ABSTRACT

FRANCIS, REBECCA PULLIAM. Interorganizational Collaboration: Interactions and Processes in a Community College and Community Collaboration. (Under the direction of Carol E. Kasworm.)

North Carolina community colleges have a long tradition of collaborating with their communities (Segner, 1974). Drawing upon the Relational Leadership Model as a conceptual framework (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998), this qualitative case study examined the interactions and processes used by a community college to collaborate with diverse stakeholders in its community. The 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum in North Carolina provided a focused example of community college leaders and staff working together with community leaders and citizens for the mutual benefit of the college and the community. The subsequent design process of the educational building funded with the bonds issuance was further examined.

Based on interviews and document analysis, key understandings developed related to interorganizational collaboration. First, the participants of this study observed that a community college as an organization had the capacity to exercise leadership within the larger community. By building upon existent relationships and forging new relationships, the college took on the leadership role in modeling and forming new collaborations with business and industry, the public school system, regional campuses of the university system, and other governmental agencies. Second, individual mental models, organizational culture, and environmental preconditions were present and increased stakeholder motivation to participate in
the alliance and structurally made collaboration possible. Most notably, two distinct manifestations of interorganizational collaboration were observed in this study.

Two models, the Goal-Based Interorganizational Collaboration model and the Issue-Based Interorganizational Collaboration model were developed. These two models were presented as a matrix to describe and compare the following characteristics of each model: the purpose of the collaboration, the initiating role of organizational leadership, the characteristics of collective group, the attitudes and values of the group, the group processes, and the outcomes of the group collaboration. These two models present key understandings of interorganizational efforts to accomplish goals or solve issues that may be beyond the capabilities of one organization or a community college.
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CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Collaboration is the process that helps individuals and organizations survive, thrive, and adapt to an increasingly complex world. This is not a new idea. Respected thinkers, practitioners, and researchers from John Naisbitt, Margaret Wheatley, Peter Drucker, Jack Welch, and Peter Senge, to Warren Bennis have expressed this thought for years. In reports from forward-looking commissions and initiatives, educational leaders suggest that collaboration will be a key to the survival and prosperity of community colleges in the 21st century (American Association of Community Colleges, 2000; Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). Community college leaders require a better understanding of collaboration to be able to use this process as another tool to creatively and efficiently solve complex problems and issues involving the college and the community.

Numerous definitions exist for collaboration in the research literature (Kanter, 1994; Komives, 2000; London, 1995; Vangen & Huxham, 2003; Wood & Gray, 1991; Yukl, 2002). For the purpose of this study, collaboration refers to an interactive process of shared decision-making. It occurs when a group of autonomous, yet interdependent, stakeholders share responsibility, authority, and accountability in order to constructively explore different perspectives in search of
a solution to a mutual problem or issue. The group uses shared rules, norms, and structures to decide and act on a jointly agreed upon result or objective.

North Carolina community colleges have a long tradition of collaborating with their communities. In fact, by North Carolina law, comprehensive community colleges must be established based on proof of local interest by citizens, proof of need by local industries, and the ability of the local governing bodies to contribute to the financing of college infrastructure (Segner, 1974). Administrative oversight of the community college is by a local board of trustees appointed from the district. Many citizens actively participate in decision-making and leadership roles for the community college through service on advisory and planning committees. The local constituents of a public community college feel that they are involved in what happens to and in the college. Therefore, there is a sense of “ownership” and responsibility that the local citizens feel for “their” community college.

It has been documented in the literature that successful community colleges involve and collaborate with the citizens and industries in their region (Roueche, Taber, & Roueche, 1995). Generally, the literature provides anecdotal evidence of collaboration for the accomplishment of a common goal. These self-reports of successful collaborations describe positive impacts to individuals and communities, such as new industrial growth, new jobs, improvements in community health and social conditions, increase in cultural activities, and better cooperation between government and community groups.
Few studies have taken a theoretical look at the interaction between a formal organization, namely a community college, and the amorphous collection and related networks of individuals and groups that make up the community. John E. Roueche, Lynn Sullivan Taber, and Suanne D. Roueche (1995) confirmed that one of the challenges of building partnerships and collaborations between the college and the community is the development of a common purpose among groups and individuals with different interests and perceptions. Therefore, there is need for research on the interactions and processes by which the representatives from various interests and organizations develop a cohesive group working toward common goals.

Self-reports of successful collaborations between the community college and the community describe “best practices” with the assumption that other practitioners may be able to apply the information to their situations. However, best practices work situationally, in specific contexts, and under certain conditions. At best, practitioners must use anecdotal information in a trial and error fashion. In this increasingly complex and information-rich world, collaborations occur between the community college and a diversity of individuals and groups in the community. An understanding of the theoretical how’s and why’s of the interactions and processes would help reduce some of the trial and error nature of relationship development and group processes.

How do a community college and its community effectively collaborate toward a common goal? Most collaborations are on-going and dynamic and
therefore difficult to study. A unique opportunity to study a community college-community collaboration occurred in 2000 with the Higher Education Facilities Bond referendum in North Carolina. The 2000 bond referendum and campaign is a time-bounded, historical event. The collaborative process was initiated in the spring of 2000 and the goal was accomplished during the November 2000 elections. Many of the actors involved in this collaboration and documentation of activities are still readily available as research resources. Several new collaborations resulted from this defined collaboration, and participants in this study were very interested in discussing these collaborations as well. This historical series of events provides the opportunity to study the collaborative process from an identifiable beginning and follow the process of that collaboration and subsequent collaborations that grew out of the initial collaboration.

*Study Purpose and Design*

The purpose of this study was to examine the interactions and processes a community college used to collaborate with its community. The bond campaign in 2000 provided a focused example of community college leaders and staff working together with community leaders and citizens for the good of the college and the community. Using a qualitative case study design, one community college was studied in-depth to provide a deeper understanding of how members of the community college build relationships with the numerous constituencies in the community in order to reach a common goal.
The goal of qualitative descriptive narrative is to help the reader grasp the processes by which people construct meaning and describe what those meanings are (Bogdan & Bilkin, 1998). The best way to find out what really happens and how it happens in the complex system of collaboration between a community college and its community is to talk to those who are in the positions to know and live it. Studying the involvement of one community college and community in the 2000 North Carolina bond referendum served as a case study. A case study is defined as a study of an individual, group, program, or organization, that has a boundary and working parts (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). Specifically, an “instrumental case study” aids understanding of an issue or adds insight to a generalization (Stake, 2000).

**Research Questions**

The questions that guided this research were:

1. How did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens perceive interactions with each other toward the development of a collaboration?

2. What actions, behaviors, tasks, and roles did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens use to accomplish an agreed upon goal?

**Context for the Case Study**

In the spring of 2000, the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) and the University of North Carolina System worked together to develop a bond proposal to present to the North Carolina General Assembly that would
address critical facility needs for both educational systems. The General Assembly approved the $3.1 billion Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum legislation in May 2000. The community colleges were allocated $600 million of the total. This amount provided $100 million more in new building, renovation, and repair funds than the amount of total state appropriations to community colleges since 1963 (NCCCS, 2000, May 18).

Why was there a significant effort between the NCCCS and the NC community colleges in this referendum? The community college system in North Carolina was over forty years old at the time of the bond referendum. Many of the buildings and facilities were at least thirty or more years old. Some buildings used by the community colleges were built even before the local college was established. Historically, the local communities were responsible for the construction and the maintenance of the facilities of the community colleges. Most community college facilities had undergone little to no renovation, due to limited local resources. While community college buildings were local assets, over the years many community colleges received special legislative appropriations for construction of buildings. In most instances, these special appropriations were available if a specified amount could be obtained from other funding sources. The bond proposal was developed to help address the needs of counties that traditionally have not been able to come up with matching funds from non-state sources (Kapp, 2001, March 15). This proposal provided a very large infusion of state funds at low or no cost to local governments.
Why were new buildings and renovations to older classroom buildings and laboratories needed at the 58 community colleges in North Carolina? Exploding enrollments had been predicted for all institutions of higher education, especially for community colleges. An additional 50,000 students were anticipated to enroll in North Carolina community colleges over the next ten years. Years of low funding for upgrades to buildings and the need for renovations to meet current safety codes and educational standards also compounded the need for new construction, renovation, and repair of existing facilities (Kapp, 2001, March 15).

In order for the bond referendum to pass during the November vote, NCCCS President Martin Lancaster charged the State Board of Community Colleges and the individual community colleges to work with the local communities on behalf of the needs of higher education throughout the state (NCCCS, 2000, May 19). In addition to a statewide media campaign, the leaders at the community college served as catalysts for the local informational and educational campaign concerning the bond referendum. They developed partnerships and collaborations with other community leaders and educational leaders; many of these partnerships continued after the passage of the bonds. The first groups targeted to endorse the bond issue were city and county governments and businesses. The campaign next provided opportunities for local citizens to gain information about the needs for the bond money and the resulting benefits that would positively affect the local community through state appropriations.
In November 2000, the Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum passed by over 73% of the vote statewide and passed in all 100 counties in North Carolina (Kapp, 2001, June 5). The community colleges played an important leadership role in educating and informing the local voters about the bonds that would address critical facility needs for both the North Carolina Community College System and the University of North Carolina System. Representatives of a variety of diverse perspectives had had to come together to form a cohesive group with a common goal and determine the roles and tasks to accomplish that goal. The community colleges played important catalytic and educational roles in order for the group processes to move quickly and smoothly to goal attainment.

**Conceptual Framework**

A relational leadership model provides a useful lens through which to examine the concepts and constructs in this case study. This study draws upon the conceptual framework of the Relational Leadership Model (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998) for understanding the leadership process in relation to the complex relationship between an organization, the community college, and its environment, the community. “Today’s understanding of wholeness in a chaotic world leads to a flexible understanding of leadership in which individuals and openness to change are valued” (Komives et al., 1998, p. 67). Relational leadership pays attention to the whole system of relations as the creative ground for leadership. Leadership is the process by which networks accomplish common tasks when not embedded in a single organizational structure (Drath, 2001). From
my experiences and observations, relational leadership is the process by which the community college and community make meaning of the diverse perspectives and symbols to build a common vision and purpose and to determine the interactions and processes that will achieve the goal.

The relational leadership model focuses on five primary components (Komives et al., 1998). This approach to leadership is inclusive of people and diverse points of view. It is purposeful and builds commitment toward common purposes. Relational leadership also empowers those involved. Additionally, the model has an ethical and moral basis. These four components are accomplished by being process-oriented, which is the fifth component of the model.

The goal in relational leadership is not to overcome the variations and differences among participants but to think in terms of webs of connection and to build shared purpose. Being purposeful means having the ability to collaborate and to find common ground with others to establish a shared purpose or a socialized vision for a group. Recognizing that people support what they create, socialized vision is building a vision from among group members. Therefore, the empowerment of all participants creates a larger group of participants who generally take more ownership of group tasks and processes and who feel committed to the outcomes. The relational leadership model also emphasizes ethical and moral leadership, meaning leadership that is driven by values and standards established by the group. Finally, process refers to how a group of individuals goes about becoming and remaining a cohesive group, how the group
makes decisions, and how the group handles the tasks related to accomplishing its purposes. Being process oriented means having a systems perspective and understanding how the process influences the group’s climate and outcomes.

This model is derived from a group of leadership theories that view leadership as a dispersed or shared process within groups or organizations, in other words, as a systemic characteristic (Gardner, 2000; Gordon, 2002; Ogawa & Bossert, 2000; Yukl, 2002). This model provides an alternate perspective to the more traditionally held theories that address leadership from an individual or leader-follower perspective (Yukl, 2002). According to the shared leadership perspective, leadership is not a characteristic possessed by an individual, an authority tied to a role, or a situational context; leadership is thought of as a process that happens when people participate in collaborative forms of thought and action (Gordon, 2002). Susan R. Komives, Nance Lucas, and Timothy R. McMahon (1998) provide a simpler definition of this version of leadership as “a relational process of people working together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good” (p. 11).

Significance of the Study

Over the years, there have been a number of studies looking at community college partnerships with particular constituencies, i.e. business and industry (Barnett, 1995; Roueche et al., 1995), social services (Barnett, 1995; Sloan, 1996), and public school systems (Rendon, Gans, & Calleroz, 1998; Restine, 1996). Building effective community partnerships are particularly important to
rural community colleges, such as the college in this study (Garza & Eller, 1998; Killacky & Valadez, 1995). However, there is less literature available on the theory behind the building of relations and the processes used by the leaders of the community college in connecting with the network of constituencies in the community. This case provides detail on how the community college leaders and community leaders and citizens build relationships and worked together toward a common goal. This case also may provide additional information that contributes to organizational collaboration theory and a better understanding of relational leadership processes.

Delineation of the experiences and actions of the community leaders and citizens in this particular context may be instructive to community college leaders regarding future community collaborations. Community college leaders need to develop a better understanding of building effective networks and partnerships with constituent groups and individuals in the community (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). By understanding the building of meaningful relational leadership processes in this case, additional understanding may be developed of how a community college can contribute to future collaboration among various groups and organizations in their community. Community colleges already have the tradition of being collaborative in nature, and having positive impacts on their communities. In order to respond to future internal and external issues and problems and to deal effectively with change;
community colleges must continue to build trust, to remove barriers, and to think inclusively and holistically about their interactions with their communities.
CHAPTER 2

Literature Review

Introduction

This chapter will present a synthesis of key literature and intellectual traditions for identification of definitions, concepts, and constructs related to this study. This background information provided a “guiding hypothesis” (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 53), a flexible tool used in qualitative research to formulate research questions and for the initial search for patterns. Key literature reviewed in this chapter includes commentary on community relationships and the community service role of the comprehensive community college, published anecdotes and models of successful collaborations between community colleges and their constituents, theories and models from research on organizational and relational leadership, and synthesis of the literature on interorganizational collaborations. The community college literature was reviewed for theories and models related to relationships between the community college and the community. Organizational theory was reviewed for theories related to systemic structures, leadership roles and processes in organizations, and processes for intra- and inter-organizational collaborative relations. Leadership literature was reviewed for an approach to leadership as a relational and collective process. Lastly, interorganizational collaboration literature was reviewed for constructs and concepts for relationships and processes situated outside of formal organizational structures.
Relationships Between a Community College and Its Community

The modern community college has had a strong tradition of relating with its surrounding community (Gleazer, 1980). Most of the publicly supported, educational institutions that are accredited to award the associate degree have the name “community college” (Gleazer, 1980). These community-based postsecondary institutions were established to provide local opportunities for affordable lifelong education. Emphasis has been on the “community” part of the name for at least the past 30 years (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988; Gleazer, 1980).

From the beginning, the philosophy of a comprehensive postsecondary educational institution has been supported at the national level. Cohen (1975) made this case in reference to two early educational leaders:

* Early in the century, Alex Lange and Leonard Koos envisioned a college with a transfer function that would relieve the university of its lower division offerings, with a vocational education function that would satisfy the societal need for manpower and the individual need for a job, one providing general education so that informed citizens could make intelligent choices about their own life and the life of their community, and with a function of helping the individual to grow in his own right. All these major themes can still be discerned in community colleges today. (p.155)

* In 1947, President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education reported the need for accessible and inexpensive postsecondary education. The authors of the
report recommended general education for a democratic society and advocated
the importance of continuing adult education for America (President’s Commission
on Higher Education, 1997). The Truman Commission Report also suggested
changing the name of the newly expanded two-year colleges to “community
college” to reflect the more comprehensive nature of their function (Cohen &
Brawer, 1996).

From the beginning of the community college movement in the 1950s
(Tillery & Deegan, 1985), the colleges have provided a comprehensive array of
programs and services generally divided into five areas: academic transfer
preparation, occupational education, continuing adult education, community
service, and remedial education (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gleazer, 1980). Although
the functions are divided into five categories in the literature, there is much overlap
in the programs and services. “Community college programs do not stay in neat
categories” (Cohen & Brawer, 1996, p. 24). Community colleges have found
numerous and various ways to be responsive to the needs of the community they
serve. Adaptability has been one element in the community college mission that is
commonly agreed upon (Gleazer, 1980).

While traditional educational institutions too often isolated themselves in the
mystique of academe, community colleges have built connections beyond the
campus (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). In the early
years of the community college movement, the “community” defined during the
legal establishment of an individual institution was based on a specific
geographical area, often referred to as the “service area” (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). Community colleges provided services that reflected the needs of those persons residing in the college service area. With the increasingly complex network of connections around the world, the term “community” has taken on a broader meaning. This meaning of community, as it relates to the community college, now includes anyone who can access or has the potential to access the individual college’s programs and services.

“Community,” defined more broadly still, refers to more than a group of individuals having a common interest. The Commission on the Future for Community Colleges recommended another redefinition of “community” in 1988. The authors suggested, “The term community should be defined not only as a region to be served, but also as a climate to be created” (Commission on the Future for Community Colleges, 1988, p. 7). The word community was based on the same root word as communication. Therefore, a sense of community comes from learning to communicate where there can be a sense of connection and interchange of thoughts and ideas (Gleazer, 1980). “The building of community in the broadest and best sense encompasses a concern for the whole, for integration and collaboration, for openness and integrity for inclusiveness and self-renewal” (Commission on the Future for Community Colleges, 1988, p. 7). Therefore, the goal is not just outreach. The community college participates as an active part of the community based on shared values and common goals.
The core function components of the mission of community colleges have stayed the same, but they are placed in a context that requires adaptability. The functions and mission have been transformed in response to the changing societal demands on the institution. These same societal forces have redefined the community served by the individual community college. Because of these factors, the relations between the community college and the community have also changed and become more complex. In this section, the historical and philosophical backgrounds for these relationships between the community college and its community will be discussed.

**Historical Relationships**

*Founding.* Local, civic, and professional leaders initiated the establishment of most community colleges (Cohen and Brawer, 1996). “Colleges were local institutions with much civic pride surrounding their development” (p. 10). Initially, the community colleges provided opportunities for affordable postsecondary education for the increasing number of graduates from the local public school system (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The college was located close to home for students not interested in living away from home or unable to afford the higher tuition at other institutions of higher education. Plus the local college provided occupational training and retraining for starting or advancing a career. Community leaders also pushed the formation of a college for the prestige of having an institution of higher education in the community (Cohen & Brawer, 1996).
Community colleges’ founders needed to show community support before establishment was considered (Segner, 1974). For example, by North Carolina law, comprehensive community colleges are established based on proof of local interest by citizens, proof of need by local industries, and the ability of the community to finance the college. Even the administrative oversight of the community college is by a local board of trustees appointed from the district (Segner, 1974). Therefore, there is a sense of “ownership” and responsibility that local citizens feel for “their” community college.

*Ongoing connections.* Once a college is established, there are many ways in which the college maintains connections with its community (Gleazer, 1980). Many curriculum programs, especially occupational programs, have advisory committees made up of community members from business and industry related to the curriculum area. A number of connections are made between college curriculum programs and businesses and industries in order to provide clinical and internship opportunities for learners in the programs (Gleazer, 1980). An excellent example of this type of agreement is found between the health-related programs and hospitals and clinics. These agreements provide experience to go along with the educational programming. Having these connections with business and industry also helps in job placement of program graduates.

Early in the community college movement, a major emphasis for many colleges was to provide workforce development and training for local business and industries (Gleazer, 1980). This remains a strong priority for many community
colleges today. A number of colleges have also developed programs to assist in training government civilian employees for civil service examinations and needed job skills (Gleazer, 1980). More recently, community colleges work with local Chambers of Commerce on economic development in their communities. College personnel participate in making presentations to prospective businesses. The presence of a local college is often used as an incentive to draw new industries and businesses to the area (Roueche, Taber, & Roueche, 1995).

Another area in which the community college has a long tradition of cooperating with other community agencies and organizations is in adult and continuing education (Gleazer, 1980). Community colleges work with churches, public schools, and government agencies to provide literacy and other adult basic education, many times the colleges coordinate programs at sites removed from the campus for easier access for the learners. The college cooperates with other community education and government agencies to provide health education, life skills education, and employment and job training (Gleazer, 1980).

In their role as educators for a democratic society (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; President's Commission on Higher Education, 1997), some community colleges provide training and workshops to help citizens who serve on voluntary citizen boards understand their duties and become more effective in fulfilling those duties (Gleazer, 1980). The college also provides a perceived neutral setting for forums on many issues of community interest, such as political issues and debates, social issues, and environmental issues (Boone & Associates, 1997). Good forums
shape public policy through education and the resulting action (Roueche et al., 1995).

