated preliminary themes and findings, I used two strategies to check my bias. First, I provided the preliminary themes and findings to some participants to learn if the themes and findings aligned with their perspectives. To prevent bias in these member checks, I solicited

the involvement of an administrator, faculty member, and classified staff member. The three participants supported the preliminary themes and findings. Second, I utilized peer review as a strategy to ensure credibility. I selected a peer with expertise in enrollment management and another peer with expertise in research methods and asked them to review the study and challenge my assumptions. Both peers supported the preliminary themes and findings.

Summary

As established in prior chapters, in both California and nationwide, community colleges have recently experienced significant enrollment challenges. This study shed light on the role of teamwork at a college within the CCC system that has a positive enrollment history. I used distributed leadership as a frame to examine community college enrollment management, which was a new approach. As such, the results of this study have the potential to benefit community college enrollment practices, potentially leading to more stable institutions that are better equipped to support students.

CHAPTER FOUR:

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to understand the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college. Western Community College was selected as the site for the case study because it reported increased enrollments from 2013–2014 to 2016–2017, a time of systemwide enrollment declines. Moreover, the college had a participatory governance structure in place. As described in the previous chapter, over the course of 14 days, I interviewed 15 employees of WCC. I also reviewed accreditation and enrollment reports, collective bargaining agreements, planning documents, meeting minutes, and the college website. These activities were completed to answer the guiding research questions listed in Chapter One.

In this chapter, I present the findings of the study. First, in Tables 1–3, I summarize the findings as they relate to my research questions. I then discuss the 10 key findings from this study, organized around three themes. Beginning with the first theme, that leadership at WCC is distributed, I describe distributive leadership around enrollment management at the college. I identify who performs which activities and address how followers contribute to the leadership process. For the second theme, contesting top-down leadership, I elucidate the internal contextual factors that participants saw as affecting enrollment management and explore their perceptions of these factors. Finally, for the third theme, adapting to state policy pressures, I explain the external contextual factors the interviewees said influence enrollment management and examine their perceptions of these factors.

Overview of Findings

Tables 1–3 below show the findings for each of the three guiding research questions, along with the number of interview participants in each employee category who spoke about the associated finding. Research Question 1 asked how leadership relating to enrollment management is distributed. Table 1 shows there was agreement across employee groups that leadership around enrollment management was distributed among senior administrators, deans, department chairs, and enrollment management committee members, while classified staff members were viewed as largely uninvolved in the process. Followers influenced leadership around enrollment management in the areas of scheduling, enrollment planning, and transparency.

Table 1

Frequency of Research Question 1 Findings by Employee Category

Finding	Administrators (n=6)	Faculty (n=5)	Classified Staff (n=4)	Total (n=15)
Leadership around enrollment management is distributed among senior administrators, deans, department chairs, and Enrollment Management Committee members.	6	5	2	13
Classified staff members are largely uninvolved in enrollment management process.	4	5	3	12
Followers influence leadership around enrollment management in…				
Scheduling	2	5	1	8
Enrollment planning	3	3	1	7
Transparency	4	1	0	5

Research Question 2 explored the internal and external contextual factors that influence enrollment management leadership. Table 2 includes the internal contextual factors that respondents said influenced leadership around enrollment management—specifically, a culture

of prestige at any cost, top-down leadership, and a lack of transparency. The external contextual

factors they said influenced leadership around enrollment management were AB 705, the Guided

Pathways program, and the Student Centered Funding Formula.

Table 2

Frequency of Research Question 2 Findings by Employee Category

Finding	Administrators (n=6)	Faculty (n=5)	Classified Staff (n=4)	Total (n=15)
Internal contextual factors that influence leadership around enrollment management are…				
Prestige at any cost	4	2	2	8
Top-down leadership	6	3	3	12
Lack of transparency	6	4	2	12
External contextual factors that influence leadership around enrollment management are…				
AB 705	6	4	1	11
Guided Pathways program	6	2	3	11
Student Centered Funding Formula	6	3	1	10

Research Question 3 probed participants' perceptions of the enrollment management

process, including its successes and challenges; Table 3 displays the findings related to their

perceptions. Interviewees were split in their perceptions of how the college defines enrollment

management: Some said it was driven by access, while others said it was equally driven by

access and success. The college's administrators, faculty, and classified staff said human capital

was a source of success in their enrollment management process, specifically strong leadership,

quality of employees, and successful working relationships. Administrators also said adapting to

changing state laws and initiatives was a challenge to the enrollment management process.

Interviewees said that campus climate issues, namely collegiality, trust, and transparency, were a

challenge to the enrollment management process. They also identified enrollment planning,

which includes setting targets and growing too quickly, as a challenge to the process.

Table 3

Frequency of Research Question 3 Findings by Employee Category

Finding	Administrators (n=6)	Faculty (n=5)	Classified Staff (n=4)	Total (n=15)
Interviewees are split on perception of whether enrollment management at college is driven by…				
Access	2	4	2	8
Access and success	4	1	1	6
Human capital is a source of success in enrollment management process—specifically, strong leadership, quality of employees, and successful working relationships.	3	4	2	9
Adapting to changing state laws and initiatives is a challenge to enrollment management process.	5	2	0	7
Campus climate issues, namely collegiality, trust, and transparency, are a challenge to the enrollment management process.	3	2	1	6
Enrollment planning, which includes setting targets and growing too quickly, is a challenge to the enrollment management process.	1	3	1	5

Examining the findings in isolation does not provide the complete picture of leadership as

it relates to enrollment management at WCC, however. As the interviews progressed, a story

began to emerge of a college struggling to adapt to evolving state policy pressures while

simultaneously contending with long-held resentments against a powerful executive. As such,

three themes emerged from the data: leadership is distributed, top-down leadership is contested,

and the college is adapting to state policy pressures. I discuss each of these in turn.

Theme One: Leadership is Distributed

I found that leadership around enrollment management at WCC was distributed across

multiple layers in the organizational structure and across two of the three employee groups.

While administrators, faculty members, and Enrollment Management Committee members were

found to provide leadership in enrollment management, classified staff members were not. I also

found that followers in the enrollment management process exerted influence on enrollment

management leadership and processes in the areas of scheduling, enrollment planning, and

transparency.

Finding: Leadership Around Enrollment Management is Distributed (RQ1a)

Of the 15 participants in the interviews, 13 identified leadership around enrollment

management as being distributed. Twelve of the participants described the leadership provided

by senior administrators, six described the leadership provided by deans, nine described the

leadership by department chairs, and 10 described the leadership by the Enrollment Management

Committee. In this section I discuss the leadership provided by each of these groups.

Senior administrators. Senior administrators perform leadership activities around

enrollment management that is specific to their positions. One senior administrator at WCC is

responsible for preparing and analyzing data regarding enrollment management; another is

responsible for overseeing the scheduling process and translating the overall college enrollment

targets into specific targets for each instructional department; a third is responsible for

organizing the Enrollment Management Committee. A review of available job descriptions for

senior administrators confirmed these responsibilities. Meeting minutes for the Enrollment

Management Committee documented senior administrators giving presentations and leading

discussions in their respective areas of oversight regarding enrollment management. In short,

setting enrollment targets for the college is one of the major leadership functions of senior administrators.

Enrollment management begins with setting enrollment targets for the coming year(s). Faculty members reported that targets were set by senior administrators, but they were unclear as to who exactly was involved and who set the targets. They made comments like "Our administration sets a goal for our growth" and "I'm not always 100 percent sure [who sets the target]." Deans were more familiar than faculty members with the process of setting targets. One dean said, "The targets come from the executive cabinet level."

Senior administrators who participated in the study were very familiar with the process of setting enrollment targets and were able to describe it in detail. A senior administrator involved in the process said, "The associate vice president, CIO [chief instructional officer], and the [senior administrator], have a dialogue [on enrollment targets] that is taken to executive cabinet, where it's conferred with the [president]." Once the executive cabinet agrees on the target, it is then taken to the Enrollment Management Committee by senior administrators for discussion and review. Senior administrators chair the Enrollment Management Committee, which I discuss next.

The Enrollment Management Committee. The Enrollment Management Committee at WCC is a long-standing participatory governance body comprising administrators (n=8), faculty (n=14), classified managers (n=8), and classified staff (n=3). According to WCC's 2002 accreditation self-evaluation report, it was formed in 1998 through the college's participatory governance structure. There are three chairs of the committee: the vice president of academics,

the vice president of business services, and a third senior administrator.[4] WCC's *2017 Decision Making Guide* defines the function of the committee as providing a venue for dialogue on strategies and approaches to enrollment management. Interviewees identified the two primary roles of the committee as (a) discussing enrollment related items and (b) creating the college's enrollment plan.

Interview participants identified various enrollment-related topics that the committee discussed. Some of the items they named include enrollment goals and targets, term lengths, parking, enrollment trends, and student fees, among others. A review of the committee meeting minutes from the last year showed that enrollment updates and the enrollment plan were the two most frequently appearing topics.

Faculty members were split in their perceptions of the effectiveness of the Enrollment Management Committee. One faculty member said, "We have a committee on enrollment management that consists of representatives from all levels. . . . They invite participation from throughout." Other faculty members took a less positive view of the committee, saying "it's mainly an information sharing group" and "it's a reporting out committee, so it doesn't really do very much."

Collegewide enrollment targets are discussed at Enrollment Management Committee meetings. A document from the academic affairs office, entitled *Section Development and Section Management Principles*, describes roles around setting enrollment targets: "Annual FTES targets are established by the District with input from the Enrollment Management Committee" (see Appendix B). Once enrollment targets are set and segmented to the department

---

[4] Position is not described to maintain the confidentiality of the site.

level by a senior administrator, department chairs and deans take an active role in enrollment management.

Department chairs. Department chairs provide leadership around enrollment management in the construction and management of class schedules. They advocate to administrators to make changes to schedules and they manage full-time and adjunct faculty members with complaints about the schedule. The academic affairs office's *Section Development and Section Management Principles* document says that, based on enrollment targets, "Department Chairs work with their Deans to best meet students' needs by initially proposing the Schedule of Classes." Department chairs are provided a scheduling request that lists the numbers of sections that the administration would like them to offer in various categories, such as full-term, eight-week, five-week, online, and so on. They advocate to deans for variations on this scheduling request. One faculty member described the process: "I make tweaks and then explain—'cause I have a new dean—why. They ask for six online, and I built 12, because looking at how much our onlines filled, and then they were still full at the end of the semester, or mostly full, and how big the wait lists were."

Department chairs also demonstrated leadership in helping faculty members understand the need for certain scheduling decisions. One chair said, "I would spend quite a bit of time talking with them about the decision making and the planning and the possibility that maybe the class could be offered down the line." Another department chair described why she used data to explain scheduling decisions to faculty members: "It didn't always convince faculty that we shouldn't offer a particular class, but it was something beyond just what we think." Department chairs collaborate with their respective deans in providing leadership around enrollment management. For example, one department chair spoke of the importance of working with his

51

dean to make sure in dealing with faculty they were "on the same page, so they weren't getting two different stories."