The community college serves as the cultural center in some communities, especially in rural areas (Gleazer, 1980). The college cooperates with cultural organizations for cultural enrichment for citizens in the community. As the population ages and remains physically and intellectually active later in life, demands will increase for artistic and recreational educational programs and activities. Colleges also provide facilities to host and support various cultural, recreational, and spectator activities, such as musical and drama presentations, art exhibits, and historical recreations.

The community college builds and maintains relationships with many different groups in the local area and service community. This is not always an easy task because the community functions are considered nontraditional functions of the college. There is a strong bias toward traditional teaching functions, especially in competing for tax dollars. Intracollege competition for funds and space and the predominant use of temporary part-time staff members (usually paid with extramural funds) keep the community programs peripheral to mainstream programs (Cohen & Associates, 1975). When resources are scarce, peripheral programs are scrutinized first. “In short, when something has to be cut, the nontraditional goes first” (Cohen & Associates, 1975, p. 86).
Philosophical Relationships

Traditional versus nontraditional education. Cohen and Associates (1975) point out that one reason the community service functions have not gained parity with instruction is that although its importance has been noted, the philosophical basis on which it stands has not been well articulated. The community dimension is narrow and removed from the mainstream of the college operations because it is the least coherently defined function and less amenable to assessment (Cohen & Associates, 1975). Even strong proponents for the community service function have agreed that the community service function is less than equal to the transfer, occupational, remedial and continuing adult education functions (Harlacher, 1969).

Throughout the community college movement, there has been continual debate related to the priority placed on the various functions in the comprehensive mission of the community college. Arthur Cohen and Edmund Gleazer, Jr. are notable spokesmen for the two major differing philosophies related to the function of the comprehensive community college. On the side for liberal arts and general education, Cohen, in a number of his writings, laments the deterioration of the emphasis on the transfer function due both to occupational education and the numerous “less academic” functions (Cohen & Associates, 1975; Cohen & Brawer, 1996). On the other side, Gleazer is recognized for a long career of advocacy for the community service philosophy for the community colleges. A great deal of attention is directed toward an attempt to distinguish between what some perceive to be of obvious academic merit and that which seems peripheral (Gleazer, 1980).
Recent studies on the mission of the community college have legitimized the community service function as part of the comprehensive community college in contrast to complaints that the community college has gotten away from its “primary” academic mission as an institution of higher education. Levin (2000) claims that the community college is a different institution from the junior college, its predecessor and contemporary. The junior college’s primary mission was the academic transfer preparation, whereas, the liberal arts orientation of the community college has mainly been limited (Levin, 2000).

Limited resources. Writers also caution against overextending the mission of the community college. Having so many different services spreads too thinly the resources that should go to the “primary task of providing quality education” (Cohen & Associates, 1975, p. 84). “Limited perceptions of the role education can play in meeting needs of people are reflected in what the state and community will pay for in terms of educational services” (Gleazer, 1980, p. 34). One argument used is that courses given for academic credit, which apply toward college transfer or direct preparation for an occupation, are considered legitimate candidates for public support. The state, which now provides the majority of the financial support and has more say so about how it is used, raises questions about community college services that do not fit the categories of transfer or occupational programs (Gleazer, 1980).

With a clearly understood philosophy, and by addressing the need for assessment to meet the increased demands for accountability, the community
The community service function. Of the five core functions of the comprehensive community college, the community service function has had the most controversy surrounding its inclusion as a nontraditional educational function. Over the past 30 years, many different names have been applied to describe the nature of the community relations function: community service, community development, community renewal, community-based education, and community-based programming (Boone & Associates, 1997; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gleazer, 1980; Harlacher, 1969; Roueche et al., 1995). The various terms have been used over the years to describe the focus, at the time, of the community college’s function that emphasizes community relations.

Ervin L Harlacher was a strong, early supporter of the community service function of the comprehensive community college. His 1969 groundbreaking report was based on a 1967 study authorized by the American Association of Junior Colleges and his 1965 dissertation study. Harlacher’s list of the four obligations of the community college under the community service function is still used today to formulate policy and practice (Harlacher, 1969):
1. Become a center of community life by encouraging the use of college facilities and services by community groups when such use does not interfere with the college’s regularly scheduled programs;

2. Provide for all age groups educational services that utilize the special skills and knowledge of the college staff and other experts and be designed to meet the needs of community groups and the college district community at large;

3. Provide the community, including business and industry, with the leadership and coordination capabilities of the college, assist the community in long-range planning, and join with individuals and groups in attacking unresolved problems;

4. Contribute to and promote the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the college district community and the development of skills for the profitable use of leisure time. (p. v)

In 1974, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges articulated a strongly worded statement of mission which reflected the emphasis placed by the national leadership on “community–based postsecondary education” (Cohen & Associates, 1975; Gleazer, 1980). All this renewal of interest resulted in extending the community college beyond being a sector of higher education to a primary role of community leadership. In response to new social forces, the “new” mission transcended the traditional function of academic and occupational education.
If the central aim of the college is to involve the citizenry in learning activities that result in a better community, then the mixture of people involved can be beneficial. For this is a real world – a continuum from slow learners to fast. … This is a community of learning, not the groves of academe. …Perhaps there is no better way to develop viable communities than to involve the citizens, as many as possible, in learning experiences where they can interact. The community college we envision provides that opportunity. It is more a process than a place. The learners are the same people that we meet in the shops and offices and plants. …Can this diversity be accommodated? If it can in the community, why not by the college? (Gleazer, 1980, pp. 9-10)

It has been advocated that the community college could serve as the hub of a network of institutions and community agencies utilizing their educational resources and, in turn, become a resource. Part of the community service function was to serve as the coordinating agent for all other community service agencies (Cohen & Associates, 1975; Harlacher, 1969). In 1988, the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges again renewed the call for service to community as part of the community college mission (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). The report quoted a 1987 presentation by John Gardner to support this stance:

The community college can perform a convening function at which representatives of various fragments and interests come together in
unofficial but serious discussion of community problems. [The college can] be an effective convener, a valuable forum, a meeting place where the common good is discussed. (p. 7)

Also to support this position, Harlacher (1969) has referred to the “catalytic capabilities” of the community college to assist the community in the solution of basic education, economic, political, and social problems.

In 1992, Boone and Associates (1997) furthered the leader-catalyst role of the community college for community renewal through community-based programming. They claimed that the community college has informational and institutional research capabilities to identify and analyze critical issues affecting the quality of life of the community and its people. The college could initiate and facilitate collaboration among stakeholders and constituents in order to identify community problems and propose solutions (Boone & Associates, 1997).

Degree of involvement. The basic issue determining how far the community college goes into community development is the extent to which its constituents feel the college should be active in the community (Cohen & Associates, 1975). The degree of involvement varies with different views of appropriateness and with respect to what the college is authorized to do under law and regulations (Gleazer, 1980). Instructional services are passive. Is the college role limited to response or reaction to community needs, pressures, or requests? Community service’s characteristic to reach out is active and depends on complex interagency arrangements and duplicates services offered by other agencies. It is
one thing to recruit students; it is another to become involved in programs and services that compete with other agencies for public dollars (Cohen & Associates, 1975).

The sophisticated services appropriate to the identification and analysis of problems and proposed solutions provide the community college the opportunity to lead its community to understand the coming changes, make provisions for coping with them, and initiates a process or provides resources to help the community solve them (Gleazer, 1980). As Gleazer states this way of thinking:

It is in the cooperative relationship that the greatest benefits are promised to the community and college. The community benefits from a college that is:

- A research arm to identify problems objectively and to project probable development;
- A forum for nonpartisan informed discussion of issues and proposed policies;
- An organization to facilitate learning; and
- A nexus for relating the teaching/learning resources of the community. (p. 38)

The impetus comes from the community with college encouragement and counsel (Gleazer, 1980). The college in effect contributes “process.” Gleazer points out that the community, being mover and partner, benefits in a greater degree because of its own involvement.
It is through the cooperative mode that the community college achieves its distinctiveness. It is to serve the community and it is to do more than that. It is to be creatively occupied with the community. It is the community’s college, a vital part of an integrated system of community services. If it limits itself to the conventional academic area, no matter how great its numbers might become or how excellent its programs, it remains the lower level of a pyramid of academic prestige with the graduate school as the cap. (Gleazer, 1980, p. 38)

Integration of community service. Administrators and faculty need to see the community service function as an integral part of the everyday operations of the community college (Gleazer, 1980). Where the community is seen as integral to the learning process, “participation in community and ‘what their work compels them to do’ would become a part of ‘regular duties,’ not something exceptional” (Gleazer, 1980, p. 171). Faculty and staff are not just of the college; they are of the community. The learners are taxpayers and citizens. Most of them are involved in their careers. To accommodate these people’s lifestyle needs, a basic change in the stance of the institution is required as well as commitments from a variety of college personnel. “One of our jobs is to develop a constituency in the area. The whole attitude of the community needs to be shaped in that direction” (Gleazer, 1980, p. 176).

Daily communication with the business community, the county and city planning bodies, employment agencies, research organizations, the Chambers of
Commerce, state and federal agencies, school officials, census bureaus, and the media is required (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). The community college, in the very process of doing what it needs to do to function effectively, maintains relationships that qualify it to be an active participant, convener, catalyst, and leader in the community.

In summary, the comprehensive community college has had strong historical and philosophical relations with its surrounding community from the beginning of the community college movement. The goal of the comprehensive community college has been to serve the people with whatever the people needed or requested (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). In order to accomplish this goal, the community college daily communicates and develops partnerships and alliances with numerous individuals, groups, institutions, organizations, and corporations.

There are two major differences in philosophy regarding the priority placed on the five core functions of the comprehensive community college. The community service function, which has had strong local and national supporters, is the most controversial for inclusion into the mission of the college. The tensions between the two different philosophies are readily apparent in times of limited resources. Proponents for the community college as an institution of higher education stress the academic functions: transfer preparation, occupational, and remedial. If severe cuts are to be made, they advocate returning to the main traditional educational function of college transfer preparation. Proponents who support the philosophy that the community college is a community-based
institution respond that during times of limited resources, the college needs to expand its relations in the community in order to obtain additional support and funding from other sources for all college programs and services.

Scarcity of resources is precisely the reason for a community college to build and increase relations with the community. Many colleges have perceived the advantages of building good relations with the community, and have organized to benefit from them. Building, maintaining, and improving relations with the community is a matter of institutional survival and continued growth for the community college.

**Best Practices in Community College and Community Collaborations**

Successful collaborations between community colleges and community organizations and groups suggest that community colleges actively participate in community activities. Literature documenting successful collaborations between the community college and the community provides evidence that a community college can play important roles as catalyst and leader in dealing with critical community issues (Barnett, 1995; Boone & Associates, 1997; Roueche et al., 1995). However, much of the literature provides models formed from practice with little information about the theoretical background for the models (McGrath, 1998; Roueche et al., 1995).

Successful collaborations between community colleges and community organizations and groups suggest that awareness of group dynamics and collaboration are important components. In 1995, John E. Roueche, Lynn Sullivan
Taber, and Suanne D. Roueche edited a volume of self-reports by fourteen community college CEOs which reported stories of successful collaborations, partnerships, and alliances. This volume, *The Company We Keep: Collaboration in the Community College* (Roueche et al., 1995), documented the diversity of community college involvements with its community. These successful collaborations ranged from participating in economic development activities to facilitating technology transfer to small businesses, facilitating community citizenship, participating in community problem-solving, and enhancing the international or multicultural experience of the community. Also, in 1995, the American Association of Community Colleges and the W. K. Kellogg Foundation published a report summarizing the Beacon College Project, a collection of diverse collaborations ranging from economic development to citizenship development (Barnett, 1995). This project was developed to implement recommendations from the Commission on the Future of Community Colleges report, *Building Communities: A Vision for a New Century* (1988). The main thrust of this report was that the mission of the comprehensive community college should no longer be to provide just educational services to the community; it should be an active partner in solving civic and cultural problems and issues (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). A few years later, Edgar J. Boone, John M. Pettitt, and Iris M. Weisman edited a collection of five case studies based on the Academy for Community College Leadership Advancement (ACCLAIM) community-based programming model (1998). It suggested that the community
college could serve actively in identifying community issues, facilitate the identification of individuals and groups in the community to work toward addressing them, and provide guidance for the coalition responsible for addressing the issues. In the same year, Dennis McGrath edited *Creating and Benefiting from Institutional Collaboration: Models for Success* (1998). Along with reporting successful collaborations, this work provided a working model that emphasized collaboration as a particular inter-organizational structure.

Through these four published works of successful collaborations, there are a number of consistent themes about what has been learned from collaboration between the community college and the organizations and groups in its community. The authors emphasize the necessity of institutionalizing the philosophy of collaboration with the community throughout the community college (Boone et al., 1998; Roueche et al., 1995). Additionally, administration, staff, faculty, and students must see community service and collaborations as part of the community college mission, integral to the everyday operations and learning process. Further, successful integrations should be rewarded and celebrated (Barnett, 1995). Moreover, building and maintaining relationships with the community need to be part of the long range, strategic planning within the college (Boone et al., 1998; McGrath, 1998). These reports suggest that the community college can serve as the catalyst for issue identification, participant identification, committee formation, and resource sharing (Roueche et al., 1995). From these activities, the college can facilitate training through its traditional education role.
related to communication skills, group process, decision-making, and conflict management (Barnett, 1995). Also, the importance for a community college in working with the community in building trust, developing a clear vision, setting clear goals, and building consensus is consistently reported. In order to build trust and consensus, the acceptance of diverse perspectives is needed among the participants (Barnett, 1995; Boone et al., 1998; Roueche et al., 1995). Likewise, assessment and evaluation is stressed for the dual purposes of providing input for continuous improvement and of providing evidence for accountability of efficient resource use (Boone et al., 1998; McGrath, 1998). Most importantly, these authors agree that the community college can play an indispensable part in the community’s efforts to build a better life for all its citizens.

In summary, a number of the models developed from successful collaborations between the community college and its community include concepts and constructs of collaboration and group dynamics theories. One example was found that attempted to address the recognition of leadership as an institutional or collective characteristic. Janet Beauchamp (1995) of Maricopa Community College District describes two types of leadership, personal leader and the coalition as leader, in her report of the collaboration. She makes the point that “An issue that may be perceived as one group’s self-interest, if heard only from that group, may be perceived as fact when stated from a communitywide voice” (Beauchamp, 1995, p. 308).
Leadership research and theory development has followed the progression of organizational research and theory development. Research and theory development has moved from Weber’s bureaucracy with a "great man" leader at the top of the hierarchy to more complex matrix organizational structures with group-defined leadership (Yukl, 2002). Just as organizational research and theory have added more variables to models over time, so have leadership models. All this has occurred because theories on the types of organizations and the leadership needed to guide them have had to change because our understanding of the world has become increasingly complex. Yukl (2002) reports that research efforts have moved beyond the scientific method of differentiation and explaining the whole by examining its parts toward an attempt to understand and explain complex systems as a whole. This new philosophy needs new and different models derived from various perspectives.

The Weberian Functional/Structural Organization

In addition to being recognized as an organizational model, Max Weber’s bureaucratic model is one of the earlier classifications of leadership framed in organizations (Yukl, 2002). Weber distinguished between organizational types according to the way in which authority is legitimated (Pugh & Hickson, 1997; Scott, 1987). He outlined three pure types, which he labeled “charismatic”, “traditional”, and “rational-legal”, each of which is expressed in a particular administrative apparatus or organization, sometimes in combination. The
Charismatic authority type is based on personal qualities of the leader that attracts followers who believe in his or her authority. Leaders in the traditional authority type have authority by virtue of the status they have inherited, and the extent of their authority is fixed by custom. The rational-legal type of authority comes from a system of rules and procedures that are set in place, and authority is set by the placement in an established hierarchy and by the competency that is defined by a description of that office.

Leadership in bureaucracies is based on the assumptions of arrival at a position through technical competency with authority based on a hierarchy of a fixed division of labor (Pugh & Hickson, 1997). Weber stated that a bureaucracy was the most effective form of an organization because it depersonalized the personal whims of leaders and used the means that were best to achieve the stated ends (Pugh & Hickson, 1997). It is interesting to note that Scott (1987) declares that because obedience by subordinates is owed to a set of impersonal principles within a bureaucracy, subordinates have a strong basis for independent action. “They have a clear basis for questioning the directives of their superiors, whose actions are presumably constrained by the same impersonal framework of rules” (p. 43). Therefore, early thought on leadership, even in a bureaucracy where employees are generally thought to be powerless, included a sense of relationship and reciprocal influences between leaders and followers.

Collaborative theories of leadership within organizations and groups will be discussed in this section. Connections will be made between collaborative
leadership theories based in organizations to leadership outside the formal structure of an organization. Collaborative leadership theories that speak to a broader perspective will be compared and contrasted to a collaborative leadership theory framed within a formal organization.

Collaborative Leadership Theories Within Formal Organizations

There are a number of leadership theories that address collaboration within the formal structure of organization (Yukl, 2002). One such theory that involves the use of various decision procedures to allow other people some influence over the leader's decision is known as participative leadership (Yukl, 2002). Consultation, joint decision-making, power sharing, decentralization, and democratic management are other terms that have been used in the literature for this type of leadership. Participative leadership principles have been proven empirically to increase quality of decisions, to increase commitment, to develop decision-making skills, and to facilitate conflict resolution and team building (Yukl, 2002). Yukl says that the Vroom-Yetton decision model and the Vroom-Jago revision of the decision model include situation variables and decision rules that guide the leader in determining when and how much participation constituents may have in decisions.

Delegation is another concept tied to collaborative leadership (Yukl, 2002). Yukl states that delegation is qualitatively different from participative leadership. Delegation involves the assignment of new responsibilities to subordinates along with the additional authority to accomplish the task. The term delegation is used
for a variety of different forms and degrees of power sharing. In its best use, delegation garners greater subordinate commitment to implementation and provides job enrichment (Yukl, 2002). It is used by many organizations as a tool for leadership and management development.

Self-managed teams have begun to appear in businesses around the world (Yukl, 2002). Self-managed teams or self-designing teams are an extreme form of delegation or empowerment. Responsibility and authority for making important management decisions are turned over to a group of people who perform a complex task with highly interdependent activities. Teams that are self-designing, or autonomous, have the highest amount of delegated authority. These teams are allowed to make most of the decisions that would be necessary to run a small business. Saturn Corporation is a popular example of an organization that is known for using self-design teams (Yukl, 2002).

According to Yukl, management responsibilities are assigned to the team and shared by group members. Typical self-managed teams have an internal group leader who coordinates group activities. Sometimes the team leader is appointed by the organization, and sometimes the other team members elect the team leader. When a team leader is elected, the position may rotate among several team members on a regular basis, i.e. quarterly or annually. In a self-managed team, group members share important responsibilities. The group, not the team leader, makes important decisions.
In the formal structure of an organization, the role of the external leader (first line manager) changes to serving as coach, facilitator, and consultant to the team, instead of direct supervision (Yukl, 2002). The external leader helps the team learn task skills. The team needs ample coaching because it may take a year or more to become proficient in managing its own task and interpersonal processes. The external leader also has to be a champion and advocate for resources in an environment that could be hostile to the self-managed team process.

Using the self-managed/ self-designed team strategy offers numerous advantages to the organization such as a stronger employee commitment to the work, improved quality, improved efficiency, more satisfied and motivated employees, lower turnover and absenteeism, faster product development, and lower cost of management salaries (Yukl, 2002). With their extensive knowledge of the work processes, members are in better positions to solve problems and suggest improvements. This approach needs strong support by top management with appropriate recognition and rewards. “Successful implementation of self-managed teams requires major changes in the structure and culture of the organization” (Yukl, 1994, p. 187).

In the 1980s, American companies became aware of the need to change from the traditions of the past in order to survive (Yukl, 2002). Organizations felt the need to transform and revitalize, and a new approach toward leadership became apparent. “Transformational leadership refers to the process of building
commitment to the organization’s objectives and empowering followers to accomplish those objectives” (Yukl, 1994, p. 350). Transformational leadership theories address leadership as a process, not a set of discrete acts. James MacGregor Burns, a prominent researcher of transformational leadership, describes leadership as “a stream of evolving interrelationships in which leaders are continually evoking motivational responses from followers and modifying their behavior as they meet responsiveness or resistance, in a ceaseless process of flow and counterflow” (as quoted in Yukl, 1994, p. 351). It may involve people influencing peers and superiors, as well as subordinates. Transformational leadership occurs at two levels within organizations; at the micro-level where the influence process is between individuals and at the macro-level where the process mobilizes power to change social systems and reform organizations (Yukl, 2002).

Transformative leaders work to create a new culture (Yukl, 2002). The major function of culture is to help us understand the environment and determine how to respond to it, thereby reducing anxiety, uncertainty, and confusion. By creating a new vision, transformational leaders empower followers to perform effectively by building their commitment to new values, developing their skills and confidence, and institutionalizing changes in the organization. They may modify organizational structure, management systems, and culture to institutionalize the changes.

As organizational theories and models become more complex and diverse, leadership theories also become more diverse and complex. As organizations
begin to be seen as social systems, leadership begins to be considered a shared process embedded in those social systems (Yukl, 2002). This perspective views leadership in terms of reciprocal, recursive influence processes among multiple parties in a systems context. New methods of research are needed to describe and analyze the complex nature of the leadership process in social systems (Yukl, 2002).

**Collaborative Leadership Theories Across Groups and Organizations**

*Groups in organizations.* In comparison to studying collaborative leadership between individuals, collaboration leadership has also been examined at the group or organization level (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). The study of group dynamics grew rapidly at the same time that organizations were using the team or group approach to look for new ways to think about their operations and new ways of accomplishing goals. Groups have more knowledge, diversity of perspective, time, and energy than individuals working alone (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). The group as a whole must share responsibility for its effectiveness. Leadership is still essential, but it does not need to come from only one person. In this approach, internal leaders share the work, and team members share the leadership (Bolman & Deal, 1997). The role of the external management leader is to serve as consultant, advisor, teacher, and facilitator, rather than director or manager (Yukl, 2002).

Group-centered leadership (Yukl, 2002) improves communication and increases acceptance of changes in organizational ideas and systems. Groups
must operate in a climate of open communication. At their best, groups are teams of loyalty, mutual commitment, excitement, and motivation. This requires considerable skill on the part of the leader and group members. As the trend grew, organizations found using groups and teams to be difficult to implement successfully. Group members must have maturity and emotional stability, as well as a high level of interpersonal skills and sensitivity (Yukl, 2002). Organizations discover these limitations because most committees are only temporary and do not meet over a long enough period of time to develop the necessary trust and skills in the committee members. The team concept needs to be accompanied by ample training in group skills. The extra time spent conducting a team-building process whenever a group is formed more than makes up for itself further down the road.

Organizational trait theories. Two theories are offered that suggest an alternative to the traditional individual-based leadership models. These theories see leadership as an “institutional trait” (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000) or an “organizational characteristic” (O’Toole, 2001). Ogawa and Bossert report that leadership flows through the network of roles that comprise an organization. Leadership is not embedded in particular roles but in the relationships that exist among the individuals filling the roles. Leadership is relational and reciprocal. By shifting attention to relationships, these authors suggest that organizational members can draw on resources to which their roles provide access in order to influence others who require those resources to enact their roles successfully.
Different roles have access to different levels and types of resources. Interaction is the medium through which resources are deployed and influence is exerted. Social interaction, not individual action, becomes the basic building block of organizational leadership. Leadership through interaction influences the system of interactions that constitute an organization.

O’Toole found a similar phenomenon in his study of three thousand leaders at all hierarchical levels (O’Toole, 2001). He noted a different pattern of leadership as shared responsibility, not a solo act. This type of leadership was rooted in the systems, processes, and culture of the organization and could not be accounted for by “cascading leadership,” the process by which a strong leader empowers others down the line. In this model of leadership, individuals at all levels act more like owners. They take the initiative to solve problems and accept accountability. There is a common philosophy and language of leadership. There is a tolerance of contrary views and a willingness to experiment. People in these organizations create, maintain, and adhere to systems and procedures designed to measure and reward distributed leadership. Now, formal leaders in the organizations view their primary task as creating overall organizational leadership capacity. They become leaders of leaders.

Relational leadership. Another group of theories based on relational leadership pays attention to the process by which networks accomplish common tasks when not embedded in organizational structure (Drath, 2001). These theories combine the relational leadership emphasis in the organizational trait
theories with the group dynamic focus of the group-centered theories. Relational leadership approaches the whole system of relations as the creative ground for leadership (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). According to these theories, leadership is not a characteristic possessed by an individual or an authority tied to a role; leadership happens when people participate in any collaborative form of thought and action. Drath (2001) defines this new thinking as, “Leadership happens when people who acknowledge shared work use dialogue and collaborative learning to create contexts in which that work can be accomplished across the dividing lines of differing perspectives, values, beliefs, [and] cultures” (p.14). Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) provide a simpler definition of this version of leadership as “a relational process of people working together attempting to accomplish change or make a difference to benefit the common good” (p. 11). This is a different way of thinking about leadership outside of the formal organizational structure.

Komives, Lucas, and McMahan’s Relational Leadership Model (1998) focuses on five primary components. This approach to leadership is inclusive, empowering, purposeful, ethical, and process-oriented. The goal in relational leadership is not to overcome the variations and differences among participants, but to think in terms of webs of connection and to build shared purpose. Being purposeful means having the ability to collaborate and to find common ground with others to establish a shared purpose or a socialized vision for a group. Recognizing that people support what they create, socialized vision is building a
vision from among group members. Therefore, the empowerment of all participants creates a larger group of participants who generally take more ownership of group tasks and processes and who feel committed to the outcomes. The relational leadership model acknowledges the ethical and moral issues of leadership as related to the values and standards established by the group. The model includes the collaborative group processes concerned with how the group goes about being a group and remaining a group, how the group makes decisions, and how the group handles the tasks related to accomplishing its purposes. Being process oriented means having a systems thinking perspective and understanding how the process influences the group’s climate and outcomes.

As the theoretical basis for the interactions and relations within the group, the relational leadership model uses the concept of collaboration. Key literature in social psychology has identified collaboration, cooperation, and communication as different theoretical concepts. Social psychologist, Terry Mollner (1992) described a developmental continuum from competition to communication to cooperation to collaboration. At one end of the continuum, competition describes a relationship based on conflict for resources or status. Along the continuum, communication is defined as a simple sharing of information and knowledge. Following communication, cooperation is a relationship that helps the other individuals or groups to realize their own goals. Collaboration describes a deeper relationship than cooperation. In collaboration, individuals or groups join together to define and accomplish mutual, shared goals (Kohn, 1992).
People collaborate with others in a group so long as they are given an opportunity to feel a sense of belonging to that group. Carol Gilligan (1982) found that there must be development of a sense of “us,” a group identity, separate from self and other. The sense of us focuses on the dynamics of relationships and dissipates the tension between selfishness and responsibility through a new understanding of the interconnection between other and self. A sense of group identity develops and the egotistic incentives become less salient, although they do not disappear altogether. Social research using commons-type social dilemmas (Hardin, 1968; Kramer & Brewer, 1984) finds that when an individual formed an identification with a collective of resource pool users, individuals seemed quite willing to cooperate for the mutual benefit of all concerned. Thus, promotion of group identification may itself be sufficient to produce cooperation. Though contact by itself is not enough, contact involving coordinated efforts toward common goals seems to be the prerequisite for collaboration and intra-group harmony (Brodenhausen, 1992). “If you bring the appropriate people together in constructive ways with good information, they will create authentic visions and strategies for addressing the concerns of the organization or community” (Chrislip & Larson, 1994, p. 14).

Comparing Two Group-Centered Models

The relational leadership model (Komives et al., 1998) and the self-managed team model (Yukl, 2002) are similar in their recognition of shared responsibility and authority, group dynamics, and the need to aid group members
in gaining proficient in working as a group. Self-managed teams have been most successfully implemented in manufacturing work or process production (Yukl, 2002). Because the members have extensive knowledge of the work processes done by the team members, they have been empowered by the organizational management to solve problems and suggest improvements in their area. Comparatively, members of the group that developed based on the relationship leadership model are also members of the constituencies they represent and are familiar with the issues that need to be resolved. The process set forth in the model empowers them to take a shared responsibility to help make their group, community, organization, or world a better place (Komives et al., 1998). Both models use the concepts of group dynamics and collaborative processes. Developing a shared vision for the outcome, establishing the goal through dialogue, and developing processes collaboratively to achieve that common goal are good examples of establishing and maintaining group commitment through group processes. Both models recognize the long-term need for training the members of the groups to gain skills in such areas as communication, collaboration, conflict resolution, and group decision-making.

The two models do have some distinct differences: the initiation of the group, the concept of group leadership, and the constraints of the structural orientation. The self-managed team is usually initiated or at least supported by the organization. An external leader is responsible for activating the team and providing it with coaching, facilitation, and advocacy. The relational leadership
team, on the other hand, may come together by its own initiative because all team
members agree on an issue that needs to be addressed. Unless they are
established as part of an organization, such as a community group or committee,
the members will have to learn processes, procure resources, and locate training
in group dynamics on their own. Loose structure and unorthodox leadership have
worked in examples with training groups in organizations. Groups in a vacuum can
establish their own agenda, goals, and procedures with very satisfying results
(Bolman & Deal, 1997).

The concept of group leader is a decided difference between the two
models. Typically, a self-directed team has an internal team leader to coordinate
group activities. The team leader may be appointed by the organization, or the
group may elect its own leader on a rotating basis. By contrast, the relational
leadership model considers group management as a group process with the whole
group performing the various tasks and roles of a team leader.

The issue of organizational context may provide both advantages and
disadvantages to the collaborative groups. As already noted, the organizational
context provides the advantages of support, resources, and training for groups
established as part of an organization. On the other hand, the organizational
culture and authority structure may also deter full collaboration and motivation.
Members of the group may feel constrained to limit their dialogue and be cynical
about the work that can be accomplished. In contrast, while the relational
leadership group members may have possible frustration with developing group
processes and obtaining resources, they may also have the advantage of not having to conform to organizational values, expectations, or other constraints imposed by governance and structure of an organization. A free-forming group can truly come together as a community of equals.

In summation, the content of collaborative leadership theories has not changed; the context in which it is practiced has. Weberian functional/structural organizations are no longer the only organizational model in which leadership is studied. Neither are group collaborative theories the most effective descriptions of leadership that occur in today’s complex context of the community college’s relations with its community. Upon comparison with the self-managed team model based in a formal organization, the relational leadership perspective emphasizes the focus on the shared process by diverse parties in complex social systems. The concept of context is important because the community is an amorphous collection of individuals, groups, and organizations, which does not fit the usual embodiment of a formal organization. Attempting to apply leadership theories and models that are derived from studies done in formal organizations may be unduly constraining for an examination of the relations between a community college, a formal organization, and its community.

Comparing Two Organization-Centered Models

Comparing Boone’s Community-Based Programming Model (1997) with Senge’s Learning Organization Model (1994) provided insight into two organization-centered models found in the literature. Boone’s model was
developed from community college research and has influenced practice in community colleges. Senge’s model was developed from research in the corporate business field. These two models address collective action from inside the formal structure of organizations and offer insights into a broader perspective to the study of community college and community interactions.

Boone’s Community-Based Programming Model

In the book *Community Leadership through Community-based Programming: The Role of the Community College* (Boone & Associates, 1997), Edgar Boone and his colleagues at the Academy for Community College Leadership Advancement, Innovation, and Modeling (ACCLAIM) describe a programming process model based on the philosophy of a comprehensive community college as a community-based institution. The authors support the philosophical claim that the community college has a responsibility to actively participate in the community. One way the college can do this, according to the ACCLAIM group, is by providing leadership to assist the community in identifying and solving critical issues, some which have not always fallen in the purview of the educational core of the college’s mission.

The community-based programming model is process-oriented, rather than mechanistic; that is, it is not just a rule-based set of steps to be faithfully followed. The model is divided into 15 “processual tasks.” The authors define a “processual task” as a series of interconnected actions which are tailored to a specific situation. The model includes a systems thinking perspective. This flexible,
conceptual approach of systems thinking is more effective in bringing about change in fundamental behaviors or dealing with complex social issues.

The first three processual tasks describe the institutionalization of the model. First, the college must develop its own definition of community-based programming using the basic tenets that define it as a community-based institution. Next, the college must study the environment in which the college functions. An understanding of the social-cultural, economic, technological, and political factors in the environment leads to an informed context in which to place community-based programming. Along with an understanding of the service environment, the college must also examine how community-based programming fits in the college's mission and operations. One strategy the model suggests at this point is the formation of a community-based programming management team. During this phase, the college may have to reinterpret or realign its mission and operations to include community-based programming as a major program area.

The next three processual tasks relate to environmental scanning. This activity informs the college on both current and future issues that might influence the quality of peoples' lives in the community. The first two tasks set up the recruitment and training of an environmental scanning committee to identify and rank critical issues. Then, the president of the college negotiates the legitimacy of the significant issues with the governing board and local leaders.

The next four processual tasks describe strategies to identify the target populations, the stakeholders, and the leaders - both formal and informal - for
each group; also, strategies are needed to develop a coalition and to refine the issue. Historically, the groups most affected by program planning have been the ones left out of the process. However, Boone states, “Since resolution of the issue rests in a change in the target public, its members must be directly involved in determining what must change and how the change will be brought about” (p. 80). Dialogue is initiated with leaders of the target public and stakeholders to build consensus on a collaborative plan to address the issue. Then, a coalition further studies and defines the issues and decides on strategies to resolve it. Next, the college’s community based programming management team provides the educational assistance in order to help the coalition evolve into a collaborative team.

The next two processual tasks cover the action phase of the coalition’s work. With the group committed to a collaborative effort to resolve an issue that has been clarified, the decisions must be translated into a plan of action. The college provides assistance to the coalition in implementing the strategies devised in the plan of action. “The need to clarify and distinguish between the roles of the coalition and the community college at this stage in the community-based programming process is of paramount importance, for there is a danger that the distinction between the roles may become muddied” (p. 126). The coalition must be the dominant force in implementing the action plan in order to maintain the empowerment of and commitment by its members to resolve the issue.
The last phase covers the areas of program evaluation and accountability. These three processual tasks ensure that results are measurable, evaluated, and reported. The college assists the coalition in assessing the outcomes of the efforts to resolve the issue. All program planning and implementation should go through cycles of evaluation. Reports to the target public and the stakeholders provide accountability for the commitment of resources and effort. Evaluation of the process provides feedback to improve continued efforts in sustaining the results and to continue the resolution of the issue.

It is important to note that the role of the college is to serve as consultant and technical advisor throughout the process. The coalition that is formed from formal and informal leaders of the target public and stakeholders must be empowered and committed to resolving the critical issues that affect their represented constituencies in the community. The community-based programming model is a collaborative process that is committed to the basic principles of participation in a democratic planning process, empowerment of affected groups to solve their own challenges, dialogue as a deeper communication, and commitment to a common vision. The community-based programming model was developed to aid the community college in “working *with* the people, not just *for* the people” (p. 205).

Because the community-based programming model was developed for the community college and community interactions, it is the easiest model in which to see the potential for use in supporting and directing examinations of the
interactions between the college and the community. This model strives to attend to the democratic planning process, which ideally ensures that all groups affected, or that may potentially be affected, are involved in the process. Empowerment of the groups involved leads to a commitment to a shared goal or vision of resolving issues that directly affect the citizens in the community.

One role of the community college in this model is as a resource to the coalition that has been formed to act on the issue. The college can provide educational programs in group processes that will help the coalition to work better. Communication skills, conflict resolution, problem solving, development of a common vision, building consensus, evaluation techniques, and beneficial team behavior are several of the strategies suggested that would aid the coalition in its performance.

Additionally, this model provides language and perspective that may be useful to a practitioner. This model adds a systems thinking perspective to the traditional educational program planning process. It also adds language from group dynamics, team building, empowerment, dialogue, and institutional culture change to the working vocabulary of the practitioner.

There are a few weaknesses that need to be considered in the potential use of the community-based programming model by a practitioner. Using a systems thinking perspective approach seems like a good goal, but the “processual tasks” are conducted in a relatively linear and principle-based order. Other than the evaluation phase, the tasks appear to be dependent on the proceeding tasks.
Waiting for linear actions to take place may reduce the momentum of the coalition, and some stakeholders may lose interest as they wait to participate in their program.

Based on this model, the college is the only determiner of the issues to be addressed. A relatively small group of college employees is responsible for determining and ranking the important issues to be addressed in the programming process. This group could have its own biases, political agendas, and pet projects. What happens if the community feels strongly about an issue that the college does not want to spend the time and resources to help address?

Also, the community-based programming model is process based. It does little to address ongoing relations with individuals and groups in the community. The authors explicitly state that the coalition formed to work on the critical issue is expected to be temporary. How does this affect the collaborative effort from the start? Will individuals truly commit to a process that they see as ending? Thoughtful citizens know intuitively that it takes a long-term sustainable effort to gain and maintain broad social change in the complex world.

Senge’s Learning Organization Model

In his book *The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization* (1994), Peter Senge introduces his model for a learning organization. He claims that traditional ways of managing and governing in businesses are breaking down as the world becomes more interconnected and businesses become more complex and dynamic. The ability to learn faster is the only
sustainable competitive advantage. The author says, “Organizations must discover how to tap people’s commitment and capacity to learn at all levels of the organization” (p. 4). In order to build a learning organization, people have to learn new ways of thinking, of interacting with each other, and of relating to the organizations to which they belong. “Ultimate change is limited unless people have new ways of understanding their practical business issues – not just better ways to interact” (p. xviii). Building a learning organization represents deep universal changes in the traditional culture of western management.

Senge explains the five elements of a learning organization in depth in his book. The five elements include: systems thinking, personal mastery, mental models, shared vision, and team learning. The systems thinking perspective pervades all the other components and ties them together.

Systems thinking is a perspective of viewing the world as a whole. In the Western tradition, people are taught to break complex issues and problems into smaller parts to be considered and studied. By looking through the systems lens, the system is understood by contemplating the whole and discerning patterns of connections and interrelationships. An awareness of these patterns brings about a “metanoia” or fundamental shift of the mind with regards to the consequences of an individual’s actions. Another characteristic of systems thinking is the concept of long-term consequences. Actions may have hidden effects and consequences that do not appear until much later.
“Personal mastery is the discipline of continually clarifying and deepening our personal vision, of focusing our energies, of developing patience, and of seeing reality objectively” (p. 7). An individual becomes committed to lifelong learning—a good adult education concept—in the personal mastery discipline. Personal mastery comes from inquiry, practice, and reflection on how mental models and actions based on those mental models affect the world.

Senge describes mental models as “deeply ingrained assumptions, generalizations, or even pictures or images that influence how we understand the world and how we take action” (p. 8). In a learning organization model, mental models need to be brought to the surface and need to be challenged. Many management-change insights have failed to become practice due to conflicts with powerful individual and institutionalized mental models.

While the first three disciplines are more individual based, shared vision and team learning are collective disciplines. A shared vision connects people to a common identity and provides a picture of the future that is the goal to create. Shared vision incorporates individual visions that have been developed and clarified during personal mastery. Building shared vision fosters collective commitment to the long-term goal.

Lastly, Senge introduces the team learning discipline by bringing to the reader’s mind the extremely fulfilling experience of involvement in a “great team.” He lists characteristics of a great team such as: trusting each other, complementing each other’s strengths, compensating for each other’s limitations,
reaching a common goal that is larger than individual goals, and producing extraordinary results. Great teams have to learn to be great teams through open and un-assumptive dialogue. “The intelligence of the team exceeds the intelligence of the individuals in the team….When teams are truly learning, not only are they producing extraordinary results but the individual members are growing more rapidly than could have occurred otherwise” (p. 10). The systems thinking perspective reappears because it “continually reminds us that the whole can exceed the sum of its parts” (p. 12).