Deans. Deans provide leadership in enrollment management in working with senior administrators, department chairs, and faculty members. They advocate to senior administrators for changes to department enrollment targets and in favor or against class cancellations. One dean described how he works with his department chairs to help them craft their justifications for schedule changes into terms that senior administrators will value. Another talked about her approach in responding to faculty members who articulate conspiracy theories regarding enrollment management: "I always try to listen. I always try to give the benefit of the doubt. And then I guess I try to gently correct."

While this study found that leadership around enrollment management is distributed among senior administrators, deans, department chairs, and Enrollment Management Committee members, not all groups at WCC were found to be a part of the enrollment management process. Specifically, as I discuss next, classified staff members remain largely uninvolved.

Finding: Classified Staff Members are Largely Uninvolved (RQ1a)

Two of the 15 interviewees said that classified staff have no role in enrollment management at WCC, and four said they did not know. When asked to describe the enrollment management process at the college and to state who did what, another six of the interviewees did not mention classified staff members. All three of the 15 participants who said that classified staff members had a role in enrollment management identified the Enrollment Management Committee as the reason for their statement. Two of these three were senior administrators; one was a classified staff member who served on the committee.

In reviewing the membership of the Enrollment Management Committee, I discovered that three of the 49 members were classified staff persons. Upon investigating further, I learned that two of these were administrative assistants to senior administrators serving on the committee and that their function was to support the committee's operation. (These two senior administrators also stated that classified staff members were involved in enrollment management.)

The classified staff member who stated that classified staff were involved in the Enrollment Management Committee had served on the committee for four years. He could not recall a single instance in the last several years when a classified staff member (including himself) spoke at a meeting or contributed to a discussion during a meeting, however.

Finding: Followers Influence Leadership in Scheduling, Enrollment Planning, and Transparency (RQ1b)

A key component of Spillane's (2006) model of distributive leadership is follower influence. At WCC, followers were found to impact leadership around enrollment management, namely when it came to scheduling, enrollment planning, and transparency.

Scheduling. In participants' descriptions of the enrollment management process at WCC, the most often cited area of follower influence was scheduling. Eight of the 15 interview participants talked about how followers impacted leadership in scheduling. Interviewees described how department chairs, deans, and faculty members exerted influence over leaders in scheduling.

Department chairs influence deans and other administrators. All of the five faculty members interviewed spoke of how department chairs influenced deans when it came to scheduling, including in decisions to add or remove classes from the schedule. One former

department chair described his experience in suggesting changes to his dean: "If you come with a good argument, they'll listen to you. You've got a chance. They don't just shoot you down and say, 'It's our way, you guys figure out how to do it.'" The administrator who oversaw scheduling for the college corroborated this sentiment when he described his response to department chairs requesting to offer fewer sections: "If it [the department chair request to offer less sections] is legit, I'm not going to hold a gun to their head, either. We make adjustments accordingly."

Deans influence senior administrators. Both instructional deans interviewed described how they were able to influence the administrator with respect to scheduling. One spoke in detail about how he was able to convince the administrator to reduce the section offerings in English (described in more detail under Theme Three, in the section on AB 705). Both deans and department chairs described the role that deans play in assisting department chairs in advocating for schedule changes. One dean said that he consults with his department chairs and then "makes the sale" for the schedule change to a senior administrator, whom he characterized as "very reasonable."

Faculty members influence department chairs. As department chairs influence deans, faculty members in departments influence the leadership provided by their department chairs. Three current or former department chairs detailed how faculty members provided input on what classes were offered. One department chair reported, "Many departments have monthly department meetings where one of the things that's discussed is upcoming schedule development. . . . And there's input there as to what kind of sections we want to offer. . . . Faculty has pretty broad latitude in picking the times and the types of courses they want to offer."

54

While full-time faculty members have clear opportunities to influence department chair leadership in scheduling, several department chairs mentioned that adjunct faculty rarely provide input. One department chair shared her thoughts on this: "Very rarely would I hear from adjuncts about their concerns with the schedule. One, because they don't have the time. But two, politically they don't want to rock the boat." As I discuss next, followers wield influence not only at the micro level of the schedule, but also at the macro level of collegewide enrollment planning.

Enrollment planning. Interview participants described how followers, primarily faculty members, have influenced enrollment management leadership in enrollment planning. This influence has occurred in two ways: through the development of an enrollment plan and through the setting of enrollment targets.

Fueled by population growth in its surrounding communities, WCC has had a long history of positive enrollment growth. Since its founding, the college's enrollments have more than quadrupled. As previously stated, WCC was selected for this study because its enrollments increased during a time of state and national enrollment declines for two-year public colleges. Interview participants described how, after the 2016–2017 academic year, conversations during Enrollment Management Committee meetings indicated that meeting or exceeding enrollment targets was no longer to be assumed. This led to increased interest from faculty members in enrollment management. A faculty leader on the committee said that, around this time, faculty became "very vocal . . . [in] wanting more accountability." Prior to this, the college's growth strategy was, as one faculty member described, "What you offered last year, plus another section for each program."

As described to me by several faculty members on the committee, the faculty members clamored for the creation of an enrollment management plan, which led to its development. This was corroborated by a senior administrator on the committee who said, "They're making themselves heard and known to the point where I think they even influenced the idea of having the comprehensive enrollment management plan created." The resulting enrollment management plan was reviewed and is a comprehensive plan structured around the goals of student access, equity, and success. In addition to the development of an enrollment plan, faculty members have also influenced administrators in the setting of enrollment targets.

Interviewees said that before faculty members began calling for greater accountability and involvement in enrollment management, collegewide enrollment targets were set solely by senior administrators. An outspoken faculty member who sits on the Enrollment Management Committee said, "Prior to my big mouth, they [enrollment targets] were made by other people. But now they seem to be somewhat made at this committee." A senior administrator pointed out that in the Enrollment Management Committee meeting she had attended the day of our interview, "we adjusted fall [enrollment targets] at the request of our faculty members." Another senior administrator described the process of reviewing enrollment targets with the committee:

> People could ask questions, and I think in talking it through we made a few changes, which is my indicator that the conversation was authentic. Because if you talk through a detail and, at the end of the conversation, not a single number has changed, that's a good indicator that it was a reporting out, but not really a dialogue. So I always hope that throughout the conversation we realize that we hadn't thought of some things, we made some mistakes, whatever it was, but we end up with some changes.

Another faculty member on the committee perceived the committee's influence on the enrollment targets to be marginal, however, saying that the targets "came to the committee, and the committee could talk about them and move them and tweak them, or whatever. But they were pretty much set by someone else. . . . But we did get to discuss them in the committee to a certain extent." In addition to deans and faculty members exerting influence in scheduling and faculty and Enrollment Management Committee members exerting influence in enrollment planning, faculty members also influenced administrators to conduct enrollment management leadership with greater transparency.

Transparency. As is described in detail in the findings within the second theme (in the next section), 12 of the 15 participants identified lack of transparency of senior leaders, especially WCC's president, as an internal factor that influenced leadership in enrollment management at the college. Faculty members at WCC have influenced senior leaders to be more transparent in their enrollment management leadership; four of the six administrators expressed this in their interviews. One mid-level administrator said that the "faculty voice saying they wanted more transparency and dialogue . . . was being responded to by my boss, who also shares that same belief that we need to have more involvement."

All four of the administrators who identified transparency as an area of influence pointed to the creation of the *Section Development and Section Management Principles* document. The administrator who oversaw scheduling said, "We just developed the guiding principles this year based on feedback from the chairs. The feedback was they felt like the practices from dean to dean were very different." An instructional dean characterized the document as "an attempt to be more transparent and to create guidelines that faculty could look at, department chairs could look at."

Feedback from study participants indicates that, in the enrollment management process at WCC, followers influence leadership in scheduling, enrollment planning, and transparency. Transparency is also a key component of the second theme, contesting top-down leadership. I discuss this next.

Theme Two: Top-Down Leadership is Contested

Interview participants across all employee groups described a singular culture at WCC characterized by high standards (or what could be called "prestige at any cost"), top-down leadership, and a lack of transparency. They believed the president of the college to be the origin point of these internal factors. In the dialogues I had with campus members, they explained how these internal cultural factors had led to climate issues around collegiality, trust, and transparency—all of which were perceived to be a challenge to the enrollment management process. Interestingly, while these issues with collaborating effectively emerged as challenges to the enrollment management process, participants identified human capital as a source of success—specifically strong leadership, quality of employees, and successful working relationships.

Finding: A Culture of Prestige, Top-Down Leadership, and a Lack of Transparency Affect Leadership (RQ2a).

From 2008 to 2018, the average tenure length of a CEO in a CCC institution was 5.2 years (Navarette, 2018), and the length of the WCC president's tenure far exceeded this average.[5] A faculty member explained how the president—and his time at the college—had shaped the culture:

---

[5] Specific tenure length is not listed to maintain confidentiality of the site.

There's only three or four employees on campus that have been here longer than the [president]. . . . Ninety-five percent of the employees that are making these decisions, were all . . . directly hired by [the president], and that has a certain influence over individuals. And with such a long history here, [the president] has kind of intentionally or unintentionally accumulated a lot of the decision-making power.

Thus it is perhaps not surprising that interviewees identified the president of WCC as the source of the internal contextual factors described below.

Prestige at any cost. Eight of the 15 employees of WCC interviewed pointed to a "culture of prestige at any cost," which referred to prestige within the community college system and the college's local service area. A faculty member said, "That's the culture of [WCC]; we always want to be ahead of the game." Campus members expressed this sentiment in various ways: "[WCC] wants to be better than everybody else," "We're go-getters here," and WCC has a "can-do, winner, innovative culture." An instructional dean characterized the culture as "can do and no excuses" and went on to say, "Cultures are led, right? And the leadership of our environment is very much that way."

A senior administrator who worked closely with the president said, "You have a culture in the upper administration where there's no respect for calendars, or people's workload, or anything else. And there are edicts that come down from the mountain, and it's not just one person, it's across the entire executive team." He went on to contrast that with the spirit of collaboration that exists among campus members excluding the executive team, warning, "But that spirit can also be killed with enough aggressive behavior and ignorance of where the real lifeblood of the college is." When asked to provide examples of how this culture of prestige at

any cost influenced leadership in enrollment management, respondents pointed to the setting of enrollment targets.

As previously mentioned, 2013–2014 to 2016–2017 was a time of state and national enrollment declines for two-year public colleges. During this time frame, WCC consistently set aggressive enrollment targets for growth. A faculty member said, "I wonder if the impetus to want to grow in the face of a statewide trend of enrollment decline got the better of the schedule makers a little bit." A classified staff member described her perception: "I think [the president] communicates it [aggressive enrollment targets] to the executive cabinet, and then they go off and try to figure something out despite the economic climate, where people are not going back to school right now because they're making a livable wage at their jobs. . . . [The president] is kind of like, 'I don't care, just figure it out.'"

In one of the findings to Research Question 3b, five of the 15 interview participants saw enrollment planning, including setting targets and growing too quickly, as a challenge to the enrollment management process at WCC. Setting aggressive enrollment targets due to the culture of prestige at any cost eventually led to an erosion of collegiality and trust—something I discuss in greater detail in a later section. Another contextual factor that participants identified as influencing enrollment management leadership was a top-down leadership approach.

Top-down leadership. Twelve of the 15 interview participants identified top-down leadership as an internal contextual factor that influenced enrollment management leadership. This 12 included all six administrators, three of the five faculty members, and three of the four classified staff members. Respondents made statements like, "Everything is imposed from the top down," "There seems to be a top-down approach," and "It's very much a top-down institution." A faculty leader expressed it by saying, "We have very much a hierarchal structure

with really one person on top. . . . At the end of the day, it's one person who's really saying yes or no to how things are going to really operate." One classified member said, "There's nothing you can do when [the president] wants something done." While respondents agreed that the top-down approach originated with the president, several interview subjects identified the president's inner circle as also operating in a top-down fashion. This inner circle was referred to as "that small circle that gets invited to the meetings." Another interviewee observed, "It's been the same people making the decisions for years."

Interviewees maintained that enrollment targets were developed in a top-down manner. A classified staff member said, "unless you're in the group that made the decisions" on enrollment targets, there is not an authentic opportunity to have input on them. A faculty member added that enrollment targets "seem to be happening at a level that is way above the faculty, and then sort of pushed down to the faculty to make happen." An instructional dean reported that the president and another senior administrator set "aspirational targets, and we're all a little bit annoyed and trying to figure out how we're actually going to bridge that gap and make it work." Another instructional dean detailed how the president and senior administrators gave him a 300 percent growth target to achieve in a single year for an academic program he supervised: "That target is not necessarily based on any reality of what is likely to happen." He went on to say that he did not protest because he was afraid of potential negative consequences for his position at the college. This exemplifies how the internal culture of prestige at any cost fused with a top-down approach in enrollment management leadership at WCC.

Respondents conveyed their perceptions of top-down leadership in the development of the enrollment plan and in the curriculum. A senior administrator referred to the "recent enrollment management plan that was created by one individual and then sent around for input."

Another administrator said of the plan, "it was driven by a single individual in consultation with the [president] . . . and then brought to the committee." In addition to the enrollment plan, one interviewee related his experience with top-down leadership in the area of curriculum. This classified staff member revealed that the curriculum, which in California is legally the purview of faculty members, "seemed like it was coming from the administration, 'We need this program because of grant funding.' Because it seemed like the administration was making the decisions more on which programs we needed to push through quickly." Participants also identified a third internal factor that functions in concert with top-down leadership and affects enrollment management leadership: lack of transparency.

Lack of transparency. Twelve of the 15 interview participants identified lack of transparency as an internal contextual factor that influenced enrollment management leadership. This included all six administrators, four of the five faculty members, and two of the four classified staff members. Participants made statements like "enrollment management . . . is done behind closed doors," "It's just the lack of transparency, and people feel like administrators are making all of the decisions," and "I think people are kind of fighting that there's this lack of transparency."

Interview subjects described several ways the lack of transparency evinced itself in enrollment management leadership. Enrollment planning again surfaced as being influenced by an internal factor, this time a lack of transparency. A faculty leader opined that the president and senior administrators were not historically transparent when setting enrollment targets because "they don't want too many cooks in the kitchen. It may be because they're setting the targets at a higher level relative to the budget."

62

In addition to enrollment planning, interviewees repeatedly pointed to examples of a lack of transparency in resource decisions. A senior administrator described multiple informal processes that existed on campus that led to programs being created or resources being allocated outside of the officially designated governance processes. He described an informal process in which upper administrators would research a project or program and write a business plan for the president, who would make a funding decision based on the plan. This occurred outside of the defined governance structure. The administrator said some of these projects became "institutional nightmares" because "in some cases . . . [they were] in direct competition to things that have been planned and put in place via the normal processes. That can be called an evasion. It can also be called crazy making." He also asserted that "Anyone can walk into the [president's] office during office hours and make a request. And it's the interpersonal relationships at this college that helps drive some decision making."

A third informal route to college resources identified by respondents was through the business community. Several interviewees spoke of the president's close relationship with the business community in the college service area. One interview participant noted, "She's a force in the business community." A senior leader explained, "Occasionally we get a directive [from the president] that we have to go this direction, because this organization needs X. . . . [And] they are a partner of the college, and so there is an interest in keeping that partner happy." Campus members not involved in these private processes were only privy to the outcomes, and they perceived a lack of transparency. A faculty member said, "There is no dialogue happening between administration and faculty, or transparency, right? Decisions are just made."

A culture of prestige at any cost, top-down leadership, and a lack of transparency are the three internal factors interview participants identified as affecting leadership in relation to

enrollment management. They described these internal factors as essential components of the general culture at WCC and said that enrollment management was one process where they were evident. These factors led to climate issues around collegiality, trust, and transparency, all of which were perceived to be challenges to the enrollment management process.

Finding: Collegiality, Trust, and Transparency Create Challenges (RQ3b)

Six of the 15 interview participants, including three of the six administrators, classified campus climate issues—namely, collegiality, trust, and transparency—as challenges to the enrollment management process at WCC. A senior administrator said, "There [are] also campus climate issues on campus right now. There's many folks that feel there's not mutual respect, and I believe there are trust issues between faculty and administration that carries over into every conversation. . . . That really permeates all of our work." One faculty member attributed the recent resignation of several instructional deans to the climate issues:

> I think that they [the deans] were just in the middle, and the faculty are getting more frustrated with not being respected or transparency, not understanding how decisions are made and wanting more information and input. Then the deans not being able to follow through because, at the level above, they're like, "I don't have time for that. We have to get all this stuff done based on the direction of our [president], and so, suck it up, buttercup." . . . I think they were like, "I think I need to leave. I need to have more balance in my life."

Relationships between faculty members and the president had deteriorated to such a degree that one senior administrator observed, "There's a perception that we need new executive leadership at the helm of the college."

Thus far I have described the internal contextual factors that participants said influenced enrollment management leadership. Next, I review how campus members contested top-down leadership. I then provide an example of distributive leadership in action, which shows how these internal contextual factors have interacted with leaders and followers in the enrollment management process at WCC.

Contesting top-down leadership. Administrators, faculty members, and classified staff members all conveyed that faculty members have been at the forefront of resisting top-down leadership at WCC. The main way that they accomplished this was through calls for accountability, information, and inclusion in the enrollment management committee. As described in the section above (on follower influence, under Theme One), faculty members on the Enrollment Management Committee began advocating for more information and asserting their influence on the enrollment management process just after 2016–2017, when it became clear that WCC might not meet its enrollment targets.

As a result of faculty efforts, enrollment targets began to be brought to the Enrollment Management Committee for input; as such, both administrators and faculty members described how committee members were able to influence the adjusting of targets. In interviews, faculty members stressed that targets were only marginally modified as a result of committee input. However, faculty calls for involvement succeeded in shifting the attitudes of one senior administrator. He recounted how, up to that point, enrollment targets had been set by the president and senior administrators and taken to the committee as an afterthought. As a result of faculty advocacy for inclusion, he developed a new vision for how enrollment targets should be set moving forward: "I think that it needs to be discussed strategically and intentionally with the Enrollment Management Committee first. . . . Then, have that body make a recommendation

through the college planning team process that ultimately is forwarded to executive cabinet and the [president] for final say." Faculty members' resistance to top-down leadership not only affected enrollment targets, in fact, it also led to the development of the college's first enrollment plan.

Faculty members chronicled how they had been excluded from the enrollment management process: "The bigger picture of how enrollment is managed at the college seems to happen outside this committee. . . . So we feel like we've been kind of left out of the conversation, so we're trying to push back and push our way in." One of the ways they "pushed their way in" was that those on the Enrollment Management Committee advocated strongly for an enrollment plan. This advocacy was identified in multiple interviews by administrators and faculty members. A faculty leader said, "The campus politics were such to probably keep it [enrollment planning] more as a close group. I think recently the campus politics have shifted to make things a bit more transparent, and a bit more accountable, which is, I think, how we were able to make some of these changes as a group, to even have an enrollment management plan in place."

The development of the enrollment management plan became a mechanism for faculty members to contest top-down leadership in enrollment management. A faculty member on the Enrollment Management Committee described how meetings were spent evaluating the goals and associated strategies of the enrollment plan: "We'll just put these up on the board and let people comment, 'Are we achieving these goals or are we not achieving these goals?' and so on throughout the document." By compelling the construction of the plan, faculty members created a vehicle that forced senior administrators to act with transparency by articulating their plans; the

Enrollment Management Committee served as the venue for faculty members to exert influence on those plans.

As described above, faculty members have contested top-down leadership and influenced enrollment management leadership through follower influence in relation to enrollment targets and the enrollment plan. Next, I present an example of distributive leadership in action. This shows how the internal contextual factors identified by participants interacted with leaders and followers in the enrollment management process at WCC.

Distributive leadership in action: approach to enrollment targets and section cancellations. As I've previously outlined, in the context of state and national enrollment declines, the culture of prestige at any cost led the president and senior administrators at WCC to set aggressive enrollment growth targets for 2018–2019. An administrator said, "The aggressive nature of pursuing every single FTES and head count and all that has been really challenging, because that's just the nature of our leadership team." These targets were established in a top-down manner without a transparent process. To meet aggressive growth targets, campus members had to scramble to perform additional activities, including conducting outreach and admissions efforts as well as scheduling and staffing classes. A dean observed, "it was really tough for folks in terms of the human power" required to meet the targets. Several faculty members expressed fatigue in comments like "It seems like we're on a rollercoaster" and "Faculty are just tired of the constant drumbeat of, you know, 'We need more students, we need to make more money.'"

The campus efforts to increase enrollments did not pay off this time, however, and large numbers of classes were canceled, leading to climate issues of trust and collegiality:

It was aggressive to a point of probably exhaustion for folks, and morale would be down

because you built all the sections, and then you have to cancel them because they didn't

fill. And then the ripple effects of that, of cutting sections, and then the faculty connected

to those sections, especially our adjunct faculty. And then our full-time faculty not

wanting to bump their adjunct colleagues. And that created . . . a difficult climate.

Adjunct and full-time faculty members affected by the cancellations voiced complaints to

department chairs. Department chairs expressed the concerns to deans, senior administrators,

and the Enrollment Management Committee. An administrator on the committee said:

Faculty were bringing forward the voices: "This is what's happening to faculty," really

humanizing, putting a face to everything we heard, not only to themselves but also what

was happening to adjuncts . . . and dealing with students when classes are canceled.

And so I think it was really bringing forward and personalizing those stories for us that

really helped to shape the direction we were going.

Over time, this influenced senior administrators who reassessed setting such aggressive growth

targets. An administrator disclosed that a few members of the president's executive team

initiated the discussion with the president of "we can't be as aggressive and here's why," which

led to a less aggressive approach.