The systems thinking perspective provides multiple levels of explanations for any complex situation in problem solving. An “events explanation” views occurrences and events in a reactive manner. “Behavior explanations” view the situation responsively at a level that sees patterns of behavior, but misses the underlying causes. “Structural explanations” address the underlying cause of behavior at a level that patterns of behavior can be changed. Systemic structure is concerned with the key relationships that influence behavior over time. In order to produce long-term sustainable solutions to problems in business, the correction must be at the systemic structure level. If the problem is addressed at any other level, then it will keep reoccurring because short-term interventions do not take into account the consequences of their application. Therefore, there may be a short-term benefit that sustains or even amplifies the long-term systemic cause and fosters the need for more corrections of the symptoms.
Senge’s learning organizations model provides tools and techniques that can be practiced to change the culture of businesses. An underlying theory to the model is Maslow’s hierarchy of human needs, particularly the higher levels of self-esteem and self-actualization (Merriam & Caffarella, 1991). In the evolution of an industrial society, individuals no longer view employment as only a means to meet their food, shelter, and belonging needs. They search for intrinsic benefits from their work; they want to contribute to something larger than themselves. This model provides community colleges with a perspective and the tools and techniques to make sustainable changes to the organization through using the motivation of employees at the personal level.

The learning organizations model has a number of elements to recommend it as a template for study and practice regarding the complex long-term interactions between a community college and its community. The community college is in the business of education. The disciplines of personal mastery, mental models, and systems thinking all require inquiry and reflection, both of which are characteristic of lifelong education. The skills needed to develop shared vision and for team learning can be part of an educational program designed to help individuals apply group processes. The systems perspective augments the philosophy that the community college is a part of a larger whole, the community. Citizens are becoming more involved in their community as they see their connection to the larger world around them. Intuitively, the community and the community college are seeing mutual connections in complex systems and
realizing that there is a need to reach or to uncover the deeper causes of critical issues that the community faces.

The concept of a learning organization may be hard to sustain in a community college setting, especially in regards to community involvement in the process. The programs and services of a community college are an open system. That is, individual learners and participants come and go voluntarily. They may leave if the work becomes too much, or they perceive the work to be extraneous to the issues they feel are important. Personal mastery, common mental models, shared vision, and team learning need to be a long-term commitment by individuals in order to sustain the concept at an institutional or community level.

In order to effectively use the model, the community college itself would have to become a learning organization by integrating a systems thinking perspective into its mission, culture, and operations. As Senge points out, the other four disciplines are not nearly as effective without the systems thinking perspective to be able to see the connections and the consequences of action. This is the same institutionalization of the model as seen in Boone’s community–based programming model.

*Interorganizational Collaboration Literature*

Another approach in the literature has focused on collaboration as related to organizational and interorganizational collective action. In this burgeoning body of literature, the emphasis is on the formal and informal webs of businesses, organizations, and groups that play an important role in the structuring of the
collective action and the relationships and perceptions of the stakeholders. From this approach, interorganizational collaboration has been identified as a distinct process, as well as, an organizational structure (McGrath, 1998).

In this literature, interorganizational collaboration is reported as a developmental process (e.g. Gray & Wood, 1991; Hord, 1986; Legler & Reischl, 2003; Kanter, 1994). Interorganizational collaboration as a developmental process has preceding conditions, a recognizable set of characteristics, and a dynamic process of planning and coordination. When interorganizational collaborations are successful, they result in creating value in relationships and resources for the partners (Kanter, 1994). Interorganizational collaboration also transforms the organizations that participate in the collective activity (e.g. Kanter, 1994; Legler & Reischl, 2003; McGrath, 1998).

Particularly in the business management literature, interorganizational collaboration has been reported as an organizational structure. Interorganizational collaboration flattened the traditional hierarchy within organizations and encouraged communication and joint problem solving (Hord, 1986; Kanter, 1994; McGrath, 1998; Senge, 1994). Informal and formal cooperative alliances between global businesses yielded strategic advantages for the survival and growth of the companies (Kanter, 1994). In the competitive business world, interorganizational collaboration has opened the door for new and unforeseen opportunities. Alternately, Kanter reports that it brought change to the culture, operations,
strategies, tactics, and interpersonal relationships within the alliance partner organizations.

A number of attempts have been made to synthesis the literature on interorganizational collaboration into a comprehensive theory (Gray & Wood, 1991; Hord, 1986; Wood and Gray 1991). Hord (1986) reviewed educational and organizational literature and developed models comparing collaborative interorganizational relations with cooperative relationships. Hord made a distinction between cooperation, defined as two individuals or organizations working together to accomplish their goals to meet their independent agendas or programs, and collaboration, defined as individuals or organizations sharing responsibility and working jointly to develop, implement, and evaluate programs or agendas. Hord’s two models compared the characteristics of beginning process, communication, resources and ownership, requirements and characteristics, leadership and control, and rewards.

Gray and Wood (1991) also conducted a synthesis of collaboration literature. They reviewed what they called a preponderance of case studies to examine the major theoretical perspectives that had been applied to explain collaboration and collaborative alliances. Six major theoretical perspectives were identified in the analysis: resource dependence theory, institutional economics theory, strategic management/ social ecology theory, microeconomics theory, institutional/ negotiated order theory, and political theory. The six theoretical perspectives were mapped related to how they addressed 1) the preconditions or
factors that caused the organizations to participate in a collective form of action, 2) the process by which coalition partners interacted, and 3) the expected outcomes of the collective action.

Gray and Wood (1991) claimed that case studies provided a major contribution by identifying the vast array of settings in which interorganizational collaborations occur. Reviewing the various case studies and their related theoretical perspectives, Gray and Wood also claimed that organizational literature treated the individual organization as the focal point of theorizing with organizational-specific research questions. In order to develop a comprehensive theory on interorganizational collaboration, research questions should address the domain level, defined as problems common to organizations. Gray and Wood’s (1991) suggested questions that would contribute understanding at the domain level include:

When do stakeholders adopt collaborative alliances?

How are the responsibilities for solving social problems allocated among actors?

How do partners in an alliance regulate their behaviors so that the collective gains are achieved?

How can collectivities overcome impediments to efficiency in their transactions?

How do alliances interact with institutional environments?
Are alliances shaped by institutional environments or vise versa?

Who has access to power and resources that affect the domain?

Who does and does not benefit from the distribution of power and resources within the domain? (p. 8)

Researchers have developed both qualitative and quantitative studies to test and revise the comprehensive theories on interorganizational collaboration (Bradshaw, 1997; Lawrence, Phillips & Hardy, 1999; Legler & Reischl, 2003; Mulroy, 1997; Van de Ven & Walker, 1984). Bradshaw (1997), and Lawrence, Phillips, and Hardy (1999) designed studies that pursued the theoretical framing of interorganizational collaboration proposed by Gray & Wood (1991). Bradshaw (1997) used collaboration theory to evaluate the development of an interagency partnership between health, education, and social services agencies in the Down East Partnership for Children. The author examined the development of the partnership and the preconditions for collaboration, evaluated progress, and identified predictable challenges using the framework proposed by Wood and Gray. The author proposed that collaboration theory could be used to evaluate existing partnerships or assist in the development of new partnerships.

Lawrence, Phillips, and Hardy (1999) used the Wood and Gray theoretical framework to study the commercial whale-watching service industry in the Pacific Northwest. The researchers used the terms antecedents, dynamics, and outcomes in place of Wood and Gray’s preconditions, process, and outcomes. The authors
developed a “discourse analytical framework” for studying interorganizational collaboration. They argued that collaboration is a communication process and that through discursive processes, issues are negotiated, issues relevant to the collaboration are identified, and stakeholders who represent the legitimate interests are identified. By taking a broader focus at the domain level, Lawrence et al. examined the institutional antecedents to gain an understanding of the dynamics of the webs of collaboration that characterize the domain field and affect the outcome.

Van de Ven and Walker (1984) used quantitative methodology to propose and revise a theory of interorganizational relationships (IR). Using a longitudinal study of non-for-profit, early childhood development organizations, they found that the perception of resource dependence gave rise to the development of IRs. They also found that in order to maintain and grow IRs, frequent communications fostered formalization of the relationship. Formalizing the relationship had a positive effect on the money transactions but had a negative effect on the client referral process, which responded to a more personal and informal pattern. They also found that consensus about the terms of the collaboration and the perception of initial resource dependency contributed to the maintenance of the relationship.

Legler and Reischl (2003) also used quantitative methods to refine interorganizational collaboration theories. The study provided quantitative support for the importance of certain key factors in the formation and maintenance of collaboration in coalitions and built understanding toward the relationships
between the key factors. The key factors identified that related to the activities and organizational climate of the partnerships were: stakeholder diversity, interdependence, resource sharing, coordination, planning, communication, and written agreements.

In summary, theories or models may be used as templates for examining and directing planning and action of researchers and practitioners (Yukl, 2002). Theories are speculative descriptions of knowledge and understandings and are formulated to support apparent relationships or underlying principles of certain observed phenomenon that have been verified to some degree (LeCompte & Priessle, 1993). Derived from theories, models are a generalized description of a pattern for use in experimentation and practice. There are a number of theories and models that can be used to support and direct study of and practice in the complex interactions between a community college and its community.

The literature reviewed and models critiqued all have elements that provided direction and support for use by a researcher or practitioner examining the long-term interactions between a community college and its community. There appeared to be very little substantive examination of community college and community networks outside the context of an organizational structure, or even the relationships between organizations. Many of the collaboration, organizational, and leadership theories and models previously discussed were firmly situated in the context of formal organizations. These organizations had established purposes, goals, values, roles, and structures, even if they were in the process of
being changed. When an employee or participant was recruited, they became assimilated into an established system with a set role and reciprocal expectations.

When a community college interacts with its community, the formal organization of the college has to interact with a complex system of individuals, groups, and other organizations with their own values, interests, expectations, and cultures. The community college has used participative leadership, delegation, self-managing teams, and transformational leadership to guide their interactions with the community. From these collaborative leadership theories, the concepts of group dynamics, open communication, shared vision, and empowerment have been applied, refined, and reapplied with some success. Leadership and organizational theories, even the collaborative theories discussed, do not address some of the variables related to context needed to understand the broad perspective of the relations between the community college and its community. A few relatively new theories potentially address this need for a more flexible understanding of interorganizational networks and relationships.

Boone’s community-based programming model (1997), Senge’s learning organization model (1994), and Komives’ relational leadership model (1998) provided structure and language to this case study on the formation and growth of interagency collaborations between a community college and the various stakeholder groups in its community. Because of the nature of complex relationships and complex social issues, interactions would have to be viewed through a systems thinking perspective. The structure and language of group
development processes and collaboration in the models would provide templates for the examination of group processes involved in building, maintaining, and improving long-term relationships. An integrated model that incorporates the strengths of the three models provided a template for examining and directing a community college’s sustained interaction with its community of individuals, groups, and organizations. The results of such a study could provide awareness for improvement of long standing relations and provide insights to build new connections with the community.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter, key literature and research were reviewed on 1) the community college philosophy of community relations and community service, 2) examples and models of successful community and community college collaborations, 3) organizational leadership and relational leadership theories, research, and models built on theories, and 4) interorganizational collaboration research and theories. This background information informed this study of community college and community collaborations.
The purpose of this study was to explore and describe the interactions and processes a community college used to collaborate with its community. Drawing upon the Relational Leadership Model as a conceptual framework (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998), this study examined how varied stakeholders and constituencies of a community college worked together to reach an agreed upon goal. Using the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond (HEFB) referendum in North Carolina as the case study context, one community college-community collaboration was studied in depth in order to answer the following questions:

1. How did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens perceive interactions with each other toward the development of a collaboration?

2. What actions, behaviors, tasks, and roles did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens use to accomplish an agreed upon goal?

**Case Study Methodology**

This research study used qualitative case study methodology. According to Robert E. Stake (Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995), a case study has a boundary and working parts. It is a study of an individual, group, program or organization, not an indeterminate process or a single event. By this definition, studying a community college and its respective community served as a case study. Stake (2000) also
identifies two types of single case studies: intrinsic and instrumental. An intrinsic case study is conducted because the particular case is intrinsically interesting to the researcher for its own particularities. An instrumental case study is of interest because it helps the understanding of another issue or adds insight to a generalization. This study was an instrumental case study of one community college-community collaboration.

A qualitative case study is descriptive, heuristic, and particularistic (Merriam, 1998). For a case study to be descriptive, the end product is a complete, literal description of the phenomenon under study. The report of this study uses documentation of events, quotes, samples, and artifacts to illustrate the complexity of the collaboration between the community college and the various groups of stakeholders and constituencies in the community. Information regarding the case is presented in a variety of ways and from the viewpoints of different groups. Moreover, the report is also heuristic. It provides information to add to the reader’s experience and understanding, to “bring about the discovery of new meaning, extend the reader’s experience, or confirm what is known” (Merriam, 1998, p. 30). In fulfillment of the third characteristic of a case study, a particular situation was studied in depth and reported in detailed description in order to develop deeper understanding about the interactions and processes a community college uses to collaborate with its community.
Sampling

According to Sharan B. Merriam (1998), there are two levels of sampling in case study research. The first level is to determine the specific case to be studied. In this study, one community college was the unit of analysis. Purposive or purposeful sampling, as described in Merriam (1998), was used for the selection of a realistic college site. Catherine Marshall and Gretchen B. Rossman (1999) offer that “a realistic site is where (a) entry is possible; (b) there is a high probability that a rich mix of the processes, people, programs, interactions, and structures of interest are present; (c) the researcher is likely to be able to build trusting relations with the participants in the study; and (d) data quality and credibility of the study are reasonably assured” (p. 69).

A realistic site for this study was a community college recognized at the state level as having made a noticeable partnership effort with its community in regards to campaigning for the passage of the 2000 bonds. The president and the assistant to the president for external affairs at the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) office were contacted and interviewed for suggestions of a community college that met the following criteria:

1. The college made a noticeable effort to partner with its community during the 2000 HEFB campaign.

2. The college should fit a profile as a typical community college in North Carolina. A typical community college in North Carolina had an annual enrollment between 1500 and 3000 full-time student equivalences (FTE)
and had a service area that primarily covers a single county that is less than 50% municipal (NCCCS, 2002).

3. The specific college was not used in the publicity campaign as an extreme case to exemplify the need for bond funding.

4. The president of the recommended college would be agreeable to graduate research involving the institution and community.

5. And preferably, the college would be located in the eastern half of the state, so that it would be time and distance accessible for the researcher.

Identifying the Study Site

To identify the community college used as the site for this study, the researcher examined statistical information regarding the 58 community colleges for the year 2000 (NCCCS, 2002). According to enrollment statistics, slightly more than half of the 58 colleges (30) had enrollments between 1500 and 3000 FTE. Forty-two of the 58 colleges were located in counties that were designated as less than 50% municipal, therefore, 70% of the colleges served rural counties. Two-thirds of the community colleges served a single county area. A number of the colleges served more than one county and some included other states in their service area. Therefore in 2000, a typical community college in North Carolina had an annual enrollment between 1500 and 3000 FTE and had a rural service area that covered a single county.
In discussion with state leaders of the community college system, several colleges were suggested that closely met the criteria for the study. The selection of the site college was finally based on its capacity to meet all the previously mentioned criteria. Therefore, the community college selected for the site of this case study was located in a rural county in eastern North Carolina, served that single county, and had an enrollment between 1500 and 3000 FTE in 2000. It was particularly noted for the creative campaign strategies used during the bond campaign and its participation in regional activities. However, the specific college was not used in the state publicity campaign as a “poster child” or an exemplary case for the need for bond funding. The researcher contacted the president at the community college regarding potential participation in a research project and he enthusiastically agreed to this research effort involving the institution and the community.

*Identifying the Interview Participants*

A second level of sampling within the case was used (Merriam, 1998). The particular type of purposeful sampling used at this level was snowball sampling, or asking individuals who are familiar with the case to make referrals to other information-rich individuals and documents (Merriam, 1998). In the first meeting with the president, he was asked for permission to use the college as the site for the study, which was approved. Then he was asked to identify individuals who could provide information about the bond campaign. Along with the president, these individuals became key informants for the study. Individuals who have
special knowledge, status, or may contribute insights into observations denied the researcher were recognized as key informants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). Throughout the study, each individual contacted was asked for further suggestions of individuals who could have special insights and knowledge of the bond campaign and use of bond funds. Because this study looked at a past event, it was important to talk to people who were present and active during the bond campaign and subsequent activities. Also during the contacts, requests were made for suggestions of and access to documents and other sources of data related to how the college worked with the community to make decisions and communicated with the citizens.

Sampling was conducted until the point of redundancy or saturation, as suggested in Merriam (1998). Saturation allowed an adequate number of participants and documents to be sampled to answer the posed questions. Five individuals employed by the college and seven individuals in the community were interviewed for this study. The request for one interview was turned down. Data collection ended when referrals repeatedly duplicated individuals already interviewed. In addition, there were numerous newspaper articles, informational materials, planning documents, videos, and website archives for review and analysis.

Data Collection

As previously stated, the purpose of this qualitative instrumental case study was to examine the interactions and processes a community college used to
collaborate with its community. Interviews and document analysis were the two primary strategies for collecting data for this study. Key informant interviews were the “interactive” form of data collection and document analysis was the “noninteractive” form of data collection (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

**Interviews**

According to Merriam (1998), interviews are used when behavior cannot be observed. Interviewing is also effective for studying events that have passed. Both criteria were present for this study. Interview participants in this study were selected by snowball sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994), with subsequent interviewees being identified by previous informants. Starting with the president of the college, who was identified by the individuals at NCCCS office, each individual interviewed was asked for suggestions of other individuals to be interviewed. In total, twelve key informants from the college and the community were interviewed. For the interviews, a written request for an interview with a brief description of the study and the consent form (Appendix A) were sent to each individual to be interviewed. Next, an interview with each key informant was scheduled for up to one hour. All interviews were semi-structured. Interview guides were developed as checklists to focus on the relevant topics, but also allowed for new questions and topics as data collection evolved (Appendices B, C, and D). Most interviews ran forty-five minutes. The shortest interview was fifteen minutes; the longest was one and a half hours in length. Interviews were scheduled for a time that was convenient for both the participant and interviewer. Most interviews were held in
the participant’s office. Two were held in vacant boardrooms. With the participant’s permission, interviews were recorded using an Olympus DM-1 digital recorder laid on the desk between the two participants; no additional microphone was needed. One interview was not recorded due to the recorder running out of memory. Written notes were used for the interview. The digital files were downloaded from the recorder and transcribed directly on the computer using the Olympus Player Pro transcription program and foot pedal.

*Document Analysis*

In addition to interviewing, document analysis was also useful for studying historical events (Merriam, 1998). Public documents were readily accessible and provided a stable source of data. Moreover, documentary data did not intrude on the research site and subjects. Merriam (1998) also stated that “documentary data are particularly good sources for qualitative case studies because they can ground an investigation in the context of the problem” (p. 126). Documentary data in this study included archived written materials and popular media forms, such as television broadcasts, advertisements, web pages, and newspaper articles. Informants were asked for suggestions and assistance in obtaining access to archived materials. Permission to make copies was obtained and some participants provided copies of materials. A data collection form similar to that suggested by Matthew B. Miles and A. Michael Huberman (1994) was developed prior to reviewing data and revised as needed. This form captured the context for the document--when it was received, who provided it, what significance it had--
and summarized the document. Document summary forms were coded for retrieval and analysis. Copies of a 50-minute public forum, a 10-minute public service announcement and a 60-minute public television broadcast were obtained and reviewed. Digital audio recordings were made of the video recordings. These digital files were downloaded from the recorder and also transcribed.

Initial analysis occurred concurrently with data collection, using a constant comparative method (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). After each contact, researcher notes were reviewed and initial categories and interpretations were made. These preliminary interpretations were used to refine the interview guide and document analysis procedures and to guide the next step in the data collection process. (A more in-depth discussion of the data analysis process is addressed in a following section of its own.)

**Trustworthiness**

The integrity of the research process is addressed throughout the research process—in the conceptualization and design of the study; in the processes of data collection, analysis and interpretation; and in the manner in which the findings are reported (Merriam, 1998). Addressing internal validity, external validity, and reliability aids the reader in determining that the reality of the case was accurately observed, recorded, and reported. Ethical issues were anticipated and addressed in order for the researcher and the research to be considered trustworthy.
Internal Validity

Internal validity refers to whether the data and interpretations represent the reality of the case (Merriam, 1998). Multiple data sources and types, review of the interpretations with the individuals interviewed, and time spent on-site provided triangulation of data and interpretations. Also, an auditor was asked to review the data to check for consistency in the researcher’s interpretations. The auditor and researcher observed similar themes and chose similar words for codes. (For the reader of the presentation of the findings and interpretations, a researcher role and bias statement has been included in order to elucidate the researcher’s biases and assumptions prior to data collection and analysis.)