This example shows how the internal factors of prestige at any cost, lack of transparency,

and a top-down approach at WCC led to aggressive enrollment targets in a time of nationwide

enrollment declines. These aggressive targets led to class cancellations, which negatively

affected trust and campus climate. Followers exerted influence at various levels in the hierarchy

to revise this approach: Adjunct and full-time faculty influenced department chairs, department

chairs and faculty influenced administrators on the Enrollment Management Committee, and

68

senior administrators influenced the president. A faculty member articulated the need for the revised approach:

> In order to foster more trust . . . when the school is planning its goals for enrollment management, I think they have to really think more about the practicality of the abstract goal that they set for meeting growth benchmarks. . . . Because when you take a class away from an adjunct faculty member, there's real hurt there. That lends to this unpredictability that doesn't help the working relationships of people on campus.

Even though interview subjects identified campus climate issues—namely collegiality, trust, and transparency—as a challenge to the enrollment management process, they viewed human capital as a source of success in their enrollment management process. This is the focus of the section that follows.

Finding: Human Capital is a Source of Success (RQ3a)

Nine out of the 15 interview participants identified human capital as a source of success in WCC's enrollment management process. Within the human capital category, interviewees named strong leadership, quality of employees, and successful working relationships; quality of employees was the most frequently cited source of success, however. Participants mentioned "the skill of administrators," "stellar faculty," and all college employees "working hard in service of our students."

Within the context of the theme of contesting top-down leadership, this finding may seem contradictory. However, most participants most closely associated the top-down approach with the president. Two participants also viewed a handful of senior administrators as operating in a top-down manner. They did not, however, transfer those views to other administrators. Four out of the five faculty members made positive statements about the quality of administrators on

campus when discussing sources of success in the enrollment management process. A classified staff member who identified strong leadership as a source of success said, "I think we have very strong leadership at the very top. . . . I don't know if it's effective leadership, but it's strong." A faculty member who spoke of successful working relationships as a source of success added, "The administration–faculty relationship, when it has been fruitful . . . there's no substitute for it. You can get a lot done."

Within Theme Two, I have discussed the internal factors that influence leadership around enrollment management, examined how these factors have created climate challenges, presented an example of distributive leadership in action, and reviewed the source of success that participants identified. Next, I introduce the third theme, adapting to state policy pressures.

Theme Three: Adaptation to External Factors is a Challenge

During the interviews, participants described a quickly evolving external landscape, their efforts to react to changes in state laws and initiatives, and the challenges that arose. These data led to the development of Theme Three, adapting to state policy pressures. Interview subjects across all employee groups identified three external factors as influencing leadership around enrollment management at WCC: AB 705, the Guided Pathways program, and the Student Centered Funding Formula. The Student Centered Funding Formula called on colleges to redefine enrollment management, and interviewees were split in their perceptions of how the college defined enrollment management: access driven or equally driven by access and success. The college's administrators said that adapting to these changing state laws and initiatives was a challenge to the enrollment management process.

Finding: Changing State Laws and Initiatives Present Challenges (RQ2b, RQ3b)

In the sections that follow, for each external factor I provide a brief description of the factor and then offer more detail on what interviewees said about it and how it influenced leadership around enrollment management. I begin with AB 705.

AB 705—Distributive leadership in action. The 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education (Coons et al., 1960) allowed for community colleges to provide remedial instruction. Beginning in the late 1990s and early 2000s, California community college faculty began to develop remedial sequences to give "unprepared" students the knowledge, skills, and abilities they lacked to be college ready (Hope, 2018b). However, not enough students were able to complete remedial sequences. AB 705 was signed into law in October 2017 with the intent of increasing the number of students who complete transfer-level English and Math. It effectively required colleges to place students into these courses.[6] I conducted interviews at WCC in spring 2018, as the institution was preparing for the implementation of AB 705 in fall 2019.

Eleven of the 15 interview participants identified AB 705 as influencing leadership in relation to enrollment management, including all the administrators and four out of the five faculty members. Specifically, they described AB 705 as a disruptive force that brought significant unpredictability to the scheduling process for the affected disciplines. This required department chairs, deans, and administrators to collaborate to respond to this statutory change. A former department chair described AB 705 as an institutional "shock to the system"; an

---

[6] Under AB 705, colleges could try alternative placement methods, but they were required to provide data substantiating that their alternate model resulted in improving students' chances of completing transfer-level English and math.

instructional dean said it put the English department in "a real quandary"; and a senior administrator said it represented "a brave new world."

Planning for AB 705 that occurred in the 2018–2019 academic year exemplifies distributive leadership in action. A faculty member explained to me that students were not informed of the impending AB 705 changes leading up to spring 2018 registration because they did not want to "scare off" students. Regardless, students learned about the changes through word of mouth and a significant number of remedial classes were canceled. As described above in the distributive leadership example on enrollment targets and cancellations, adjunct and full-time faculty members affected by cancellations voiced complaints to department chairs.

During the planning process for fall 2019, the administrator who oversees scheduling directed a department chair who schedules remedial classes to include many sections. Considering the statutory change, the department chair expressed concerns to the dean that they were offering too many sections that would result in cancellations. The dean was able to broker a compromise with the administrator: "So we built a substantially, I would say 20 percent smaller schedule. But what we did was, we built in shadow sections, kind of to appease them. So, if we get a wait list, if things are filling, we can just activate those."

In this example, two factors were at play: AB 705 influenced student enrollment decisions, and the culture of prestige at any cost influenced the setting of aggressive targets. Adjunct and full-time faculty members who experienced cancellations influenced the department chair and dean, who were then able to influence the administrator over scheduling to adjust the target for the department. This is one example of how the external factor of AB 705 has operated in the ecosystem of distributive leadership around enrollment management. Another

72

external factor that participants identified as influencing enrollment management leadership at WCC was the Guided Pathways program.

Guided Pathways. The Guided Pathways framework utilizes a holistic, student-centered approach for institutional redesign (Bailey, Smith Jaggars, & Jenkins, 2015). It involves (a) restructuring curricula to create clear program pathways; (b) helping students select pathways; (c) supporting them through their progression; and (d) monitoring their learning. In comparison to the cafeteria college model of curriculum—in which students choose from a wide array of options—the Guided Pathways model narrows choices with the aim of increasing the likelihood of completion. In 2017–2018, then-Governor Jerry Brown sought to advance Guided Pathways systemwide in CCC by distributing $150 million to colleges that implemented the initiative (Brown, 2017). During my interviews, WCC was in the process of instituting Guided Pathways.

Eleven out of the 15 interview subjects identified Guided Pathways as an external factor that influenced leadership around enrollment management. This included all of the administrators, two of the five faculty members, and three of the four classified staff members. At the time of the study, WCC was in an early stage of implementing Guided Pathways, and a consistent theme in interviews was anxiety about how it would play out. An instructional dean captured this sentiment when he said, "It's been a key point of discussion, but I think that there's a lot of uncertainty still." Another dean observed, "I don't feel like we're there yet in terms of it actually having any impact, but I know there's a lot of concern on the part of the faculty over Guided Pathways and how that could negatively impact their programs."

Faculty members expressed fear about how this new framework would affect their programs. One faculty member explained how faculty conversations on reducing the number of general education options for students left her colleagues "feeling like, 'Well, you can't get rid of

my GEs that I teach, you can get rid of somebody else's GEs.'" Another faculty member gave an example of how defining GE options for Guided Pathways could lead to not being able to offer some classes in his discipline anymore, which could lead to the dissolution of the discipline. He went on to describe his perception of how administrators were planning for this change:

> No discussion from admin about that at all. They're like, "It will be okay, all your programs will be fine, not a problem, everything will work itself out, no real concern." And if there is concern, it's, "Let the cards fall how they may." They didn't say this, but I call it Darwinism, you know? Survival of the fittest.

This perception of administrative indifference links back to the campus climate issues, which include a lack of trust. It again illustrates the interconnectedness of contextual factors within distributive leadership.

Student Centered Funding Formula. Prior to 2018–2019, California community colleges were funded based largely on enrollments, as measured through FTES. In 2018–2019, the Student Centered Funding Formula was instituted for all community colleges through the passage of the governor's budget. The formula bases funding on three factors: instructional time as measured through FTES; counts of low-income students; and PBF as measured through student outcomes (CCCCO, 2018). The ratio for instructional time, low-income student counts, and outcomes in Year 1 of implementation (2018–2019) was 70:20:10; it will shift to 60:20:20 in the final year of implementation (2020–2021). This change from a focus on enrollment to a focus on enrollment, equity, and success asked colleges to reconceptualize approaches to enrollment management. During interviews, I asked participants to define enrollment management at WCC. As I discuss next, there was variation in their answers.

Finding: Perceptions of How WCC Defines Enrollment Management are Split (RQ3b)

Eight of the 15 participants said that enrollment management at WCC was access driven, including four of the five faculty members and two of the six administrators. In other words, from the perspective of half the participants, WCC had not adapted to the approach of the new funding formula and its focus on student success. They made statements like, "It's strategies to gain enrollments," "It really seems to be driven by an FTES target," and "It's really just counting how many students are enrolled."

Six of the 15 participants said that enrollment management at WCC was driven by both access and success, including four of the six administrators and one of the five faculty members. The four administrators provided definitions that incorporated the inclusion of student success mandated by the new funding formula. One administrator defined enrollment management at WCC as "trying to effectively manage the enrollment so that we're maximizing the funding that we get from the state, but also balancing the needs for the students." A senior administrator articulated the transition from access-only to access-plus-success: "About a year or so ago, we purposely changed . . . the definition of enrollment management to include both those elements of access and success. Previously, access was really the main driver."

Regardless of participants' perceptions of what enrollment management meant at WCC, the majority—11 of 15 participants—agreed that the Student Centered Funding Formula was an external factor that influenced leadership around enrollment management. This 11 included all of the administrators, three of the five faculty members, and one of the four classified staff members. Interview subjects identified many examples of how the new funding formula had worked its way into their enrollment management process. Several Enrollment Management Committee members pointed out that the structure of the new enrollment plan was built around

the new funding formula categories: access, equity, and success. An administrator explained that their enrollment reports had been redesigned to reflect all the categories in the new funding formula. Another administrator spoke about how the college was aiming to increase the numbers of high school and incarcerated students it enrolled, because these categories were prioritized for higher funding in the new formula. Several respondents characterized WCC as "in the process" of reacting to the new formula. They made comments like, "We've been trying to adjust ourselves in terms of anticipating what that [the new funding formula] means for us."