External Validity

External validity refers to the transferability of the research findings to other situations (Merriam, 1998). By definition of an instrumental case study, the goal is to provide understanding for use in other situations. Use of multiple informants and more than one data-gathering method help strengthen the study’s credibility and potential usefulness for other settings (Marshall & Rossman, 1999). Using thick description and by describing the “comparability” of the case, one hopes to provide the reader with the information needed to draw conclusions on the transferability of the findings and interpretations (Merriam, 1998).

Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of the findings with the data collected (Merriam, 1998). A reader of the presentation should be able to follow the
process and the logic of the research and the interpretations. The researcher bias statement provides the theoretical assumptions and the biases inherent in the collection of the data and interpretation of the data. A research journal and other forms of documentation of how data were collected, how decisions were made, and what categories and interpretations were developed also provide an audit trail to explain how the researcher developed interpretations and conclusions (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).

**Ethics**

Robert C. Bogdan and Sari Knopp Bilkin (1998) provide four ethical areas to be addressed: voluntary participation, participant understanding of expectations, confidentiality, and truth in reporting findings. For this study, an initial contact was made by telephone, asking for each individual’s help and receiving initial agreement to participate. Participants were asked for permission to record the interview prior to beginning each interview. This step covered the first ethical area of voluntary participation. Secondly, to meet the ethical issue of participant understanding of the expectations, a letter putting the request in writing and explaining the research topic was provided prior to each interview. During interviews, the researcher fielded questions regarding the nature of the research and reporting procedures. Thirdly, a consent form was signed and kept on file to document that the individual agreed to participate and was aware of measures that were taken to insure confidentiality and anonymity of the participants. No names were used in the reporting or presentation of research results. Measures were
taken to insure security of all forms of data to assure confidentiality of the participants. The fourth issue of truth in reporting addressed the fact that the researcher has no hidden agenda. The researcher for this study had no strong ties to the college or participants and truly wanted to learn from the participants how they perceive and describe the processes and interactions that aid in the collaboration between the community college and its community.

Consciousness of ethical issues during the conceptualization and design stage helped to anticipate some of the issues and dilemmas that may arise during data collection, analysis, interpretation, and presentation of findings and interpretations (Merriam, 1998). Reviewing the information available from the Institutional Review Board for the use of human subjects in research and completing the Application for New Studies provided insight into several ethical issues to be aware of and to anticipate in the research process. “The best a researcher can do is to be conscious of the ethical issues that pervade the research process and to examine his or her own philosophical orientation vis-à-vis these issues” (Merriam, 1998, p. 219).

One minor ethical dilemma had to be addressed early in the study. A concern arose due to an adjustment in the interview protocol. In an early interview, the participant asked if the president had granted permission to discuss the collaborative building design process and to provide copies of documents. Because the researcher only became aware of the design process during the first interview with the president, permission to ask questions specifically about the
building was not requested at that time. The concern was acknowledged and assurances were made to the participant that permission would be clarified with the president. The researcher immediately contacted the president and obtained permission to proceed with gathering information regarding the building design process. This was one of the few participants who was not formally introduced by an individual making the referral.

Researcher Role and Bias

Researcher Role

Qualitative research as a field of inquiry is recognized to be subjective, naturalistic, and interpretive (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Glesne, 1999; LeCompte & Preissle, 1993; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 1995). Qualitative inquiry is distinguished by the recognition that the researcher and the participants all have unique subjective perspectives on the phenomenon being studied. All bring those unique perspectives into providing an integrated interpretation and additional understanding to a universal understanding that is held as credible and factual (Stake, 1995). Personal and professional biases and interests also affect the choices for research questions and choice of participants and methodological choices (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).

Qualitative research is naturalistic, because the researcher engages participants in the natural setting in order to capture the subjectivity of the participant’s perspective (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). This engagement occurs within the natural environment of the phenomenon in order to capture the nuances of the
complex relationships that occur and the unique contexts of the case (Stake, 1995). Qualitative research is useful in taking a holistic look at the complex processes in social systems (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001; Yukl, 2002). This is different from the attempt to determine linear cause-and-effect as emphasized in quantitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000).

Qualitative research is interpretive because the subjective perspective and biases of the researcher are tools to be used in planning, conducting, and analyzing the inquiry. As Stake (1995) writes, “Standard qualitative designs call for the persons most responsible for interpretations to be in the field, making observations, exercising subjective judgment, analyzing and synthesizing, all the while realizing their own consciousness” (p. 41). Reflecting on one’s consciousness is necessary to the exercise of composing a researcher bias statement and attempting to make the researcher’s perspectives and biases apparent to the reader.

**Researcher Bias Statement**

Because qualitative research uses the researcher as a tool (Merriam, 1998), a section on researcher background and assumptions is provided to allow the reader to determine the perspective of the researcher and how it might have affected the study. The qualitative inquiry paradigm is compatible with this researcher’s constructivist worldview. The constructivist worldview uses direct contact with individuals in context and attempts to capture and interpret the individual perspectives of the participants in support of the belief that knowledge is
constructed, not something to be discovered (Stake, 1995). Through the synthesis and interpretation of multiple perspectives, ultimately this researcher hoped to provide a personal view of the interactions, processes, and context under study. By providing the reader with examples of raw data, such as quotes and narrative description, the constructivist view encourages the reader to make their own interpretation and integrate their interpretation into their own version of the world (Stake, 1995). Because of the fallibility of human interpretation, it is understood that some interpretations have more credibility and utility than others, thus interpretations have varying value. In constructivism, it is possible to have numerous interpretations that, although each may be unique and of differing value, may be integrated into a universal understanding (Stake, 1995). This researcher wholly agrees with Stake (1995) that “the function of research is not the necessarily to map and conquer the world but to sophisticate the beholding of it. (p. 43)”

Bringing this understanding of relative constructivism into a qualitative inquiry placed this researcher into the role of curious student (Glesne, 1999). This influenced methodology and implicated the use of interviews and observation to capture individual interpretations (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993). In the role of learner, the researcher became the listener, not an expert or authority that should have been doing the talking. This was essential in establishing rapport and building trust with participants (LeCompte & Preissle, 1993).
This researcher has an acknowledged bias toward collaboration and community processes. Many of her beliefs regarding collaboration and leadership issues were developed during the grassroots civic action and lay leader movements prevalent in the cooperative extension programs in the 1970s. This researcher participated in a number of the cooperative extension youth programs. The belief in the power of individuals in affecting programs and policies and that leadership can come from any level was formed and reinforced. She learned these beliefs at the knee of a strong extension layleader who gained recognition at the state and national levels.

As a professional and civic leader, this researcher has seen the maxim, *It’s not what you know, but who you know*, played out innumerable times. Through networking and coordination of efforts and limited resources, she has observed that groups can create more stellar results than individual efforts. As an instructor and program director in the North Carolina Community College System for over a decade, she has been involved in several community-based programs and partnerships at the state, institutional, and curriculum levels. Therefore, this research was pursued in order to explore and discover the theoretical concepts that underlie the processes and interactions that she has experienced in practice.

The exercise of planning and conducting this research has given the researcher a unique opportunity to check her understanding of the concepts that she has grown up with and has honed in her professional life. She tried to be realistic to the extent that everyone has a perspective of how the world operates,
how the work of the world gets done, and how relationships are built. This researcher tried to take into account other perspectives that may differ from her own and has tried to keep this in mind as she runs across different perspectives of how things ought to happen. It has been an interesting journey.

As a long time student of leadership issues, this researcher plans to pursue a career in community college administration. Awareness of the theoretical constructs that underlie the community service and community-based college movements will provide a better understanding of the management of institutional processes and the leadership with people for a future administrator. From her experience and observations, organizations of the future will be even more subject to external forces and must be prepared to adapt quickly and creatively. In this world of interdependence, difference, scarcity, and power relations (Wheatley, 1999), collaboration among all interested parties will be more productive than competition. As stated in the futures report of New Expeditions initiative by the AACC and the Kellogg Foundation, in order for the community college to remain a viable institution in the twenty-first century, it will have to be an active and essential partner in the community by building partnerships and collaborations (American Association of Community Colleges, 2000).

Data Analysis

In an instrumental case study, collecting good data, establishing trustworthiness, and recognizing the researcher’s perspective are important for good data analysis. Data analysis is the process of bringing order to the quantities
and varieties of data collected, developing understanding of the meaning of and
insight into the words and acts of the participants in the study, and then displaying
that meaning to the reader through a written report (Marshall & Rossman, 1999).
For this study, analysis began during data collection. Data collected through
fieldwork were analyzed using the constant comparative method described by
Margaret D. LeCompte and Judith Preissle (1993). The researcher used the
preliminary research questions and related literature to develop guidelines for data
analysis. As concepts and understandings were developed and recorded, they
were compared to previous data and understandings. Relationships and
interpretations were continually refined throughout the data collection and analysis
process. As coherent interpretation with related concepts emerged from the
analysis, this led to new data collection and analysis, which served to strengthen
the interpretations.

Marshall and Rossman’s six phases of typical analysis procedures were
used to guide the organization, reduction, interpretation and reporting on the data
(1999). The six phases are: (a) organization of data, (b) generation of categories,
themes and patterns, (c) coding of data, (d) testing of emergent understandings,
(e) searching for alternative explanations, and (f) writing the report. Protocols
were developed prior to and refined throughout the study to manage and organize
the various types of data collected. To start, transcripts were read and reread,
paying attention to how the information could be reduced and interpreted.
Secondly, categories, themes, and patterns were developed in order to group the
data for further analysis and interpretation. Next, inductive analysis was used to code the data in order to provide formal representation of interpretations of the relationships among the categories and themes. The ATLAS.ti (Muhr, 1997) software program was the tool used to help capture and organize the coding of the data. It is “a powerful workbench for the qualitative analysis of large bodies of textual, graphical, and audio data” (Muhr, 1997). Then, the codes and interpretations were tested against the data for centrality and usefulness to explain the data. At this point, an active search was made for alternative plausible interpretations from the data. Meanwhile, a reflective and recursive writing process was used throughout data collection and analysis to help summarize, reflect, and engage in the interpretative process.

Presentation of Findings

The final step in any research process is the formal presentation of the findings and conclusions. In this final written report, a chronological narrative description of the information gathered through interviews and document analysis and the participant’s perspectives formed the structural framework for the report. Multiple perspectives and detailed descriptions were given in hopes of conveying the vicarious experience to the reader and providing evidence from which the researcher drew interpretations and conclusions (Merriam, 1998). Descriptive data were summarized and analyzed inductively in order to propose more general theoretical constructs.
Chapter Summary

In summary, this chapter has addressed the qualitative research methods and tools to be used to examine the collaboration between a community college and its community that occurred related to the 2000 HEFB referendum. The selection of the case study site, the use of interviews and documents for data collection, data analysis and interpretation, and the presentation of the findings are described. Additionally, the issues of trustworthiness and researcher bias have been recognized and measures were discussed and incorporated to address these issues.
CHAPTER 4
Historical Narrative of the Case Study

Introduction

This study was designed to examine the interactions and processes a community college used to collaborate with its community. The 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum (HEFB) promised the 58 North Carolina community colleges an unprecedented $600 million for renovations and new construction. The HEBF provided a focused example of community college leaders and staff working together with community leaders and citizens for the good of the college and the community. The research questions that guided this study were:

1. How did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens perceive interactions with each other toward the development of a collaboration?

2. What actions, behaviors, tasks, and roles did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens use to accomplish an agreed upon goal?

This chapter will present a story of collaboration as described by the participants and as found in newspaper and professional journal articles, video copies of a public forum and public television broadcasts, unpublished manuscripts, and other campaign planning and marketing documents. References made to public figures will retain their proper names as a matter of historical record. The names of the key informants in this study have been changed in
compliance with the confidentiality agreement reached and signed by each interviewee. Pseudonyms of Eastern Community College (ECC) and Emerson County will be used for the name of the community college and county in which it is located. To aid the reader, a roster has been provided to identify the key informants in this study, and key participants involved in the development of the bond referendum in 1999 and 2000; the state, regional and local bond campaigns in 2000; and the building design process of the community college in 2002-2003.

Roster of Key Public Figures and Informants

Public Figures

Molly Corbett Broad: president of the University of North Carolina System composed of 16 campuses in 2000;

Martin Lancaster: president of the North Carolina Community College System composed of 58 community colleges in 2000;

Lauch Faircloth: former United States Senator from the area in 2000;

Dr. James Leutze: chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington in 2000;

Dr. William B. McLeod: chancellor of Fayetteville State University in 2000;

Phil Kirk: chair for the North Carolina Citizens for Business and Industry, the statewide Chamber of Commerce in 2000.
Informants (Pseudonyms Used)

Andrews: president of Eastern Community College (ECC);

Borden: chairman of the ECC Board of Trustees in 2000, and still held that position at the time of the study in 2003;

Creech: public relations officer for a regional university;

Daniels: long-time department chair of a curriculum program at ECC; retired in 2003, but continued to instruct at the time of this study;

Gardner: executive director of the ECC foundation, active organizer of the 2000 local bond campaign; still available for interviews in 2003;

Gilbert: business owner; had served on the foundation board for ECC;

Madison: department chair of a curriculum program; new to the college at the time of the building design; was not living in the county nor employed by the community college at the time of the bond campaign;

Masterson: owner of a multi-generational business; he, his wife, and two children were alumni and strong supporters of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill;

Roberts: business owner; had served as a trustee for ECC;

Strickland: administrative vice president of ECC in 2003; served on the community college executive council in 2000;

Unger: director of the Emerson County office of the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service; alumnus of North Carolina State University;
Wilson: the executive director of the Emerson Chamber of Commerce; she and her husband, who served on the Emerson Board of County Commissioners in 2000, were alumni of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Narrative Presentation

In order to examine the interactions and processes a community college used to collaborate with its community, a narrative of the chronological history will be presented in four sections. First, a brief history of the HEFB referendum legislation and state bond campaign will be provided. Next, a description of the planning and execution of the local bond campaign will be given, followed by a discussion of the involvement by the community in the design of the building, that was initiated from the bond funding. Finally, examples of connections and partnerships that developed as a continuation of the relationships built during the bond campaign and building-planning process will be presented.

History of the Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum and State Campaign

The institutions of higher education in North Carolina have a history of struggling to negotiate funding for the construction and maintenance of buildings and facilities on campuses. Funding for educational programs and personnel are included in the state budget annually; whereas, funding for the construction and renovations of buildings on university campuses has historically been at the discretion of the state General Assembly through legislation. The facilities on community college campuses are primarily funded and maintained by the county governments. Due to the recognition of the limits on local funding for community
colleges, especially in poorer counties, community colleges across the state have also benefited over the years from state funding voted on by the state legislature and by state bonds passed by the citizens.

The activities that initiated the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond referendum began in 1997, when the university system hired a higher education and finance consultant, Eva Klein. Her responsibilities were to visit and study each of the 16 University of North Carolina (UNC) campuses in 1998 (Cunningham & Lanier, 2001). Her report completed in April 1999 told of a critical need for repairs, renovations, and new construction to meet the forecasted increases in enrollment at the university level. In the summer of 1999, the university system worked with the General Assembly to initiate legislation that would sell bonds to provide money for the much needed renovation and construction of facilities on the sixteen UNC campuses. After studying the report, both houses of the state legislature introduced legislation seeking to fund not only the needs of the universities, but also added the needs for additional and renovated facilities at the community colleges. Several legislators who were strong supporters of the community colleges ensured that the interests of state community colleges were represented in the funding legislation. This particular legislation proposed financing that did not need a popular vote.

The 1999 version of the funding bill passed the senate, but did not pass the house. A majority of the house legislators felt that such a large funding initiative should be put to a public vote. There were also a number of projects included by
the universities, such as athletic fields and campus landscaping projects, which came under scrutiny and criticism by legislators and citizens, alike.

Despite the setback with the proposed legislation, there was a strong feeling of support for addressing the needs of higher education facilities. As a result, a twenty-member special commission, the Joint Select Committee on Higher Education Facilities Needs, was appointed by the General Assembly in February 2000 to study the issue further. During March and April of 2000, the special commission made a tour of the state. They visited numerous university and community college campuses across the state. The initial strategy of tour planners was to show the deplorable condition of facilities at institutions across the state. Members of the commission quickly tired of seeing buildings that were falling down and in various stages of disrepair. With an evident change in strategy for the second half of the tour, the organizers of the tour began to show the commission members the benefits of higher education to the state economy and the impact that quality facilities had on the training of employees for businesses and industries across the state.

While the commission was touring state campuses, a key partner came forward. The North Carolina Citizens for Business and Industry (NCCBI), the statewide Chamber of Commerce, announced that they would lend their support as an active partner to the bond referendum. NCCBI had positively supported the bonds legislation at the end of 1999. NCCBI chair Phil Kirk, who also chaired the North Carolina Board of Education, had previously taken an active role in
promoting the bonds. He had worked to develop a true partnership between business and education for economic development of the state. The NCCBI formed a committee of representatives from businesses, the universities, and the community colleges to help develop and gain passage of any forthcoming legislation.

By the spring of 2000, the community college system also recognized the need to conduct its own facilities study. Community college leaders hired an independent consultant to study the facility needs of all the fifty-eight state community colleges. By the end of the spring, the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) president, state board, and college president's association discussed funding needs and subsequently supported the bond referendum legislation. During this time, the board of trustees and administrators for each of the community colleges were asked to develop their “wants list” to be forwarded to the state office for inclusion in the financial formulas. The requests were divided into two categories: one for renovations and one for new construction. Borden explained:

Most schools have a general idea of what they want and those lists go before their board of trustees. The trustees endorsed those and they were passed on. It was primarily a want list, not necessarily a bare bones need list. You expect some shrinkage and we certainly did get some.
The community college leaders involved in developing the request list from the college expressed various levels of frustration. Some were concerned with how clear the communication was related to what projects would be considered for the system-wide request list to the General Assembly, and how allocations would be determined once the bonds passed. Strickland of ECC articulated this frustration: “There was really no clear indication as to what would make it on that list.” In addition, because county governments are responsible for the construction and maintenance of community college facilities and have limited funds, some colleges developed their initial requests conservatively. As described by Strickland of ECC,

In our case, we tempered even our original request with some understanding that this county can only pay so much operating money; for buildings, $1.05 to $1.15 per square foot operating costs per year out of local money. So, when you start talking about adding another hundred thousand square feet of space, you’re going to have to ask the county to pony up another 120 to a 150 thousand dollars a year and... this county is challenged to come up with that kind of money.

Another factor that influenced the development of conservative estimates was that the bonds, if passed, would provide differential funding to counties. Some more affluent counties were required to match a portion of the funds from the bonds from other funding sources. Many rural counties were funded with no
requirement for matching funds. But there was an additional concern if the colleges had building projects in process.

We were excited about the opportunity to have some new money coming in to build buildings. We’re in a much-challenged county here. It is really a very poor county, with very limited resources and a high demand for public services. It’s hard to get money in the form of millions of dollars to build buildings. A lot of people don’t realize it’s the responsibility of the local government to provide the buildings for the community college. So we just recently completed two new buildings and we were in the process of those being built or planned when this bond came about ... we were worried that maybe the fact that we were building buildings at that time may have dampened the community support… But it didn’t. (Borden)

Developing Campaign Strategies

Leaders of the university system and the community college system worked with state legislators to redraft the funding package to include a public bond referendum. Their efforts began with an examination of past public bond initiatives. In addition to the challenge of getting the bill passed by legislators in both houses, they also knew that they had to develop strategies to gain passage by the support of citizens of North Carolina. In the past, the universities had barely passed bond referendums for the sixteen campuses, whereas separate bond referendums for the community colleges were more easily passed by popular vote (Cunningham &
Lanier, 2001). When looking more closely at the past community colleges bonds, the leaders saw that the community colleges had a broad base of support throughout the state.