As previously mentioned, seven out of 15 interviewees said adapting to changing laws and initiatives, like the Student Centered Funding Formula, was a challenge to WCC's enrollment management process. One faculty member expressed frustration about the lack of planning for improving student success required by the new formula. He said of the enrollment plan, "The targets are now in there [the enrollment plan] for degree completion. . . . But how do we do it? Not seeing that yet." An administrator expressed concern that the new funding formula reduced the funding rate for a type of enrollment that WCC had previously relied on during difficult enrollment times.[7] A faculty member and enrollment management committee member spoke about "the overwhelming amount of information" needed to make scheduling decisions to support student completion for the new formula. A senior administrator emphatically stated why he saw the Student Centered Funding Formula as a challenge to the enrollment management process at WCC: "It's poorly written and poorly executed. I think they had the best of intentions, but they're causing all sorts of havoc amongst districts. . . . It needs to be carefully thought out, because you're playing with a lot of lives."

---

[7] The specific type of enrollment is not identified to maintain the confidentiality of the site.

In this section, I have described Theme Three, adapting to state policy pressures. Interview participants described how college members were reacting to three new state laws or initiatives, namely AB 705, Guided Pathways, and the Student Centered Funding Formula. WCC's administrators perceived adapting to these external factors as challenges to the enrollment management process. These external factors shed light on how distributive leadership operates around enrollment management at WCC.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to understand the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college with a history of positive enrollment growth. The results described in this chapter delineate the various leadership functions around enrollment management at Western Community College, who performed them, and how followers were able to influence enrollment management leadership. As I progressed in collecting data, a unique picture began to emerge of a college responding to state-level laws and initiatives while grappling with hierarchical, top-down leadership. These internal and external factors weighed heavily on discussions and actions related to enrollment management. College members, particularly faculty, expressed frustration with the lack of transparency and unilateral decision making of the college president and other senior college leaders. Through the enrollment management committee, they exerted influence over enrollment management leadership to increase transparency and opportunities for input into enrollment planning. In the next chapter, I explain the significance of these findings.

CHAPTER FIVE:

DISCUSSION

In 2009, the U.S. national unemployment rate was 9.3 percent (Bureau of Labor Statistics, n.d.). By 2018, unemployment had fallen more than 5.4 percentage points, to a rate of 3.9 percent. Numerous studies have shown that as the unemployment rate decreases, community college enrollments also decrease (Betts & McFarland, 1995; Hillman & Orians, 2013; Pennington et al., 2002). Indeed, from fall 2016 to fall 2018, two-year public college enrollments declined by 4.8 percent (National Student Clearinghouse Research Center, 2018). The CCC system saw a 6.1 percent decline in enrollments in this time period (CCCCO, n.d.). Since community colleges in California have historically been largely funded based on enrollments, these declines have a significant impact on the financial resources available to them. Considering that, in California, community colleges receive substantially lower per-student funding rates than either four-year universities or K–12 schools (Bohn et al., 2013; Rhoads et al., 2009), any decrease in funding is felt deeply.

Complicating the landscape even further, the CCC system has been engaged in reform efforts for over a decade. With the enactment of the 2018–2019 California budget and the implementation of the Student Centered Funding Formula, the funding model for community colleges was radically altered. Transitioning from funding based nearly exclusively on enrollments, colleges now receive financial resources based on three factors: instructional time as measured through FTES, counts of low-income students, and PBF as measured through student outcomes (CCCCO, 2018). It was amidst this environment of declining enrollments and revenues and a metamorphosing funding formula that I set out to understand the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college.

Over a two-week period in March 2019, I conducted 15 interviews with WCC administrators, faculty, and classified staff. I used James Spillane's model of distributive leadership as a frame to examine if and how teamwork operated at the college. In this final chapter, I first discuss the significance of the findings, including their connection to existing research. I then address the limitations of the study before outlining implications for future research and practice. Finally, I reflect on how conducting this study changed me as a community college leader.

Significance of the Findings

James Spillane's model of distributive leadership is composed of three components: leaders, followers, and situation. Prior research on distributive leadership has looked at its connection to instruction (Camburn & Han, 2009; Dinham, 2009; Harris, 2004; MacBeath, 1988; Mitchell & Sackney, 2000), the roles of principals and school districts (Klar et al., 2016; Spillane, 2006; Spillane et al., 2009), and its relationship with the school environment (Cansoy & Parlar, 2018; Liu et al., 2018; Mascall et al., 2009; Woods & Roberts, 2016). Most of this research involved primary and secondary schools, however. This study expands the research base on distributive leadership by describing how it functions around enrollment management in a California community college.

Theme One of the study is that leadership is distributed. Interview data revealed that leadership around enrollment management at WCC has been distributed among senior administrators, deans, department chairs, and Enrollment Management Committee members. In Chapter Four, I described in detail how the leadership is distributed among these parties. While I was not surprised by the distribution of leadership that emerged in the interviews, the situational factors that influenced enrollment management leadership and the degree to which followers

79

influenced the enrollment management process were quite surprising. I will explain the import

of these matters in my discussion of the second and third themes.

The second theme that emerged from the data is that top-down leadership at WCC is

contested. Interview subjects across all employee groups said that this leadership model,

together with a culture of prestige at any cost and a lack of transparency, influenced leadership

around enrollment management. These internal factors expressed themselves in the setting of

aggressive enrollment targets by a small number of senior leaders in consultation with the

president. The top-down approach of the president and senior leaders led to campus climate

issues around collegiality, trust, and transparency, which created challenges in the enrollment

management process. This aligns with prior research that has shown that trust, leadership, and

relationships are the determining factors in the effectiveness of participatory governance (Kezar,

2004).

At face value, these findings seem to controvert multiple studies that established a

relationship between distributed leadership and a culture of trust (Adıgüzelli, 2016; Cansoy &

Parlar, 2018; Coleman, 2012; Smylie et al., 2007). Study participants differentiated between two

groups, however: the president and the president's inner circle, and lower level administrators,

such as instructional deans. They associated a top-down approach and a lack of trust with the

president and his inner circle. However, when discussing lower-level administrators, they

described collaborative working relationships that were not associated with a lack of trust. This

raises the possibility that distributive leadership may support trust at one level within an

organization, but not at all levels.

Arguably the most significant finding of this study is the elucidation of how followers

influence leadership around enrollment management in the areas of enrollment planning and

transparency. WCC's chief executive held the presidency for many years, which allowed him to consolidate power. Interview participants from all employee groups attributed the college's internal culture of prestige at any cost, top-down leadership, and a lack of transparency to the president. Faculty members became increasingly frustrated with the top-down approach and used the Enrollment Management Committee as a vehicle to resist it. Their advocacy led to the development of an enrollment management plan that provided the opportunity for committee members to influence the direction of enrollment management at WCC. In an example that illustrated the complex interplay of internal factors, leaders, and followers, faculty members were able to influence the setting of enrollment targets.

The internal factors of prestige at any cost, lack of transparency, and a top-down approach at WCC led to aggressive enrollment targets in a time of nationwide enrollment declines. These aggressive targets led to class cancellations, which negatively affected adjunct and full-time faculty members. Followers exerted influence at various levels in the hierarchy to revise this approach, which eventually led to senior administrators influencing the president to adopt a less aggressive approach. This successful grassroots effort to influence leadership in enrollment management contributes to the literature on distributive leadership and affirms prior literature on grassroots leadership.

The role that followers played in influencing positional leaders and effecting positive change at WCC reinforces previous research that found that grassroots leaders bring about needed and significant changes (Astin & Leland, 1991; Safarik, 2003; Scully & Segal, 2002). The current findings about faculty members' frustrations with top-down leadership uphold existing scholarship, which notes a shift from bureaucratic or top-down approaches to collaborative approaches in community college leadership (Amey, Jessup-Anger, & Jessup-

Anger, 2008; Cohen, Brawer, & Kisker, 2014). Faculty use of the Enrollment Management Committee supports past research that found that grassroots leaders effect change by co-opting existing organizational structures (Kezar, 2012). And the focus on transparency aligns with literature that points out that grassroots leaders often focus on ethical issues (Borregard, 2016; Kezar & Lester, 2011).

Theme Three relates to adapting to state policy pressures. Interview subjects across all employee groups identified three external contextual factors that influenced leadership around enrollment management at WCC—namely, AB 705, Guided Pathways, and the Student Centered Funding Formula. The identification of these changes to state laws, initiatives, and funding supports the literature that recognizes changes in government policy and funding as highly important external factors to community colleges (Amey & VanDerLinden, 2002; Bensimon, Neumann, & Birnbaum, 1989; Gumport, 2003; Johnson & Jones, 2018; Sullivan, 2001).

The college's administrators said adapting to changing state laws and initiatives such as these was a challenge to the enrollment management process; this was supported in interviews across employee groups. Participants described course cancellations that resulted from student enrollment decisions around AB 705. They also spoke of faculty members' anxiety over how the implementation of Guided Pathways could lead to reduced curricular offerings. Interviewees were split on where WCC was in terms of redefining enrollment management in alignment with the new Student Centered Funding Formula's foci of access and success. The picture that emerged was that of a college struggling to adapt to sweeping changes.

The enrollment management process was a fitting lens through which to examine leadership at WCC, as it is concerned with the entire student journey, from initial recruitment through completion. As such, it requires the collaboration of all of the major organizational

divisions of a college, academic affairs, student services, and business services. Enrollment management touches every aspect of college planning and was, therefore, an important issue to study and an apt lens through which to examine distributive leadership. Having addressed the significance of this study's findings, I next address the study's limitations.

Limitations

Though care was taken in the design and execution of this study, limitations do exist. These limitations do not compromise the validity of the findings; rather, they point to opportunities for further investigation. I describe these important considerations in this section.

One limitation of this study was that it primarily relied on participants' perceptions and memories of the examined phenomenon. Observing the phenomenon as it unfolded would have been beneficial. I could have interviewed participants as the events occurred and observed the phenomenon directly. Interviewing multiple people to confirm responses and conducting document analysis helped to address this limitation.

The study is also somewhat limited as a result of its scale. Eleven of the 15 interview participants were employed in the academic division of the college. Four were employed in the remaining divisions, including student services and business services. Although this breakdown is similar to the representation on the Enrollment Management Committee—where 30 of the 49 members were from the academic division of the college—in a larger scale study, broader representation from more areas of the college would incorporate more perspectives.

The site for this study was selected in part because it had increased FTES generation from the academic years 2013–2014 to 2016–2017, a time of systemwide enrollment declines. Colleges that were able to buck the national trend of shrinking enrollments during this time may have been able to do so because of enrollment management leadership, the focus of this study.

This study revealed the challenges that WCC encountered in regard to enrollment management leadership, suggesting that its enrollment growth from 2013-14 to 2016-17 occurred in spite of the leadership around enrollment management. A limitation of this study is that it was not designed to identify the reasons why the growth occurred. This is an opportunity for further investigation.

Finally, transferability of the findings is dependent upon context, which is limited to the CCC system. Furthermore, the transferability of the findings is limited due to the unique internal contextual factors at WCC. When I began this study, I could neither anticipate that the college leadership employed top-down leadership nor that faculty members were in the process of resisting it. While this unique internal culture does limit the transferability of the findings, it also points to implications for further research.

Implications

This study has implications for future research, policy, and for the work of education practitioners, including positional leaders and followers. In this section, I first discuss the research implications, then I consider the implications for policy, and finally examine the implications for community college personnel.

Implications for Future Research

This study identified the internal factors that influenced leadership around enrollment management at one California community college. As one would expect, internal factors develop out of the unique aspects of a specific site. In this case, these unique aspects included a college president who had been at the college for many years beyond the average presidential tenure in a CCC and who employed a top-down approach. Future research should examine the variety of internal factors that influence leadership around enrollment management.

Variations on the research design should be employed to expand the knowledge base on distributive leadership and enrollment management. A multiple case design would be a natural extension of what was learned herein. For example, a multiple case study of colleges responding to some of the same external pressures could provide insight into how unique internal cultures respond in similar or dissimilar ways to the same external factors. Other multiple case study frameworks that could yield new information include sites across various states with significantly different external contexts; sites that vary geographically within the same system (rural, urban, suburban); and sites with varied missions (transfer or vocational focused). Furthermore, a survey could be employed to incorporate more perspectives from throughout the college. Lastly, a mixed methods design could be employed to incorporate quantitative analysis of population and demographic data to shine light on a college's enrollment performance. In addition to research implications, this research also resulted in implications for policy.

Implications for Policy

As was noted in Chapters One and Four, the CCC system is in the process of implementing multiple new policy changes, including AB 705, Guided Pathways, and the Student Centered Funding Formula. Policy makers should closely monitor success and completion data relating to these initiatives to ensure that they are achieving their intended outcomes. AB 705 requires colleges to place incoming students into college-level English and Math. Course success data should be examined to ensure that this change is benefitting all students and not continuing disproportionate impacts on marginalized groups. Policy makers should evaluate completion data over the coming years and decades to assess whether Guided Pathways has increased completions and decreased time to completion, as intended.

The new Student Centered Funding Formula is California's version of performance-based funding. Prior research into performance-based funding has shown little benefit in states where it has been implemented (Hillman et al., 2015; Hillman et al., 2018; Li & Kennedy, 2018; McKinney & Hagedorn, 2017; Thornton & Friedel, 2016). However, when Melguizo, Witham, Fong, and Chi (2017) ran simulations of four funding formulas using California community college data, they found that a hybrid model that balances outcomes performance indicators with consideration of the numbers of disadvantaged students is most likely to result in funding adequacy for community colleges. Their results provide hope that the Student Centered Funding Formula may be a success for students and colleges, but policy makers should rigorously evaluate the effects of the new funding formula to ensure that colleges are adequately funded and that student outcomes improve. Next, I discuss implications for practitioners at colleges.

Implications for Practice

This investigation into distributive leadership around enrollment management generated implications for community college practitioners. These implications are in the areas of leadership, follower influence, and systemwide support. I discuss each of these in this section.

The implementation of participatory governance in California community colleges was intended to improve their effectiveness, but participatory governance can push constituent groups apart, rather than bringing them together (Schuetz, 1999). On a broad scale, community college leaders have evolved from a directive style to a collaborative style (Sullivan, 2001). Indeed, multiple studies on community college leadership have identified the importance of teamwork (Malm, 2008; Neumann & Bensimon, 1990; Price et al., 2016). Likewise, community college faculty members value communication, honesty, integrity, listening, and ethical behavior in their leaders (Pate & Angell, 2013). When college leaders don't lead effectively, followers can rebel.

86

From 2000 to 2014, 349 faculty votes of no confidence took place against institutional leaders and 26 percent of them were related to their leadership (Frantz & Lawson, 2017). Effective enrollment management requires the participation and collaboration of all campus members. At WCC, despite positive enrollment trends, the top-down approach had eroded the campus climate. This decrease in collegiality made faculty less willing to work with administrators in addressing enrollment challenges and, in fact, fueled an adversarial relationship between the two groups. In the current study, the findings concerning top-down leadership imply that community college administrators need to employ collaborative leadership approaches in enrollment management.

A collaborative approach requires transparency. At WCC, the president and his inner circle's top-down approach led to campus climate issues relating to collegiality, trust, and transparency, which participants said were a challenge to leadership around enrollment management. Community college administrators need to promote transparency in enrollment management by clarifying the process, including identifying who sets enrollment targets and the rationale for the targets. They also need to provide genuine opportunities for involvement and input into enrollment management, rather than developing plans and bringing them to participatory governance committees fully formed for minor adjustments. Successful enrollment management addresses student needs holistically and requires the efforts of personnel campuswide (Bontrager & Hossler, 2015; Dolence, 1993). To successfully engage faculty and staff in enrollment management, administrators must employ ethical and transparent collaborative leadership strategies. Without the engagement of the entire campus community, efforts to respond to an ever-evolving external landscape will be hampered.

As mentioned in the discussion of significance, perhaps the most noteworthy finding of this study is the explication of how followers influence leadership around enrollment

management—a finding that, in fact, caught me off guard. Originating from one of the least influential positions at the college, the adjunct faculty member, followers were able to effect change up the hierarchy at WCC in a manner that eventually resulted in the president adjusting his approach to enrollment targets. The president set aside the internal culture that he established of prestige at any cost and shifted to a less aggressive approach. The success they were able to exert on leadership serves as a call to followers to be steadfast in advocating for ethical change. Community college faculty members must be aware of the legal rights afforded them by AB 1725's participatory governance mandates and advocate for their right to be included and make recommendations. So far I have outlined the implications for internal campus constituents, but this study also sets a path for the actions of external players.

The third theme that emerged was adapting to state policy pressures. I was not surprised that participants identified AB 705, Guided Pathways, and the Student Centered Funding Formula as external challenges to the enrollment management process. However, I did not anticipate the level of anxiety and disruption these new initiatives and laws exerted on campus members. This study portrayed a college grappling with these extensive changes. Educational system leaders need to offer greater assistance to colleges adjusting to legislative changes and implementing new initiatives. Leading up to these changes, the California Community College Chancellor's Office held many regional and statewide workshops and trainings. This study showed that, at least at one California community college, these resources were not enough. System leaders should evaluate the effectiveness of the support they offer for the systemic changes that are currently roiling through the California community colleges. They should consider more intensive support for the colleges, perhaps in the form of resource teams to work

directly with individual colleges. As this research highlights new directions for leaders, followers, and system leaders, it also has implications for me personally. I turn to these next.

Reflection

Going into this project, I had two goals. First, I wanted to produce a piece of research that could benefit the educational system that I've worked in for 12 years. As an eyewitness to systemwide declining enrollments over the last six years, I've seen their negative impact first hand. The cuts that result from declining revenues are painful. I've observed consternation and finger pointing on campuses, as colleges find themselves unable to buck economic trends. Second, I hoped to learn about effective practices and leadership strategies that would aid me in my work as a community college enrollment manager. I achieved these goals, and the process of designing and conducting this study has changed me profoundly in the way that only multi-year, hands-on learning can.

I conclude this experience knowing that leadership occurs at the point of connection between two people. Individual human relationships are the foundation of organizations. When trust exists, organizations can flourish. Trust is built over time through ethical behavior, transparency, and inclusion. When trust is absent from organizational culture, progress can be stalled while followers incite correction.

APPENDIX A:

INTERVIEW PROTOCOL

Opener & Consent:

- The purpose of this interview is to gather information on the role of teamwork around enrollment management at a California community college.

- Western Community College was selected for participation because it increased enrollments from 2013 to 2016 and has a structure in place for participatory governance.

- The interview will last approximately one hour and be audio recorded for data analysis.

- Your participation and responses will be kept confidential.

- You may choose not to answer any question or to stop the interview at any time. Do you have any questions? Do you consent to participate in this study?

1. **Opener:** How long have you worked at Western Community College?

2. **R3:** Define enrollment management at WCC. In other words, what does enrollment management mean, and what does it include at WCC?

3. **R1:** Could you walk me through the enrollment management process at WCC? Be as specific as you can. (What happens first? Etc.)

    a. For each of the following, what leadership does this person or group provide in enrollment management, if any?

        i. Senior leadership (this includes the president and vice presidents)

        ii. Administrators with oversight of enrollment management

        iii. Deans

        iv. Department chairs

   v. Enrollment management committee members

   vi. Academic senate president

   vii. Classified staff

   viii. Others

 b. For each person or group above, describe the leadership they provide related to enrollment management.

   i. Who did they lead?

    1. Please describe how these followers responded to their leadership and direction.

     a. In what areas did they agree with the leadership and direction?

     b. In what areas did they resist their leadership and direction?

     c. Did they respond in another way? Please explain.

 c. How are decisions made?

 d. How does communication occur?

4. **R2:** Internal and external factors can influence leadership around enrollment management.

 a. Internal factors include any elements that are unique to your college's setting and may include things like campus politics, technological capability, staffing resources, and institutional routines and practices.

   i. In what ways, if any, have campus politics influenced enrollment management policies or approaches?

   ii. In what ways, if any, has campus technological capability influenced enrollment management policies or approaches?

91

     iii. In what ways, if any, have staffing resources influenced enrollment

management policies or approaches?

     iv. In what ways, if any, have WCC's routines and processes influenced

enrollment management policies or approaches?

     v. Are there any other internal factors that influence enrollment management and

the way it is led?

         1. How do they influence enrollment management?

b. External factors include any elements from the outside environment and may include

things like changing laws or initiatives, economic conditions, and demographic shifts

like numbers of high school graduates.

     i. In what ways, if any, have changing laws or state initiatives influenced

enrollment management policies or approaches? For example, AB 705, the

new Student Centered Funding Formula, Guided Pathways, etc.

     ii. In what ways, if any, have economic conditions influenced enrollment

management policies or approaches?

     iii. In what ways, if any, have demographic shifts like numbers of high school

graduates influenced enrollment management policies or approaches?

     iv. Are there any other external factors that influence enrollment management

and the way it is led?

5. **R3:** What do you think are the two most important factors that have helped make WCC's

enrollment management process successful?

a. What made those factors important?

6. **R3:** What do you think are the two most difficult aspects of WCC's enrollment management process?

   a. What made those aspects difficult?

7. **R3:** What are your greatest concerns about WCC's enrollment management process as you move forward?

   a. Why are these concerns most significant?

8. **R3:** What is one thing that you think I need to know or understand before I leave here today?

APPENDIX B:

WCC SECTION DEVELOPMENT AND SECTION MANAGEMENT PRINCIPLES

Development

1. Guided Pathways are scheduled for all students to enable them to achieve their educational goals in a timely manner. Consideration in schedule development should be given (but not limited) to:
   a. Full-time students
   b. Part-time students
   c. Evening students
   d. Weekend students
   e. Satellite locations[8]
   f. Online students
   g. Hybrid students
   h. Offsite locations
   i. Honors students
   j. First-Year Promise students
   k. Dual-enrolled students
   l. Concurrently enrolled students
   m. Noncredit and continuing education students
   n. Public safety students (e.g., Police, Sheriff, Fire, Lifeguard)
   o. Incarcerated students
   p. Community education students

2. Academic Affairs develops schedules based on enrollment data available from previous and planned terms to determine the number of sections to offer, taking into account potential growth targets, policy shifts (e.g., AB 705), and available state funding where applicable. While this is not the sole determining factor, enrollment trends are important considerations when used to determine student demand for courses and sections.