The organizers for the bond referendum began by developing strategies to combine the influence of supporters of the universities and the broad geographic support of the community colleges. They believed this combined partnership would improve the chances that the bond referendum would pass. Leaders at Eastern Community College recognized this as a “masterful strategy by the university system.” Borden of ECC explained the importance of this partnership:

The university system recognized that joining with the community college system would put fifty-eight communities on their side. And the community colleges have reached a lot of people...over the last forty years of their basic existence. So that’s a whole new constituency that they were wise enough to plug into. Community colleges got the smaller end of the package, but the community colleges saw that ‘hey, here’s a chance for us to get a major shot in the arm on our construction needs at the same time.’ So it was a good marriage and it was a first. The community college system and the universities have not always gotten along perfectly together. It’s always competition for limited resources. But I think you’re going to see more and more cooperation, which is a major outgrowth, maybe more important than even the bond itself.
Additionally, Andrews felt that the partners mutually benefited:

By joining together, you know the universities have a big alumni base, but we [the community colleges] also have a broad geographic base, because there are fifty-eight of us and so we are everywhere. I think they saw some merit in joining together and I think that’s probably true. So, people in the county saw not that it would benefit the universities, but it would benefit the local community as well.

The leadership of the university system and the state community college system then worked together to develop a combined request to present to the “short session” of the General Assembly, which convened on May 8, 2000. The bond issue was quickly introduced in both houses. The legislation, known as the Michael K. Hooker Higher Education Facilities Finance Act after the bill’s author, put bonds for both the universities and the community colleges on the ballots in November 2000. Debate and voting on the Higher Education Facilities Bonds Referendum was the first major action of the session. By May 17, the bill had passed in both houses.

While the bonds and the bond referendum legislation were being debated in the capital, several groups from Emerson County participated in the civic process of contacting their legislators and lobbying for funding for the colleges and universities. Directors of the Emerson Chamber of Commerce signed a resolution in support of the bond referendum to be sent to the General Assembly. The director of the chamber remarked, “We encouraged our legislators to put it to a
vote of the people.” Trustees of Eastern Community College traveled to the capital for a major legislative hearing and lobbied the legislators in support of the bond referendum. The rapid reconfiguration of the legislation and subsequent passage also caught the local supporters off guard. Although pleased that community colleges were included in the effort. Borden, chair of the local board of trustees, commented:

It looked like the whole bond issue was not going to be put together and then the next thing I knew, it was a done deal. They had worked it out. I remember seeing for the first time what our final allocation was going to be in the newspaper. And we were a little disappointed that it was as low as it was, but now we were in the lower part of the second tier of the community colleges. We’re not that big. It’s all pro-rata. We didn’t get millions and millions and millions of dollars, but it was a gracious amount for us.

Governor Jim Hunt signed the act, which placed the $3.1 billion dollar bond issue on the November 7 ballots, in a public ceremony on the steps of the state capital building on May 25, 2000. The ceremony and celebration drew top legislators, business leaders, and educational leaders. Students, alumni, representatives, and leaders from the community colleges and universities attended, carrying banners and wearing their school colors. A group of elementary school children sat on the steps in front of the stage as a symbol of the reason for the bonds--third graders who would be seeking admittance to colleges and
universities in 2008. A number of the individuals from ECC attended the signing ceremony. One educator who was present at the ceremony attempted to express the importance of the legislation to the future of higher education in the state:

It was needed so much. And that’s why I think everybody realizes this county is for education. I think you’ll find that if you go back and look, they really support education. But it’s just like a poor man wanting to do good things for his family: he can only do so much. So that’s the dilemma and the paradox. With all of its faults ... and with all of the problems that they face and the criticisms that they get, education is by far the best hope for the poor folks, and for all of us. I mean everybody pins their hopes on their children. They hope their children will have a little better chance than they did ... to have a little better opportunity. And they realize, I think everybody realizes that the gateway for that is education. We all benefit from education and that it is the answer to so many of our problems. (Borden)

State Bond Campaign Planning

As soon as the bill was signed, the real work began. In a May 25th press release from the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) office, president Martin Lancaster charged members of the state board for community colleges and president’s association members “to work to educate the public to get the bonds passed” (NCCCS, 2000, May 19). The universities immediately began to promote the involvement in the bond campaign to their employees and alumni
statewide. Unger, who was located in Emerson County and employed by North Carolina State University, received information first from a meeting held at NCSU and later mentioned the issue to the ECC president at a local reception.

In order to maintain the non-profit status of the three partners (UNC system, NCCCS, and NCCBI), a separate bond issue advocacy group was formed. Known as North Carolinians for Educational Opportunity (NCEO), the group helped organize the state-level campaign to advocate for passage of the bond referendum in the November election. There was a statewide media and advertising campaign that included commercials, public service announcements, and UNC Public Television broadcasts. The group also coordinated major statewide events. The state-level committee provided suggestions for strategies and tactics for local referendum campaigns. They also developed resources to aid local organizers. These resources included fact sheets that could be modified with information related to what the funds would mean for the local institutions, press release templates, and an informational website that the colleges and universities across the state provided links to from their home websites.

NCEO, the state-level committee, hired a professional political survey group to determine the messages that would best resonate with the voters on the state bond referendum. They determined that the messages of “access” and “opportunity” touched the values of the most voters. “Access” messages addressed the current and future facility needs of the state institutions of higher education--the current need for renovation of out-of-date and unhealthy buildings
found at every community college and university campus--and the future need for more space to meet the expected explosion in enrollment. The message of “opportunity” coincided with the historically held value of providing educational opportunities for all citizens of the state, as well as with the open-door philosophy of the community colleges. Strong educational and training programs provided incentives for businesses and industries to start or relocate to the state, which in turn brought economic development to the state. Additionally, this group conducted public opinion surveys that helped fine-tune the message in the last weeks before the vote in November.

The NCEO suggested that each college and university campus designate a key contact person to receive all communications and coordinate all local activities. In most community colleges, the director of the community college foundation traditionally represented the college to external constituencies, especially in matters concerning large sums of money and fundraising. Gardner, as director of development for ECC, became the contact person to the state-level committee. He attended one of the early meetings of the committee held during the summer of 2000, noting, “I went up to Raleigh and attended a meeting--and it was very disjointed. … It was good, but I think it spoke more to the universities than it did to the community colleges.”

Back at the county level, supporters at ECC seemed to have less information in the early days of the campaign, but this may be due to a strategy by the NCEO to not push the grassroots local campaign until just two months prior to
the actual vote. Masterson thought the short time frame provided to the local committee turned out to be a positive situation: “In primaries and most elections, the process is drawn out.” The local campaigning for the shorter time frame proved beneficial, though the strategies were only put into action during a September and October of 2000.

Selection of the New President

At the time of the bond campaign, ECC was faced with the challenge of selecting new executive leadership. One of the key background issues was the frustrating lack of communication from the state level regarding funding allocation and early campaign planning. Some of this frustration may have occurred because the president of ECC retired during this time. In comparison, other community college presidents were active at the state-level through the North Carolina Association of Community College Presidents. Through meetings and regular communications, the other college presidents kept current regarding the bond funding legislation and participated in state-level decisions related to development of the bond legislation and the campaign. They, in turn, communicated important state-level information to their local community college administrations and regional constituencies.

On the other hand, college leaders believed the timing of the president’s search was fortuitous for the local bond campaign. They believed the strategy of including the community in ECC’s presidential selection process helped build positive relations with the community. Positive relations with the community
increased the potential for a positive reception to the information communicated during the bond campaign, Borden remarked, “People have always had a good perception of our college and I think that reinforced it. And I think that was certainly a part of the success in this county of the bond effort.”

The selection process for the president itself was not extraordinary. Most colleges include the community in many activities in the process of selecting a new president. However, the ECC board of trustees decided to include local citizens, in addition to community leaders, as part of this selection process. The board also specifically searched for someone to build relationships with the community. Borden, the chairman of the ECC board of trustees described this more comprehensive community involvement and the result:

The process we used in recruiting that president took place over about a year or six months, and we were really proud of that... We made a big point to include the public, in trying to get input as to what they felt the community college should be doing for this community... We wanted a president who would strengthen and develop good ties in our community. We felt that could be improved upon. And we got that with the man we hired.

In April 2000, local selection of the finalist for the president of ECC was made and in May the State Board of Community Colleges issued their approval of the new president for ECC. During the press release announcing the approval, the State Board of Community Colleges also announced the upcoming the Higher
Education Facilities Bond Referendum. The public announcement set the stage for entry of the new president into the bond referendum campaign.

*Local Bond Campaign*

Andrews assumed the office of president at ECC in July of 2000. One of his first tasks in the position was to assume the key leadership role for the local bond campaign.

It really gave me a chance to get a feel of the community really fast...

It was going great guns before I came in July and that vote was coming in November, so it was pretty important to utilize that time very effectively.... The immediate thing that I was faced with was how we wanted to champion the cause.... And we had to decide how we would convince people that that was a worthwhile project.

As one of his first actions to respond to the bond referendum, Andrews met with Gardner, the executive director of the ECC foundation. The executive director was an important player because he had many contacts in the county. The two of them created the strategic groundwork for the local campaign. Gardner explained how they approached the campaign:

We had the vision to make it successful. We never thought it would not pass. At all times that was positive, to approach it from that standpoint. There was a real grassroots effort. The reason we were successful locally is because of the long standing we have in the community. We made a gesture to include all the people. We acted
as if there were no naysayers and just took the high road and never let it get off course from that standpoint.

With two months to accomplish this mission, one key strategy was to designate key activities for local involvement by members of the community who had affiliations with the universities and by students of the college. The other local strategy targeted the offering of a public forum at the college. Prominent leaders of the university and community college systems and prominent leaders in the community were invited to participate on the forum panel. Further, the public forum was broadcast over the public access channel run by the college.

*The Local Bond Committee*

Due to time constraints, the foundation director was charged with identifying the initial group of community leaders who would lend their name and time to promote passage of the bond referendum. In an effort to share the work in the local community, the state-level bond committee suggested creating local committees consisting of community leaders. Emerson County followed this suggestion, creating what study participants referred to as the “loose-knit committee.”

The president and foundation director used three criteria for selection of members for the local bond committee. They specifically targeted assistance from local individuals who were strong supporters of the universities. The selection of these individuals accomplished two distinct goals. First, it emphasized the connections between the universities and the community college. These
affiliations enabled the campaign committee to use these individuals as spokespersons for the newly created alliance between the universities and the community colleges on the bond referendum campaign. Second, the individuals selected were prominent, respected members of various local businesses, civic organizations and governmental agencies. Masterson described the individuals who comprised the committee in slightly different terms: “They were people who touched many people and had shown previous civic commitment. The fact that they had high civic profiles was primary and their jobs were secondary. They had a history of putting out beyond work, as in civic involvement.”

After considering the individual committee members’ university affiliation, the next focus was on individuals who could influence the rural voters. As Gardner said, “...rural voters are the ones that you have to impress to get them to vote positively...The word ‘bond’ scares them.” Emerson County at the time of the bond referendum was a predominantly rural county and covered a large area. The committee determined that the rural voters had to be assured that this funding would not affect their property tax rates, and that the local government would listen to the leaders in the county’s farming community. Wilson emphasized this point by saying, “In a county that has large farm owners, a direct property tax increase has the potential of putting them out of business, due to the margin some farmers are operating. So, they’re not going to vote for something that they think will do that.”

The newly established committee was comprised of members of private businesses, corporations, civic organizations, and local government. That initial
group numbered approximately ten community leaders. In attendance were the
director of the Emerson Chamber of Commerce, a local business owner, the city
manager, a public school superintendent, a county commissioner, the director of
the county cooperative extension program, and several college representatives.

The newly formed committee met at a local restaurant to devise a plan of
action. As the first order of business, the group readily agreed upon one common
goal: the passage of the bonds for the good of the students and the community as
a whole. Wilson recalled the meeting as a brainstorming session. The
brainstorming focused on what resources were available among the group and a
way that these identified resources could be pooled to advocate and gain a
majority support for the referendum. According to Wilson, “It seemed to be ‘this is
what we need. How can we work together to get there? And what kind of input do
you have that will help us achieve a positive outcome?’ Not so much ‘this is what I
want you to do.’” This individual saw this group as empowered to act to achieve a
common goal, rather than completing stated directives and maintaining separate
interests.

*Bond Campaign Strategies*

A primary strategy for the state and local bond campaigns was to involve a
large, diverse group of community leaders to communicate and educate the most
diverse group of citizens possible. Numerous traditional marketing and political
campaign tactics were used to present the messages in as many different forms
and in as many different media as possible. Mailing lists were accumulated from
many of the committee members for contacting voters across the county. One such mailing was used for the invitation to the public forum that was held at the ECC campus. As part of the campaign, local leaders of the campaign met with community groups and individuals to personally tell the story and educate the citizens. The college president and foundation director developed a presentation package, visiting civic clubs, city and county governments, and other community organizations. Gardner believed that, “It was real important that [groups in the community] not feel like they were excluded in any way.” As an outcome of these presentations, many organizations adopted resolutions in support of the bond referendum. For example, the president made a presentation to a meeting of the county commissioners who, in turn, adopted a resolution supporting the bonds.

In addition to the aforementioned campaign strategies, the local campaign effort capitalized on local media coverage to supplement the statewide media sources. Andrews stated that the college did not buy any advertising during the campaign, but the local newspaper ran numerous articles discussing the bonds. The college itself ran public service announcements on their public access television channel.

According to Masterson, community leaders offered “voice support” through radio interviews, encouraging people to vote for the bonds. He stated, “In a small community, when people hear it on the radio, it’s the truth.” He felt that it was the same as if he had gone to talk to people personally. Business owners who were interviewed for this study also recalled discussing the bonds with customers during
their daily interactions in the stores, all in an effort to educate the public at large. Wilson, as executive director of the Chamber of Commerce, recollected that her main input was her connection to the businesses. “We gave them our list of members so that, together, we could send out information to the general community.” The chamber also worked closely with the Small Business Center of the community college. Some employees of the college served as Chamber ambassadors at ribbon cuttings and Chamber events known as “Business After Hours.” From her perspective, Wilson believed, “It’s a win-win situation.” Through the inclusion of the community college in Chamber events, campaign committee members gained more access and exposure within the community, especially among prominent, influential community leaders. Wilson explained this influence by saying, “When a group of prominent business people support something and then they tell their circle of friends,...that moves within the community, more than it would, say, in a city the size of Raleigh.”

As college and community leaders reflected on the strategies and activities of the bond campaign, two key messages were identified. Masterson stressed that the first strategic message was to make the issue personal and local- -“You have to touch the heart and emotions.” The philosophy for the bond campaign was to get both people involved with the educational institutions and to get the families of the community involved and committed to bond passage. Using himself as an example, Masterson, a dedicated alumnus of UNC-Chapel Hill, explained, “tax payer money and people had paid the price” for him to benefit from educational
opportunities, and he wanted to “continue the tradition.” He saw the HEFB as “a way to work for the university” by “supporting the bond campaign in the community.” Prior to the bond campaign, he had very little contact with the community college. After working on the bond campaign, he became much more active in the life of the community college. The committee’s values and messages met with positive comments from the community, such as “we did it for the kids” and “the story was told how it would touch the lives of individuals.”

The second key message used to “sell” the bonds to the voters was the message of “no tax increase.” The state treasurer stated early in the campaign that the state could take on more debt from the sale of the bonds and would not have to incur more taxes. Strickland interpreted the community’s response as a direct acknowledgement of this message: “I think most people simply heard, ‘it’s money for the schools’ and these people I respect say it will not cost us any tax money. Therefore, they voted for it.” However, several other study participants suggested that there was an opposing side. These individuals had historically opposed bond issues in the county. Borden explained it as:

You’ve got more people with fewer resources living in these [rural] counties and a greater demand for food stamps and the Medicaid program...but your tax base is smaller and there’s the dilemma. These counties don’t have the monies to do what they have to do...We don’t have much industry here. We’ve got an increasing
population, but our people are working in places outside the county.

So, the tax base is not here to keep up with those demands.”

Wilson clearly also pointed out that because younger people were moving to more urban areas to work, the rural population was aging. When funding is based on property tax, “it puts an undue burden on those who go to the polls and vote.”

Despite this support for the bond referendum from the “no new taxes” perspective, several sources remarked that community college facilities were the responsibility of the local government to maintain. Eventually taxes might have to be raised in order to keep up with the maintenance of new buildings. Any future increase in property taxes would not appear to the citizens to be tied directly to the financing of the bonds.

For two intensive months, the local campaign committee used a variety of strategies, resources, and media to reach all corners of Emerson County. Using resources developed locally, in addition to resources developed by the state committee, committee members provided information on the local needs and local benefits of the potential bond funding. The messages of “do it for the children” and “no new taxes” encouraged the citizens of Emerson County to vote positively on the bond referendum.

*Student Involvement*

In addition to involving respected community spokespeople, Andrews stressed that student involvement was also important in the bond campaign. College administration held several meetings for students providing key
information and facts to students who would advocate for the bonds. This strategy could be questioned by outside observers, however community college leadership knew that community college students were not what most people think of as traditional students--young adults straight out of high school who may or may not be working a part-time job while attending classes. Rather, most ECC community college students were active citizens and taxpayers in the local community. Many of the ECC community college students were adults who had returned to school after some period of employment. A majority of them had family responsibilities and were ‘going to classes’ while juggling other life responsibilities. Some already had college degrees and needed to retool their skills for promotion or for career changes. Others may have been completing their high school coursework for similar reasons as their community college peer group. Therefore, student involvement in the bond campaign was key. These students were able to speak more personally and passionately to fellow citizens about the need for bond funding, than could the administration and college employees.

Several of the interviewees of this study remembered ECC student involvement primarily during the public forum and luncheon. In addition, Strickland and Borden both discussed an attempt to use alumni of the college or, in Strickland’s words, the “historical student body.” He made the distinction because “not all the students graduate, therefore they cannot be called alumni.” Borden agreed with this assessment, referred to graduates of the college as “latent supporters,” and expanded on the thought:
As they go and get jobs and think back on the school’s impact on their career, they would be much more positive and that will probably grow through the years. The college is making an attempt to start an alumni association in order to be able to tap that resource in the future, for things like bonds and things like that.

Unger, as one of the local bond campaign committee members, also thought student involvement was one reason that the bonds passed in the county.

Local Public Forum

At the initial planning meeting between ECC president Andrews and the executive director of the ECC foundation, one strategy they decided to use was to offer a public forum at the college. In mid-September, this forum was held at the college in their 200-seat auditorium. It was broadcast over the public access channel, which is used to broadcast college-offered courses and programs to the community.

On the day of the forum, attendance was “standing room only.” Prominent individuals who participated in the forum were Molly Corbett Broad, president of the UNC System; Martin Lancaster, president of the NCCCS; James Leutze, chancellor of UNC in Wilmington; Willis B. McLeod, chancellor of Fayetteville State University; and Lauch Faircloth, former United States Senator from the region. Andrews hosted and moderated the panel. Each member of the six-member panel was given ten minutes to speak, presenting the potential uses and benefits of the bond funds. As an added incentive to vote for the bonds, each member presented
the perceived benefits that the region and the state would gain with the passage of the referendum. At the conclusion of the final presentation, the session was opened for questions from the public. Andrews complimented each speaker on the presentation of all benefits and the minimal burden on the taxpayers. In the later interview regarding this major local event, Andrews shared, “There were a lot of townspeople who came. There was a broad spectrum of people from the community at the forum.”

All involved in the forum seemed surprised and impressed that Molly Corbett Broad, president of the UNC system, attended and presented at the forum. Most felt somewhat humbled that someone of her stature would attend an event in their small community. Even community members who were not present at the public forum recognized the fact that some “heavy hitters” had come to their rural community, and that people in the community had gained “exposure to these influentials.” As Andrews said, “people were impressed that [Broad] took the time to come and [the panel members] all gave very convincing arguments. They were very influential in gaining people’s support from the positions they took.”

Many were impressed that Broad spent time before the forum meeting with students and referred to these conversations several times during her presentation. Following the public forum, a luncheon was held, providing local government officials, community leaders, and students the opportunity to interact with the forum speakers. When discussing the forum, Gardner commented, “Because the local leaders had an opportunity for one-on-one contact with the
dignitaries, they became very strong advocates in making sure that the university and community colleges Higher Ed bonds passed.”