3. Schedules are centered around the mission of the California Community Colleges system and Vision for Success goals in supporting access, equity, success, completion, transfer, career/technical education, continuing education, cooperative work experience, and apprenticeships.

4. The Chancellor's Office-approved time blocks, published by the Academic Affairs Division, should be used for credit-bearing courses whenever possible in order to assist

---

[8] The offsite name was replaced with a general term to maintain confidentiality of the site.

with students' planning and to enable maximum facilities utilization and efficiency.

5. Annual FTES targets are established by the district with input from the Enrollment Management Committee. Based on these targets, department chairs work with their deans to best meet students' needs by initially proposing the Schedule of Classes.

6. Schedule development should include consideration of other impacted areas of campus, such as student services and support, facilities, campus safety, contracts & procurement, and technology.

Management

1. Deans will inform department chairs of requests for class cancellations and strategize ways to minimize impact on students.

2. Gateway credit classes should strive to achieve at least 33% enrollment (e.g., 12 out of 35) by the start of the semester or term. Exceptions to this norm may be merited and will be addressed by the office of Academic Affairs in concert with department chairs and deans. Changes in the state's funding formula may also require revisiting this percentage.

3. Capstone credit classes should strive to achieve at least 20% enrollment (e.g., seven out of 35) by the start of the semester or term. Exceptions to this norm may be merited and will be addressed by the office of Academic Affairs in concert with department chairs and deans. Changes in the State's funding formula may also require revisiting this percentage.

4. Noncredit CDCP, Dual Enrollment, Concurrent Enrollment, and Incarcerated classes should strive to achieve at least 25% enrollment (e.g., nine out of 35) by the start of the semester or term. Exceptions to this norm may be merited and will be addressed by the office of Academic Affairs in concert with department chairs and deans. Changes in the state's funding formula may also require revisiting this percentage.

5. Noncredit (non-enhanced) classes should strive to achieve at least 33% enrollment (e.g., 12 out of 35) by the start of the semester or term. Exceptions to this norm may be merited and will be addressed by the office of Academic Affairs Division in concert with department chairs and deans. Changes in the state's funding formula may also require revisiting this percentage.

6. New classes and programs, and/or new delivery modes or education sites, may be exempt from the aforementioned suggested minima in order to help build and sustain the evolving program/mode/site.

7. Enrollments within priority registration blocks are monitored carefully by Academic Affairs before cancellations are made. Every effort is made to cancel courses in a timely manner to allow students to find alternate options to satisfy pathway requirements. Course cancellations should be made in consultation with the department chair and dean whenever possible.

8. The decision to cancel class sections is based on multiple factors that may include (but are not limited to) management criteria denoted in Numbers 2–5 above, the number of students currently enrolled in that section, the availability of other sections of that course, if the course is a capstone course and required for students to complete a pathway leading to a degree or certificate, past enrollment trends and an assessment of the likelihood of the course reaching a minimally acceptable enrollment, where and how the course is offered (e.g., CCC), and other factors.

9. After registration has begun, additional courses are added to the schedule as deemed necessary, based on waitlist demand with consideration of available resources (e.g., instructors, facilities).

10. Class cancellations are communicated to students through email, and whenever possible or necessary, by phone. Every effort is made to inform students about existing alternative options for enrollment. Students are now prompted that cancellation may impact their financial aid status, and that questions should be addressed to Financial Aid. Department chairs and/or deans notify impacted faculty and staff of course cancellations whenever they occur. Academic Affairs regularly sends a summary list of additions and cancellations via district distribution list, typically at the end of the day or at the start of the following day in which cancellations occur.

REFERENCES

Adıgüzelli, Y. (2016). Examining the relationship between distributed leadership and organizational trust according to opinions of teachers. *Education & Science/Egitim ve Bilim*, *41*(185), 269–280. https://doi.org/10.15390/EB.2016.6218

American Association of Community Colleges. (2015). *Community college completion: Progress toward goal of 50% increase*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://vtechworks.lib.vt.edu/bitstream/handle/10919/83069/CommunityCollegeCompleti onProgress.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

American Association of Community Colleges. (2017). *Enrollment trend*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/DataPointsVol5_No3_final.pdf

Amey, M. J., Jessup-Anger, E., & Jessup-Anger, J. (2008). Community college governance: What matters and why? *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *141*, 5–14.

Amey, M. J., & VanDerLinden, K. E. (2002). *The institutional context of community college administration* (Leadership Series Research Brief No. 4). Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.381.6532&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Apple, M. W. (1999). Between neoliberalism and neoconservatism: Education and conservatism in a global context. In N. C. Burbules & C. A. Torres (Eds.), *Globalization and education: Critical perspectives* (pp. 57–77). New York, NY: Routledge.

Astin, H. S., & Leland, C. (1991). *Women of influence, women of vision : A cross-generational study of leaders and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bailey, T. R., Smith Jaggars, S., & Jenkins, D. (2015). *Redesigning America's community colleges: A clearer path to student success*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A., & Birnbaum, R. (1989). *Making sense of administrative leadership: The "L" word in higher education* (ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1). Washington, DC: The George Washington University.

Betts, J. R., & McFarland, L. L. (1995). Safe port in a storm: The impact of labor market conditions on community college enrollments. *Journal of Human Resources*, *30*, 741–765. https://doi.org/10.2307/146230

Bohn, S., Reyes, B., & Johnson, H. (2013). *The impact of budget cuts on California's community colleges*. San Francisco, CA: Public Policy Institute of California. Retrieved from http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_313SBR.pdf

Bontrager, B., & Hossler, D. (2015). *Handbook of strategic enrollment management* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borregard, A. R. (2016). *Organizing for change: A case study of grassroots leadership at a Kentucky community college* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from https://uknowledge.uky.edu/epe_etds/38

Breneman, D. W., & Nelson, S. C. (1981). *Financing community colleges: An economic perspective*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Brown, E. (2017). *2017–18 Governor's budget summary*. Retrieved from http://www.ebudget.ca.gov/2017-18/pdf/BudgetSummary/FullBudgetSummary.pdf

Bureau of Labor Statistics. (n.d.). *Employment status of the civilian noninstitutional population, 1946 to date (annual averages)*. Retrieved from https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat01.pdf

Burke, K. M. (2010). Distributed leadership and shared governance in post-secondary education. *Management in Education*, *24*, 51–54. https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020610363088

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (n.d.). *Full-time equivalent students (FTES) interactive summary report*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from https://datamart.cccco.edu/Students/FTES_Summary.aspx

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2010). *2008–09 Recalculation apportionment report by district, Exhibit E*. Retrieved from http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal_Services/Apport/2008-09/R1/Exhibit_E_-_2008-09_Recalculation.pdf

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2017a). *2015–16 Recalculation apportionment report by district, Exhibit E*. Retrieved from http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal_Services/Apport/2015-16/R1_4_June/Exhibit_E_201516r1_060217.pdf

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2017b). *California Community Colleges key facts*. Retrieved October 19, 2017, from http://californiacommunitycolleges.cccco.edu/PolicyInAction/KeyFacts.aspx

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2017c). *Understanding FTES and its role in California community college funding: A primer (July 2017 Draft)*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. (2018). *Non-technical student-centered funding formula frequently asked questions (as of August 17, 2018)*. Retrieved from http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal_Services/SCFF/NonTechFAQsAugust17 Version.pdf

California Postsecondary Education Commission. (1998). *Towards a unified state system*

    (Commission Report No. 98–9). Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from

    http://www.cpec.ca.gov/CompleteReports/1998Reports/98-09.pdf

Camburn, E. M., & Han, S. W. (2009). Investigating connections between distributed leadership

    and instructional change. In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: Different*

    perspectives (pp. 25–46). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Cansoy, R., & Parlar, H. (2018). Examining the relationships among trust in administrator,

    distributed leadership and school academic optimism. *Educational Administration:*

    Theory and Practice, *24*, 1–44. https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2018.001

Cohen, A. M., Brawer, F. B., & Kisker, C. B. (2014). The American community college (6th

    ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Coleman, A. (2012). The significance of trust in school-based collaborative leadership.

    International Journal of Leadership in Education, *15*, 79–106.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2011.578755

Collins, S. E., Leitzel, T. C., Morgan, S. D., & Stalcup, R. J. (1994). Declining revenues and

    increasing enrollments: Strategies for coping. *Community College Journal of Research*

    and Practice, *18*, 33–42. https://doi.org/10.1080/1066892940180104

Community College Reform Act, Assembly Bill 1725 (1988).

Coons, A. G., Browne, A. D., Campion, H. A., Dumke, G. S., Holy, T. C., McHenry, D. E., . . .

    Wert, R. J. (1960). *A master plan for higher education in California, 1960–1975*.

    Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education. Retrieved from

    http://www.lib.berkeley.edu/uchistory/archives_exhibits/masterplan/MasterPlan1960.pdf

D'Amico, M. M., Friedel, J. N., Katsinas, S. G., & Thornton, Z. M. (2014). Current

   developments in community college performance funding. *Community College Journal*

   of Research and Practice, 38, 231–241.

Dinham, S. (2009). The relationship between distributed leadership and action learning in

   schools: A case study. In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: Different perspectives*

   (pp. 139–156). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Dolence, M. G. (1993). *Strategic enrollment management: A primer for campus administrators*.

   Washington, DC: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions

   Officers.

Dowd, A. C., & Shieh, L. T. (2014). The implications of state fiscal policies for community

   colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *168*, 53–63.

   https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20120

Dowd, B. A., & Hardash, P. (2016, July 25). *Nuts and bolts of community college finance*.

   Presentation at the Association of California Community College Administrators'

   Administration 101 meeting. Retrieved from http://www.mtsac.edu/president/cabinet-

   notes/2016-17/ACCCA_Admin_101_Nuts-Bolts_CC_Finance_072516.pdf

Eckel, P. D. (2000). The role of shared governance in institutional hard decisions: Enabler or

   antagonist? *The Review of Higher Education*, *24*, 15–39.

   https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2000.0022

Eddy, P. L. (2005). Framing the role of leader: How community college presidents construct

   their leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *29*, 705–727.

Frantz, A. C., & Lawson, J. N. (2017). Faculty expressions of (no) confidence in institutional

    leadership. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *49*(1), 62–70.

    https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2017.1265395

Grasmick, L., Davies, T. G., & Harbour, C. P. (2012). Participative leadership: Perspectives of

    community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *36*,

    67–80. https://doi.org/10.1080/10668920802421496

Gronn, P. (2000). Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. *Educational*

    Management & Administration, *28*, 317–338.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/0263211X000283006

Gumport, P. J. (2003). The demand–response scenario: Perspectives of community college

    presidents. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *586*,

    38–61.