*Regional Bus Tour*

After the public forum held at ECC, the next major opportunity to publicize the bond referendum was referred to as the regional bus media tour. According to Andrews, upon Dr. Leutze’s return to UNC-Wilmington after the public forum, UNC-Wilmington representatives organized this tour. At each stop, Dr. Leutze and the local representatives made introductions and short presentations about the upcoming vote to decide the bond referendum. Andrews was very excited to be able to participate in the two-day, twelve-stop media blitz. He felt that riding the bus permitted him to visit with other community college presidents in the region, and the tour gave him an excellent opportunity to visit neighboring colleges. He also expressed disappointment that only community college people were at those meetings with the media tour visit. This limited representation was very different from the public forum on his campus, which drew such strong community participation. The final stop on the tour was Cape Fear Community College in Wilmington. With its close proximity to the University of North Carolina at Wilmington, there was an excellent turnout, and unlike elsewhere, there was a strong response from the community as a whole.

On November 7, 2000 federal and state elections were held with the inclusion of the bond referendum. The 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bonds passed by 74% in Emerson County. College leaders and campaign committee
members expressed surprise that the bonds passed by such a wide margin of support. Based on the past failures of bond referendums in the community, many speculated that this success was due in large part to the lack of impact on property taxes. There was also a belief shared by many that the community valued higher education. Even for members of the community who had not been involved with the university system, many suggested that these individuals voted for the bonds knowing that “their community college” would benefit.

Using the Bond Funding

The success of the local bond referendum advocacy effort served as a catalyst for a new collaborative effort in the design of a new building on ECC campus. While the bond campaign committee worked as a collaborative group to implement key campaign strategies of the state committee and leaders, college and community members instigated a new set of collaborative activities in the planning and design of the building. Almost all study participants echoed Gardner’s sentiment: “You can’t talk about the bond referendum without talking about the building or the capital campaign to raise the money to build the building we want, not what the bond referendum will allow.”

After the 2000 HEFB referendum passed statewide in all 100 counties with an average of 73%, the community college system office began the task of assigning priorities to renovation and construction projects. The first funds from the bond issuance were available to some colleges in May 2001. Funds were allocated by an accumulation system. As described by ECC president Andrews:
“We earned our money in increments, so much each month... And we had to wait until we’d accumulated enough money from those resources to start the project.”

ECC began receiving funding for repairs and renovations in May 2003. First priority attended to were certain repair projects that needed immediate attention. For instance, the college made the proper renovations on campus for handicap accessibility requirements. Another important repair project was the complete replacement of one of the older heating and ventilation systems on campus. Once those most immediate repair and renovation needs were met, new construction funds were made available to the college in the spring of 2004. The second priority for action targeted construction of a new building on the ECC campus.

*Planning a New Building*

The planning process for the new building reinforces the theme of community college and community collaboration. Simultaneous with the selection process of the new president and preparation for the bond referendum, the board of trustees decided to use the bond funding to construct a vocational education building. A great deal of time and thought was invested on the purpose of the new building as part of campus facilities master planning. Members of the board, as well as the new president, expressed the desire to balance the vocational training needs of the community with the needs already being met by both the college transfer program and the business and health training at the college. Borden considered this building a move by ECC to “get back to our roots of providing
vocational technical education.” Andrews summed this sentiment up by saying, “We’re a rural county. People need jobs. Many of them don’t go on to college, and we’re trying to respond to that need as well.” Continuing along this same line, Gardner added, “We will always have a demand for the blue-collar workers..., as well as the white-collar workers. So, vocational education is real, real important.”

The vocational curriculum programs offered at the ECC represented “clusters” of industries in the county and region. The animal science programs were recognized as exemplary across the state. As with many counties in this rural region in the state, the livestock industry, consisting primarily of poultry and swine production, was the major industry in Emerson County. Other curriculum programs consisted of the horticulture program, representing the plant production industry, and programs in the industrial systems technology department, based on the maintenance and repair of equipment in the large manufacturing plants of the area.

As part of the discussion, Andrews suggested the college reintroduce the building trades programs. The building trades programs trained workers in carpentry skills, electrical wiring, heating and air conditioning, and welding skills. Justifying the use of bond funding for this purpose, he noted, “we continue to hear from the region that there are absolutely no trained craft people in those construction trades.” He believed by planning the building for vocational education the college could be more responsive to business and industry’s need for workers.
In the master planning, one key point of discussion was the specific geographic placement of this building on campus. College leaders felt that the new building should be located in the center of campus. This key placement on campus reflected the renewed belief that vocational education was central to the mission of a community college located in a rural community. By offering training in the skills needed for the construction, manufacturing, and agricultural industries, the college would provide trained workers for the current and future employers in the county. College leaders believed that a trained workforce encouraged economic development in the rural county.

In addition, locating the new building dedicated to vocational education in the heart of campus was unusual and reflected a serious commitment to vocational education. Most vocational training programs offer training in using and repairing large and noisy equipment, sometimes use malodorous processes, or have training activities that need to occur outside. Most buildings and training areas designed for vocational programs at community colleges are relegated to distant sites away from the main areas of campus.

The only reasonable way to respond to their desire to centrally locate the building was to combine new construction with an existing building. Planning to build an addition on to an existing building served four important purposes. First, by combining renovation funds with construction funds, a façade could be added to improve the cosmetic look of a campus eyesore. The existing building that was identified for renovations and addition was visible from the highway and according
to Daniels, it was long, flat, and “frankly ugly.” Second, the existing building had once housed an automotive department, and included large bay areas with roll-up doors, which were seemingly unsuitable for most educational purposes, but would still work with the building’s planned purpose. Third, by renovating the unusable spaces in conjunction with the construction of new space, nine new classrooms would be gained, providing additional space during a time of increased enrollment. Fourth, by combining renovations with new construction, the college was able to leverage funds for double the amount of space.

Past history at ECC had left beliefs that funding provided by the state for new building construction was always inadequate to meet the needs by users of the building. Many participants in the study, when discussing renovation and construction plans, mentioned the belief that community colleges seemed to get only enough funding for “building half buildings.” Gardner explained this in more depth, drawing attention to the frustration:

We’ve been down that road too many times where we’ve had enough state funds to build a building halfway... When Andrews came on the scene, we told him the whole tale of woe, of how we had always had half buildings or how buildings never reached our expectations for the needs that we foresee for this college and for the future. So we approached the building with that dream and a vision to start with.
Therefore, the president and key college and community leaders considered a more visionary perspective for this new construction. As Andrews shared, “The goal for this building was to build it the way it ought to be built.”

*Initiating a Different Approach*

In keeping with this vision, Andrews took a different approach to the building design process than ECC administrators had used in the past. A long-time department chair compared this different approach to the past design processes: “Normally, the administrators of the college get together and talk to the architects and a building emerges...all of a sudden, a plan pops up on an easel somewhere. And the departments who were going into the building had nothing to do with the designs.” The president indicated that this approach was ineffective when building buildings. “Time after time, I’ve seen people move into a building and say, ‘Well, this is not what we needed.’” According to Andrews, for this building, the plan was “to get input on the front end.”

For the planning of the new building, the president invited the deans and department chairs from the program areas that potentially would be housed in the building to meet. At the meeting, he started a conversation suggesting the new building was an opportunity to provide state-of-the-art training in state-of-the-art facilities. Andrews presented the vision for the project, with which the college personnel wholeheartedly agreed. That vision was to meet 100% of the expectations for training needed by employers in the county. In opening the dialogue with college personnel, he modeled a collaborative style of leadership,
took suggestions that members of the business and industry community could provide valuable input into the design, and set a vision for the project based on expectations instead of funding availability. According to Madison, the president “set the tone of the whole thing in that first meeting.”

Each department chair and dean identified a list of potential candidates to be invited to participate in planning the vocational building. These potential participants were drawn from lists of current advisory committee members, as well as contact lists of local business leaders in the industries that would be represented in the new building. At ECC, each curriculum program had an associated group of business and community leaders who used their experience and interest to help the college. The advisory committee, as it is called, provided information and feedback to assist the college in keeping its training programs current on the latest trends, standards, and training needs. Local business leaders are actively recruited to serve on the advisory committees for the curriculum programs. For example, the owner of the local garden center may be asked to serve on the horticulture advisory committee, or an upper level manager at one of the pork processing plants may be asked to serve on the swine production advisory committee.

In addition to the list compiled by the department chair and dean, the foundation director also developed a list of the chief executive officers of businesses in the relevant industries. Once this list of potential participants was compiled, an invitation was sent to each of these representatives for each program
area to attend a luncheon to learn about the vision for this proposed state-of-the-art building for vocational education. In addition to those in industry who would directly benefit from the employee training, board of trustee members and department chairs were also invited to participate.

At the luncheon, the construction project was described and the president encouraged input from business and industry. Gardner described the overall message of the meeting when he said, “We told them about our dream and what we wanted to have happen.” Madison noted that there was an energy that transferred to everyone involved. This energy remained throughout the design process of the building, regardless of any struggles or challenges that arose. All community members present were asked to participate. Many of the county business executives went back to their companies and assigned representatives to participate in the collaborative process. Generally, the individuals chosen were involved directly in managing employees and knew what skills the companies needed in trained employees. According to Gardner, the designated representatives of the executives were “trusted one hundred percent and could share the vision. They had to know the CEO well enough to speak for him and design the building.”

*The Collaborative Building Design Process*

To start the design process, five work groups were formed. These work groups represented the clusters of industries found in the county--animal sciences, plant sciences, manufacturing, building trades, and a fifth group explored future
program expansion. These work groups were composed of representatives from the appropriate industries, college employees, and the college board of trustees. Trustees were matched with the group according to their interests and expertise. For example, one trustee worked in the construction industry; therefore, he served on the building trades subcommittee.

The work groups each chose their own chairperson, then decided what group processes would facilitate meeting the goals that they had determined for their area. According to college leaders, college employees were told to avoid taking leadership roles for the group at the meetings. Daniels discussed this decision by saying, “Each department head was advised not to be the chairmen of the committee, to appoint or have the committee or task force actually vote upon and name a head or chairman who is a layperson and that person would be in charge of the meetings.” Andrews continued by saying, “The instructors served as resource people, but the meeting was actually chaired by somebody from business and industry.” The faculty members were to serve more in the role of group scribe at the group meetings, reporting the group’s progress to the college administration at the end of each meeting. Andrews explained his rationale behind establishing these criteria for each group: “I was afraid that it would look like those committees were just a rubber stamp kind of thing. But I wanted [community representatives] to be the ones to generate the ideas.”

Each work group was asked to consider the following question: “If you were going into a new building and you were going to have everything you wanted as
far as what it takes to deliver the program, what would you ask for?” Andrews offered another version, “Help us design laboratory space in a manner that would cause our training program to prepare people to be ready to work in that industry.” Each group member recognized that designing a laboratory space for vocational programs had to balance the need to train in a realistic work environment for the students, all the while meeting and exceeding the educational needs of the training.

Each work group set their own goals, decided their own tasks, and determined the number of meetings required to accomplish the task. For example, one work group, in an effort to minimize disappointment, decided early to “go for the gusto.” Madison explained the reasoning behind this decision, “We would design it to the maximum and, that way, if it was cut back, we would still be satisfied with the area that we would end up with.” As part of the process, some groups held meetings on campus. Several of the groups visited other colleges to observe different facilities. Some groups met once or twice; others met every week so they “wouldn’t run out time,” according to Madison. All work groups had two months for their information collection, discussion, and report completion.

All four program-based groups developed design drawings for their respective areas within the building. These drawings went beyond the initial list of suggested elements they would like to see incorporated into the design. Each group came up with the similar response--they literally drew a blueprint of how the laboratory space should look when completed--to include with their report.
Although each group used the resources and talents of the individual members, each group approached the process differently. One group discussed, in one or two meetings, the wants and needs for the area; then, the instructor, who had experience in computer-aided design, developed the drawings. Another group worked on specific areas each time they met. At the end of each meeting, all of the notes from the meeting were compiled to create a sketch of the area. A representative from the industry who had experience in architectural drawing took the sketches and used the company design department resources to develop the drawings. The drawings were then brought back to the next meeting for review and revision. Then the process would either begin again, or the group would move on to the next section. The other two groups used variations of these two processes.

At the end of the two months, all groups met together again to present their reports to the administration and to present their specific suggestions to the architects. Madison described the presentations, and some of the suggestions, as follows:

Different groups did it in different ways. We did it using overheads and using our drawings to present ours, and everybody played a part in this presentation to the architects. Other groups had videos. The welding department did a video on what they wanted. They went out to other schools and ...showed the areas that are lacking in some of the technology that they need, on the video. Another group did a
PowerPoint presentation of what they wanted and they had a guest speaker to come in on the health part of animal science, on the bio-safety, I guess you would say. They had to have a secure area when they brought an animal in, to make sure that if there is some type of disease or anything with that animal it does not spread, because they're working with people that are going to go back to farms. And they have to have bio-security that they're not going to bring something back. So they had an expert in that area to come in and talk. Every area, you know, did it a little bit different and it made for really an interesting night for everybody when it was all over.

Most of the more novel solutions were credited to the industry representatives of each group. Andrews told the story of another unique suggestion that came from the groups' work:

Another example would be the building trades program. That group of people told us that they thought the most ideal thing to do would be to construct a house inside the building. And we thought that pretty novel. We don’t know of another building trades program that’s doing that. We were pretty much interested in that because if we built the house, say on location, you have to be concerned about lost time during bad weather for instruction. For example, if you had intended to go out and work on the roof of that house and it poured down rain all day long, you wouldn’t be able to do that. And yet the instructor’s
obligated to meet so many hours of instruction time. Well, by building it inside the building, we have some control over environmental conditions and they don’t lose any down time. So whatever that instructor’s teaching that day, he’s able to go ahead and do that without any interference of outside elements. There’s space all the way around the perimeter of that house for equipment and so forth, whatever they need to do. And then once the house is completed, we’ll lift the house up, we’ll open these overhead doors, and the house will be rolled out and taken to the final location. Yeah, we think that’s pretty novel.

This decision to construct a building inside a building was unique. To make the proposed solution more compelling, a second suggestion was made: construct two houses, at the same time—one inside and one outside—and no time would be lost due to adverse weather conditions.

Because the architects hired to complete the resulting design were present during the presentations, these work groups felt the design process represented a joint effort between the architects and the building users of both the college and the community. Daniels suggested that it appeared this process supported the architects working with the local industries to “bring the space together into a useable, workable educational facility that would train people to meet the needs of the community.” For Daniels, the college then became a “benign catalyst” that joined together local industry with the architects. Andrews, Daniels, and Madison
felt that the architects were receptive to input from the faculty, as well as industry personnel. The architects even requested the blueprints and drawings that each work group developed and presented. In fact, the architects returned to eventually work with faculty members on details of the final design.

After the main presentations, the chair of each work group turned in written reports and a resource notebook to the architects. The resource notebook was extremely detailed, as suggested by Andrews:

In that book was a page that talked about every single room in that building—what its computer capabilities ought to be, what its electrical requirements were, of what the square footage space was and what the finish of the walls should be. So, we literally described every room in the building. And we passed that book on to the architects and said, ‘here’s what people who are leaders in the industry say we need.’

The architects, over the next six month period, took the information provided by each group and created a single design, noting additional questions and estimates of cost. A meeting was held of all the work groups with the architects to answer questions, review the architects’ design draft, and make suggestions for revision. Daniels remarked that the architects had included everything that was requested. He said, “It represented the ideal horticulture department. The animal science people could have their corral; and the building trades had their two-story area to actually construct a building within a building.”
Addressing Additional Funding Needs

It became evident early in the process of completing the design for the building and related renovations that meeting expectations would cost more than the funds available from the bonds. The architects’ full design was needed to estimate the additional funding needed. The estimate for the building, built to meet the training needs expressed by the industry, came to approximately $5 million, $3.1 million of which would be provided by bond funds. In order to raise the remaining $1.9 million needed to construct the proposed building, additional local and federal sources of funding were pursued. Andrews, Gardner, and the college foundation began a capital campaign to solicit the remaining funds from local sources. The president first approached the industries that would directly benefit from the training programs housed in the new building. He also met with community leaders. By October 2003, $800,000 had been raised from the local economy. This amount was exceptional in a county with few large industries.

Although the collaborative college-community design process took more time, it was believed to have benefited the college. This collaboration created the goodwill to secure additional funding support. Daniels expressed the concern that “a certain amount of building ability was lost each month, when you’re waiting for all this design work and all these decisions to be made and permits to be gathered in the process.” However he noted that the monetary support from the local businesses had garnered almost the complete sum of funds lost in the time gap. Andrews also estimated that construction had fallen one year behind because the
college went into the community to raise the final funding needed, but “it was worth the wait because we'll really be getting the ideal building.” Because of their involvement in the design process and, according to Andrews, because it was believed that the college showed that they had listened to what was said, the local businesses were more willing to contribute. Furthermore, in addition to the monies raised from local businesses, Andrews approached the county commissioners and they pledged $300,000 from county funds. With this pledge, the funds raised locally totaled $1.1 million.

Another source of funds pursued by the college was a federal Department of Agriculture grant. This grant proposal described the new facilities as an employment-training center for the county. In seeking the grant, Andrews noted:

We decided that we would write a grant to the US Department of Agriculture. We convinced them that the livestock and poultry industry was a significant part of the economy here and so we really needed to focus attention on helping that industry as much as we could. We wrote the proposal. We had letters from business and industry that said that we could create close to two thousand jobs if we had that training facility. That's probably the most convincing part of the argument for the funding of that proposal. We originally asked for 1.1 million dollars. I was discouraged from turning it in at that level, because they said they’d never known one to be funded at that level. So I cut it back to $875,000. And we received full funding of
$875,000. The approval of the grant was credited to the letters of commitment from the businesses, especially those involved in the planning of the building and to the assistance of one United States Senator for the state.

By late fall 2003, the atmosphere at ECC was one of exuberance and expectation. The college had received notification that the grant had been approved. With the $875,000 in grant funding, the $800,000 raised from local businesses and the community, the $300,000 provided by the county commissioners, in addition to the $3.1 million from the 2000 bonds, the funding goal for the new building had been met. The final funding for the building resulted from a combination sources, coming from private businesses, as well as local, state, and federal government. Believing there was enough money in hand to proceed with construction, bids for the primary design and several alternate plans for the new addition to the campus were requested. The anticipated start date for construction was spring 2004.

**Strengthening and Forging Relationships**

There is more to the story than just the collaboration for the local bond campaign and the collaborative design process for the building. Additional significant partnerships and relationships were built from the connections made during these two main activities. Study participants recalled that they used their ongoing networks to build new relationships. People they had known brought them in contact with new people through projects and activities. In turn, the new
relationships became the basis for new partnerships and new organizational collaborations.

After the successful collaborations that took place during and after the bond campaign referendum, the college and community were willing to co-participate in more ambitious and creative projects. A number of new educational alliances were formed in order to meet goals identified during the bond campaign. One example was the identification of new ways for the high schools and the community college to collaborate. Borden proudly described one successful partnership to share teaching resources that developed because public school leaders were involved with the HEFB campaign:

We have a collaborative group that consists of [public] school system representatives and our school [college] trying to develop a joint use of some of these facilities for everybody... We will use some of these facilities and jointly fund them, as far as teaching, with this community college and the public schools.

Individual high schools in the county did not have enough students enrolled in the various trade classes to justify the facilities and teachers at each high school, therefore many trade programs closed. The new building on the college campus was designed to meet the needs for vocational training in the county. In an agreement developed with the community college, a few students from each high school would converge on the community college and, in total, make up an adequate sized class for required resource investment. Thus, partnering in
education met the needs voiced by the community for training in certain career fields without straining the resources and good will of the local taxpayers and local government.