Harris, A. (2004). Distributed leadership and school improvement: Leading or misleading?

    Educational Management Administration & Leadership, *32*, 11–24.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143204039297

Hendrick, R. Z., Hightower, W. H., & Gregory, D. E. (2006). State funding limitations and

    community college open door policy: Conflicting priorities? *Community College Journal*

    of Research and Practice, *30*, 627–640.

Hillman, N., & Orians, E. (2013). Community colleges and labor market conditions: How does

    enrollment demand change relative to local unemployment rates? *Research in Higher*

    Education, *54*, 765–780. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-013-9294-7

Hillman, N. W., Fryar, A. H., & Crespín-Trujillo, V. (2018). Evaluating the impact of

    performance funding in Ohio and Tennessee. *American Educational Research Journal*,

    55, 144–170. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217732951

Hillman, N. W., Tandberg, D. A., & Fryar, A. H. (2015). Evaluating the impacts of "new"

    performance funding in higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*,

    37, 501–519.

Hope, L. (2018a, June). *Change leadership, AB 705, and strategic enrollment management*.

    Presented at the Strategic Enrollment Management Academy, Newport Beach, CA.

Hope, L. (2018b, July 11). *Assembly Bill (AB) 705 implementation* (Memorandum). Sacramento,

    CA: California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. Retrieved from

    https://assessmentplacement.squarespace.com/s/0718-AB-705-Implementation-

    Memorandumpdf.pdf

Johnson, A., & Jones, S. J. (2018). An instrumental case study analysis of anticipatory leadership

    practices in community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*,

    42, 389–404.

Joughin, L. (1969). *Academic freedom and tenure: A handbook of the American Association of*

    University Professors. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Kezar, A. (1998). Exploring new avenues for leading community colleges: The paradox of

    participatory models. *Community College Review*, *25*(4), 75–87.

    https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219802500407

Kezar, A. (2004). What is more important to effective governance: Relationships, trust, and

    leadership, or structures and formal processes? *New Directions for Higher Education*,

    127, 35–46.

Kezar, A. (2012). Bottom-up/top-down leadership: Contradiction or hidden phenomenon. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *83*, 725–760.

Kezar, A., & Eckel, P. D. (2004). Meeting today's governance challenges: A synthesis of the literature and examination of a future agenda for scholarship. *Journal of Higher Education*, *75*, 371–399. https://doi.org/10.1353/jhe.2004.0022

Kezar, A. J., & Lester, J. (2011). *Enhancing campus capacity for leadership: An examination of grassroots leaders in higher education*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Kezar, A., Lester, J., & Anderson, G. (2006). Challenging stereotypes that interfere with effective governance. *Thought & Action*, *22*(2), 121–134.

Kirst, M. W. (2008). Secondary schools and colleges must work together. *Thought & Action*, *24*, 111–122.

Klar, H. W., Huggins, K. S., Hammonds, H. L., & Buskey, F. C. (2016). Fostering the capacity for distributed leadership: A post-heroic approach to leading school improvement. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *19*, 111–137. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1005028

Levin, J. S., Martin, M. C., López Damián, A. I., & Hoggatt, M. J. (2018). Preservation of community college logic: Organizational responses to state policies and funding practices in three states. *Community College Review*, *46*, 197–220. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552118758893

Li, A. Y., & Kennedy, A. I.. (2018). Performance funding policy effects on community college outcomes: Are short-term certificates on the rise? *Community College Review*, *46*, 3–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0091552117743790

Little Hoover Commission. (2012). *Serving students, serving California: Updating the California Community Colleges to meet evolving demands*. Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved from http://www.lhc.ca.gov/sites/lhc.ca.gov/files/Reports/210/Report210.pdf

Liu, Y., Bellibas, M. S., & Printy, S. (2018). How school context and educator characteristics predict distributed leadership: A hierarchical structural equation model with 2013 TALIS data. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, *46*, 401–423.

MacBeath, J. (Ed.). (1988). *Effective school leadership: Responding to change*. London, England: Paul Chapman.

Malm, J. R. (2008). Six community college presidents: Organizational pressures, change processes and approaches to leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *32*, 614–628.

Mascall, B., Leithwood, K., Strauss, T., & Sacks, R. (2009). The relationship between distributed leadership and teachers' academic optimism. In A. Harris (Ed.), *Distributed leadership: different perspectives* (pp. 81–100). Dordrecht: Springer.

Maxwell, J. A. (2013). *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Mayrowetz, D. (2008). Making sense of distributed leadership: Exploring the multiple usages of the concept in the field. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, *44*, 424–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013161X07309480

McKinney, L., & Hagedorn, L. S. (2017). Performance-based funding for community colleges: Are colleges disadvantaged by serving the most disadvantaged students? *Journal of Higher Education*, *88*, 159–182. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2016.1243948

Mehta, J. (2013). When professions shape politics: The case of accountability in K–12 and

    higher education. *Educational Policy*, *28*, 881–915.

Melguizo, T., Witham, K., Fong, K., & Chi, E. (2017). Understanding the relationship between

    equity and efficiency: Towards a concept of funding adequacy for community colleges.

    Journal of Education Finance, *43*, 195–216.

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and*

    implementation. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Miller, M. T., Vacik, S. M., & Benton, C. (1998). Community college faculty involvement in

    institutional governance. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *22*, 645–

    654. https://doi.org/10.1080/1066892980220702

Mitchell, C., & Sackney, L. (2000). *Profound improvement: Building capacity for a learning*

    community. Lisse, Netherlands: Swets & Zeitlinger.

Mullen, J., & Regalado, E. (2011, August). *Attendance accounting for the California Community*

    Colleges. Presentation to California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office. Retrieved

    from

    http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/CFFP/Fiscal_Services/Attndc_Acctg/General/CCC_At

    tendance_Accounting_8-2-11_2.pdf

Mullin, C. M., & Honeyman, D. S. (2007). The funding of community colleges: A typology of

    state funding formulas. *Community College Review*, *35*, 113–127.

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2017a). *Current term enrollment estimates:*

    Fall 2017. Retrieved from https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-

    content/uploads/CurrentTermEnrollment-Fall2017a.pdf

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2017b). *Current term enrollment estimates: Spring 2017*. Retrieved from https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/CurrentTermEnrollment-Spring2017.pdf

National Student Clearinghouse Research Center. (2018). *Current term enrollment estimates: Fall 2018*. Retrieved from https://nscresearchcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/CurrentTermEnrollmentReport-Fall-2018-3.pdf

Navarette, L. (2018). *CEO tenure and retention study: Eighth update.* Sacramento, CA: Community College League of California. Retrieved from https://www.ccleague.org/sites/default/files/publications/CEO/2018-ceo_tenure_retention_study_cclc.pdf

Neumann, A., & Bensimon, E. M. (1990). Constructing the presidency: College presidents' images of their leadership roles, a comparative study. *Journal of Higher Education*, *61*, 678–701. https://doi.org/10.2307/1981990

Northouse, P. G. (2015). *Leadership: theory and practice* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Pate, J. C., & Angell, L. R. (2013). Factors community college faculty consider important to academic leadership. *Kentucky Journal of Higher Education Policy & Practice*, *2*(1), 1–13.

Pennington, K. L., McGinty, D., & Williams, M. R. (2002). Community college enrollment as a function of economic indicators. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *26*, 431–437. https://doi.org/10.1080/02776770290041783

Phelan, D. J. (2014). The clear and present funding crisis in community colleges. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, *168*, 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/cc.20116

Pierce, S. R. (2014). *Governance reconsidered: How boards, presidents, administrators, and faculty can help their colleges thrive* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Piland, W. E., & Bublitz, R. F. (1998). Faculty perceptions of shared governance in California community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *22*, 99–110. https://doi.org/10.1080/1066892980220201

Price, P. D., Schneider, D. K., & Quick, L. A. (2016). Financial challenges in higher education: Community college leadership style and ranking. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *40*, 508–522.

Rhoads, R. A., Saenz, V., & Carducci, R. (2004). Higher education reform as a social movement: The case of affirmative action. *The Review of Higher Education*, *28*, 191–220.

Rhoads, R. A., Wagoner, R. L., & Ryan, E. (2009). The American community college and the neoliberal state: A critical analysis of the case of California. *Education & Society*, *27*(1), 5–33.

Royer, D. W., & Latz, A. O. (2016). Community college leadership transition through the framework of appreciative inquiry. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *40*, 695–705.

Safarik, L. (2003). Feminist transformation in higher education: Discipline, structure, and institution. *The Review of Higher Education*, *26*, 419–445. https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2003.0035

Saldaña, J. (2013). The coding manual for qualitative researchers (2nd ed). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Schuetz, P. (1999). Shared governance in community colleges. *ERIC Digest*. Retrieved from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED433077

Scully, M., & Segal, A. (2002). Passion with an umbrella: Grassroots activists in the workplace. In M. Lounsbury & M. J. Ventresca (Eds.), *Research in the sociology of organizations* (Vol. 19, pp. 125–168). Retrieved from https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1016/S0733-558X%2802%2919004-5

Seymour-Campbell Student Success Act of 2012, Pub. L. No. Senate Bill 1456 (2012).

Smylie, M. A., Mayrowetz, D., Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and the development of distributed leadership. *Journal of School Leadership*, *17*, 469–503.

Spillane, J. P. (2006). *Distributed leadership* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M., & Pareja, A. (2009). Positioning the principals in patterns of school leadership distribution. In K. A. Leithwood, B. Mascall, & T. Strauss (Eds.), *Distributed leadership according to the evidence* (pp. 87–110). New York, NY: Routledge.

Spillane, J. P., & Diamond, J. B. (Eds.). (2007). *Distributed leadership in practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Spillane, J. P., Hallett, T., & Diamond, J. B. (2003). Forms of capital and the construction of leadership: Instructional leadership in urban elementary schools. *Sociology of Education*, *76*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.2307/3090258

Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2001). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. *Educational Researcher*, *30*(3), 23–28. https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X030003023

State of California Employment Development Department. (n.d.). *Annual averages unemployment rate and labor force data table*. Retrieved on May 1, 2019, from http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/data/unemployment-and-labor-force.html

Stoeckel, P. R., & Davies, T. G. (2007). Reflective leadership by selected community college presidents. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *31*, 895–912.

Sullivan, L. G. (2001). Four generations of community college leadership. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *25*, 559–571. https://doi.org/10.1080/106689201316880759

Tedrow, B., & Rhoads, R. A. (1999). A qualitative study of women's experiences in community college leadership positions. *Community College Review*, *27*(3), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/009155219902700301

Thornton, Z. M., & Friedel, J. N. (2016). Performance-based funding: State policy influences on small rural community colleges. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, *40*, 188–203.

Woods, P. A., & Roberts, A. (2016). Distributed leadership and social justice: Images and meanings from across the school landscape. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, *19*, 138–156.

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Zumeta, W. (2011). What does it mean to be accountable? Dimensions and implications of higher education's public accountability. *The Review of Higher Education*, *35*, 131–148.