So that’s a great concept but getting it put together and who’s gonna fund it--it’s almost mind boggling. We’ve been working for a couple of years on trying to make this opportunity a reality. So that’s one of the goals we had and there again we’re bringing in all the school systems and letting them use our facilities and maybe have some benefit from this bond referendum. (Borden)

Building upon the collaboration begun by the state community college system leaders and the state university leaders, several educational partnerships between nearby universities and the college formed from the connections made during the local bond campaign. ECC and the regional universities developed several local articulation agreements. These local articulation agreements increased educational opportunities for students to matriculate into a bachelor’s degree program, while taking most of their courses at the local community college. Borden gave an account of one example of this new collaboration between ECC and a regional university:

We now have several programs, for example, with Fayetteville State University in Fayetteville. Students can come here and get a bachelor’s degree in elementary education at our campus and do that by basically having seven semesters here in this county and
only one over there. Those types of collaborative agreements have sprung up since then and we hope to build on that. I think you’re going to see more and more cooperation.

In addition to new partnerships between educational institutions, many study participants recognized benefits from active participation by community members in both the bond referendum campaign and the design of the building. Gardner articulated benefits that occurred from these “significant partnerships” as:

The major industries in this county were very involved in [the design and funding of the building]. Not only did they come and have input into the building, they saw our institution. They had hands-on experience with the instructors. They had an opportunity to really glance what the community college system is all about.

This increased involvement by many of the community members was perceived as a beneficial switch from the traditional advisory roles that many community members take on a community college campus. More significant inclusion of input led industry participants to feel their time and energy were appreciated. Daniels described how this perception would benefit the college:

When the building is finished, I really think that the local people would feel that they have a stake in it and will become involved in the college more. It just bonded the committees, and industries and the employers to the college in a very meaningful way.
In the very practical words of Andrews, “If people have input on the front end, then they are a part of that decision making. If it doesn’t work out right, then they share part of the responsibility for it not working out right.” In other words, because community members took ownership of the process and result, they were more willing to make sure the goal was met.

As individuals participated in positive collaborations, they described benefits to their own work and relationships. As individuals become more comfortable with the concepts and applications of collaboration, they were willing to apply collaborative constructs in areas that had not been as collaborative in nature. While discussing the trend of poor attendance at curriculum advisory committee meetings, Madison gave an excellent example of what he learned from participating in the collaborative process of designing the new building:

I learned a lot from [the building design collaboration] because I’m new as an instructor. I found out that one of the things to have at an advisory committee is to have a good agenda. If you’re going to come; we’re going to feed you a little bit; we’re going to sit around and just talk a little bit - my life is too busy for that. And if I want to sit around and talk to somebody, I want to sit around and talk to friends and associates. You know, make a social function. And so it taught me to have a good agenda and let them know ahead of time. Just don’t invite them, but have the agenda with the invite, so that they know what we’re going to be doing and that way they can say ‘ok, we
are going to accomplish something.' Have a purpose for them to come.

Because the building design process included more members of the business community than just those already serving on advisory committees, the college added several new advisors who were enthusiastic about the training programs the college offered.

The same enthusiasm for the college was observed from members of the local bond committee. As participants became more involved with activities for the community college, they began to understand the college better and the benefits to the community. They became more willing to work on behalf of the college and become more involved with future endeavors. Masterson served as an excellent example of this increased involvement. He started the bond campaign as a member of Gardner’s network through past bond efforts for the public schools in the county. Although he and his family are active alumni of UNC-Chapel Hill, he had never actively participated in local community college activities. Since his involvement with the bond campaign he has participated in receptions and some foundation work for the college. As an acknowledged business leader in the community, his support of the community college has been a strong endorsement for the college in the community.

Chapter Summary

The timeline of the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond referendum, detailing conversations that created collaborative measures on a variety of fronts
was presented in this chapter. The collaborations ranged in breadth from those involving state-system-wide partnerships to those involving institutional and individual relationships. Many participants in this study described the collaboration between the University of North Carolina System and the North Carolina Community College System as the first cooperative measure on an important issue between the two entities. The inclusion of the North Carolina Citizens for Business and Industry validated the interdependence between higher education and the economic health of the state. Numerous regional and local partnerships have been forged following the opportunities afforded the universities, community colleges and state-wide businesses throughout the bond campaign.

Members of the local community college, and community as a whole, had multiple opportunities to take part in and recognize the benefits of collaboration as a tool and ideology. From initial participation in the legislative process, to the local bond campaign, to the building design process, citizens and community college staff alike had the opportunity to experience first-hand the positive aspects of using collaboration as a negotiation tool. The use of collaboration in the bond campaign as a tactic for promotion of the bond dramatically increased the number of respected individuals that could influence the voting public, as well as advocate for the passage of the bonds. By using a collaborative method in the earliest planning phases of the building design process, the president initiated a procedure that laid the groundwork for involvement by diverse, creative perspectives.
Once the members of the community believed their input was an integral part of the building design process, they became more willing to support the final design financially. Throughout this process, it was discovered that as individuals have increased opportunities to participate in positive collaborative efforts that result in positive relationships and the meeting of goals, they each learn the skills necessary to be better collaborative participants. Further, once they learn the skills necessary, they come to expect more issues and problems to be addressed and resolved through collaborative means. As an attitude of collaboration permeates institutions, individuals both expect and anticipate participating fully in the decision-making process. With this anticipation comes the desire for participation in group processes, including the authority and responsibility for accomplishing the goals established and set forth by the group. New collaborative efforts build upon previous relationships and processes that were believed to be successful.
CHAPTER 5
Discussion and Implications

Introduction

Interorganizational collaboration is changing the way the world works (Komives, 2000). Educational institutions, businesses, nonprofit organizations, and even governments are all becoming more involved in new forms of collective actions (McGrath, 1998). In so doing, they are beginning to realign from traditional, hierarchical organizational structures to more network-based and less competitive forms (Komives, 2000). Community colleges, in particular, have developed partnerships with public schools and have developed articulation agreements with universities. They have also found it advantageous to work with groups and organizations in the community to provide benefits for both the college and the community. In each case, the organizations have seen the benefits of working together (McGrath, 1998).

Community colleges have a long history of collaborating with other organizations, groups, and individuals in their communities (Gleazer, 1980). Collaboration has been defined as an interactive process of shared decision-making among stakeholders who share responsibility, authority, and accountability for solving a mutual issue or problem (Komives, 2000; Wood & Gray, 1991; Yukl, 2002). There is a veritable mythology of anecdotal evidence for successful collaborations that have occurred over the years. Much of the literature regarding collaboration between community college and the community records examples of
best practices and stories of successful collaborative efforts. For example, Roeuche, Taber, and Roueche (1995); Barnett (1995); McGrath (1998); and Boone, Pettitt, and Weisman (1998) all compile reports about successful collaborative efforts across the country. These examples of collaboration span the range from articulation agreements with university systems and coordination with public school systems to community economic development, customized job training, one-stop employment centers, and other community service activities. All these authors and editors agree that collaborations are important to the effective workings of a community college, but none attempt to explain the collaborations from a theoretical understanding. These previous written discussions have the stated purpose of providing examples and models to aid organizers in the formation of other collaborations. But there are very limited theoretical understandings of collaboration between the community college and its community to guide the framing and strategies for interagency collaboration.

While the theoretical basis for the study of collaboration is limited in community college literature, other areas of interorganizational research have suggested general theories of collaboration. In the behavioral sciences field, several authors have identified concepts and constructs of interorganizational collaboration with related forms of shared leadership (Drath, 2001; Ogawa & Bossert, 2000; O'Toole, 2001). Gray and Wood (1991) have also attempted to identify and define a general theory of interorganizational collaboration. In the accretion of research to validate theory, several studies have also been conducted
using the constructs that Gray and Wood identified as characteristics of
collaboration in order to build toward a general theory of interorganizational
collaboration (Bradshaw, 1997; Lawrence, Phillips, & Hardy, 1999; Legler &
Reischl, 2003).

This current study was undertaken to explore propositions from real world
cases towards development of theory on interorganizational collaboration between
community colleges and their communities. According to LeCompte and Preissle
(1993), the purpose of research is to examine phenomena toward development of
theory. “The purpose of theory is to help us sort out our world, make sense of it,
guide how we behave in it, and predict what might happen next” (p. 120).
Propositions and generalizations are developed based on individual cases in order
to systematically build information toward general theoretical constructs. Every
situation has different actors and different idiosyncrasies. Therefore, research
actively engages in the conditions that frame a phenomenon and attempts to
identify the common characteristics in order to generate knowledge and theory,
which then can be used to inform more effective practice.

Using a qualitative case study design, one community college was studied
in depth to provide a deeper understanding of how members of the community
college build relationships with the numerous constituencies in the community to
work toward a common goal. The goal of qualitative descriptive narrative was to
help the reader grasp the processes by which people construct meaning and
describe what those meanings are (Bogdan & Bilkin, 1998). An “instrumental case
study” aids understanding of an issue or adds insight to a generalization (Stake, 2000). This study, as an instrumental case study, was of interest because it provided understanding of the specific issues of interactions and processes of interorganizational collaboration in complex systems. The following research questions guided this study:

1. How did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens perceive interactions with each other toward the development of a collaboration?

2. What actions, behaviors, tasks, and roles did community college leaders, community leaders, and citizens use to accomplish an agreed upon goal?

Concepts and Constructs from Literature

Relationships Between a Community College and Its Community

The modern comprehensive community college has a strong tradition of cooperating with its surrounding community by building connections beyond the campus (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988). With the increasingly complex network of connections around the world, the term “community” has taken on a broader meaning. This meaning of community, as it relates to the community college, now includes anyone who can access or has the potential to access the individual college’s programs and services. Community, defined more broadly still, refers to more than a group of individuals having a common interest. Based on the same root as communication, community, or rather a sense of community, comes from learning to communicate where there
can be a sense of connection and interchange of thoughts and ideas (Gleazer, 1980). The mission of the community college is to serve the community (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988) and, therefore, based on the broader definition of community, to participate as an active part of the community based on shared values and common goals.

According to Dale Tillery and William Deegan (1985), the 1950s marked the beginning of “the community college movement,” a period of rapid expansion in numbers of institutions and in enrollment, that marked the change of emphasis from the general education and college transfer mission of the junior colleges to a more comprehensive mission. Since that period, community colleges have provided a comprehensive array of programs and services generally divided into five areas: academic transfer preparation, occupational education, continuing adult education, community service, and remedial education (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Gleazer, 1980). Although these functions are often divided into five categories in the literature, there is much overlap in the specific programs and services. Of the five core functions of the comprehensive community college, the community service function has had the most controversy surrounding its inclusion as a nontraditional educational function. Over the past 30 years, many different names have been applied to describe the nature of community relations function: community service, community development, community renewal, community-based education, and community-based programming (Boone & Associates, 1997; Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Deegan, Tillery, & Associates, 1985; Gleazer, 1980;
Harlacher, 1969; Roueche, Taber, & Roueche, 1995). The various terms have been used over the years to describe the philosophy and the specific expectations of the community college serving and partnering with the community.

Ervin L. Harlacher was a strong, early supporter of the community service function of the comprehensive community college. His 1969 groundbreaking report was based on a 1967 study authorized by the American Association of Junior Colleges and his earlier 1965 dissertation study. Harlacher identified the four obligations of the community college under the community service function. These expectations are still used today as a foundation for policy and practice. Harlacher stated that a community college should:

1. Become a center of community life by encouraging the use of college facilities and services by community groups when such use does not interfere with the college's regularly scheduled programs;

2. Provide for all age groups educational services that utilize the special skills and knowledge of the college staff and other experts and be designed to meet the needs of community groups and the college district community at large;
3. Provide the community, including business and industry, with the leadership and coordination capabilities of the college, assist the community in long-range planning, and join with individuals and groups in attacking unresolved problems;

4. Contribute to and promote the cultural, intellectual, and social life of the college district community and the development of skills for the profitable use of leisure time. (Harlacher, 1969, p. v)

Building upon this perspective, in the 1970s the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges changed its name by adding ‘community’ and articulated a strongly worded statement of mission that reflected emphasis placed by the national leadership of the community colleges on “community-based postsecondary education” (Cohen & Associates, 1975; Gleazer, 1980). This renewed interest in community service resulted in extending the community college beyond a higher education institution to a primary role in community leadership. Some authors have advocated that the community college could serve as the coordinating agent for all other community service agencies and institutions, using their educational resources and, in turn, becoming a resource for the community (Cohen & Associates, 1975; Gleazer, 1980; Harlacher, 1969). Harlacher (1969) refers to this potential for leadership in community coordination as the “catalytic capabilities” of the community college. As a catalyst, the college
actively assists the community in the solution of basic education, economic, political, and social problems.

In 1992, Edgar J. Boone and Associates (1997) furthered the discussion on the leader-catalyst role of the community college by targeting community renewal through community-based programming. They suggested that the community college has informational and institutional research capabilities to identify and analyze critical issues affecting the quality of life of the community and its people (Boone & Associates, 1997). The college also can initiate and facilitate collaboration among stakeholders and constituents in order to identify community problems and propose solutions. The community college then has the opportunity to lead its community to understand coming changes, make provisions for coping with them, and initiate a process or provide resources to help solve them.

In summary, the comprehensive community college has had strong historical and philosophical relations with its surrounding community from the beginning of the community college movement. The contemporary goal of the comprehensive community college is to serve the people with whatever the people need or request (Cohen & Brawer, 1996). In order to accomplish this goal, the community college daily communicates and develops partnerships and alliances with the citizens, the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, the county and city planning bodies, state and federal agencies, public school officials, other higher education institutions, and the media (Cohen & Brawer, 1996; Rendon, 1999). The community college maintains relationships that qualify it to be an active
convener, catalyst, and leader in the community; therefore, this study examined the relationships and processes needed to fulfill the mission of the community college through its active participation in the community.

*Organizational and Relational Leadership Theories*

When a community college interacts with its community, the formal organization of the college has to interact with a complex system of individuals, groups, and other organizations with their own values, interests, expectations, and cultures. In general organizational literature, there appears to be limited examination of leadership outside the context of an organizational structure, nor in community college and community relations literature. A review of key literature finds that traditional organizational and leadership theories do not address some of the variables needed to understand the broader perspective of the relations between the community college and its community.

*Organizational leadership theory.* Two organizational theories suggest an alternative to the traditional individual-based leadership models. These theories assert leadership as an “institutional trait” (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000) or an “organizational characteristic” (O’Toole, 2001). Rodney T. Ogawa and Steven T. Bossert (2000) propose that leadership is not embedded in particular roles but in the relationships that exist among the individuals filling the roles. Leadership is relational and reciprocal. Organizational roles provide access to resources. Different roles have access to different levels and types of resources. By shifting attention to relationships, these authors suggest that interaction is the medium
through which resources are deployed and influence is exerted. Therefore, organizational members must interact with each other to access resources to enact their roles successfully. Social interaction, not individual action, becomes the basic building block of organizational leadership. Leadership through interaction influences the system of interactions that constitutes an organization. In a separate study, James O’Toole (2001) noted a different pattern of leadership as shared responsibility, not a solo act. This type of distributed leadership is rooted in the systems, processes, and culture of the organization. Leadership capacity is treated as an institutional capacity and not solely as an individual trait. In these organizations, a conscious effort is made to build overall organizational leadership capacities (O’Toole, 2001).

Relational leadership theory. Another group of leadership theories, relational leadership, offers an alternate perspective which pays attention to the process by which networks accomplish common tasks when not embedded in organizational structure (Drath, 2001). These theories combine the leadership through social interaction emphasis in the organizational trait theories with group dynamics theories. From this perspective, leadership as a process cultivates interactions between individuals and then networks of individuals (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 1998). These self-organizational processes cultivate structures and processes that are needed to deal with global issues that have local manifestations (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001). Komives, Lucas, and McMahon (1998) define this version of leadership as “a relational process of people working
As a component of relational leadership theories, group dynamics theories provide key concepts and constructs in group development and management processes. Collectively, groups have more knowledge, diversity of perspective, time, and energy than individuals working alone. Groups engage in various processes that are often called group dynamics. Group dynamics, the study of the group’s life, include such processes as how the group makes decisions, how the group handles its conflicts, and how the group meets its leadership needs (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Effective groups focus on both processes -- how things happen in a group and how members relate -- as well as the ultimate goal (Hulse-Killacky, Killacky, & Donigian, 2001). Leadership is still essential to group dynamics, but it does not need to come from only one person. There is a sharing of power between individuals and a blurring of the boundaries that separate individual roles (Gordon, 2002). This provides a different way of thinking about leadership outside of the formal organizational structure.

The Relational Leadership Model (Komives et al., 1998) combines the leadership through social interaction emphasis in organizational trait theories with the concepts and constructs of group dynamics and collaboration. The relational leadership model focuses on five primary components. First, this approach to leadership is inclusive of people and diverse points of view. Secondly, it is purposeful and builds commitment toward common purposes. Thirdly, relational
leadership also empowers those involved. Fourthly, the model has an ethical and moral basis. These four components are accomplished by being process-oriented, which is the fifth component of the model.

“Leadership happens when people who acknowledge shared work use dialogue and collaborative learning to create contexts in which that work can be accomplished across the dividing lines of differing perspectives, values, beliefs, [and] cultures” (Drath, 2001, p.14). Members of the group are familiar with the issues that need to be resolved because they are members of the constituencies they represent. The process set forth in the model empowers them to take a shared moral responsibility to help make their group, community, organization, or world a better place. Developing a shared vision for the outcome, establishing the goal through dialogue, and developing processes collaboratively to achieve the common goal are good examples of establishing and maintaining group commitment through group processes. The relational leadership model considers group management as a group process with the whole group collaborating to perform the various tasks and roles of leadership (Komives et al., 1998).

As the theoretical basis for the interactions and relations within the group, the relational leadership model uses the concept of collaboration. People collaborate with others in a group so long as they are given an opportunity to feel a sense of belonging to that group. Carol Gilligan (1982) found that there must be development of a sense of “us,” a group identity, separate from self and other. The sense of us focuses on the dynamics of relationships and dissipates the tension
between selfishness and responsibility through a new understanding of the interconnection between other and self. A sense of group identity develops, and the egotistic incentives become less salient, although they do not disappear altogether.

The relational leadership model is firmly embedded in the concept of team and organizational learning (Komives et al., 1998; Senge, 1994). The model recognizes the need for ongoing training of the members of the group to gain skills in such areas as collaboration and communication, as well as in group processes such as conflict resolution and group decision-making. The partners bring their own strengths, talents, knowledge, and limitations to a collaboration (Komives et al., 1998). Besides being an active participant in collaborations with the community, an important asset that the community college contributes to the collaborations is its strength as a provider of training for group learning in collaboration and group processes.

In summary, key literature and theories found in organizational leadership and relational leadership were used in this study to address the issues of leadership as a social interaction dependent upon group processes and collaboration in order to accomplish a common goal. The community college as an organization was viewed as a leader in the collaborative process, rather than certain individuals of the college being leaders of the process. Using the relational leadership model, this study examined the community college as having the primary task of creating leadership capacity and becoming leaders of leaders.
Interorganizational Collaboration

Another area of previous research focused on collective action between networks of organizations and, specifically, interorganizational collaboration. This body of literature has emphasized compiling a comprehensive definition of collaboration, defining the key characteristics of interorganizational collaboration, and developing comprehensive theory of collaboration between businesses and organizations (Gray & Wood, 1991; Hord 1986; Legler & Reischel, 2003; Kanter, 1994; Wood & Gray 1991). In this literature, interorganizational collaboration is identified as both a distinct process, as well as an organizational structure (McGrath, 1998). As a process, interorganizational collaboration has been identified as developmental with preconditions, a recognizable set of characteristics, dynamic communication, and distinct group processes of planning and coordination. As an organizational structure, interorganizational collaboration flattened the traditional technical-rational hierarchy within organizations and business alliances, and encouraged communication and joint problem solving (Hord, 1986; Kanter, 1994; McGrath, 1998; Senge, 1994).

Models and theories have been proposed for a comprehensive theory of interorganizational collaboration (i.e. Hord, 1986; Wood & Gray, 1991). Researchers have conducted qualitative and quantitative studies to test and revise the proposed comprehensive models and theories of interorganizational collaboration (i.e. Lawrence, Phillips & Hardy, 1999; Legler & Reischl, 2003; Mulroy, 1997; Van de Ven & Walker, 1984). These studies have empirically
identified conditions that lead to and promote collaboration, key characteristics of interorganizational collaboration, the roles that organizational leaders play in initiating and sustaining collaboration, the processes by which coalition partners interact, and the expected outcomes of collective actions.

In summary, successful collaborations between community colleges and community organizations and groups suggest that community colleges already practice the concepts and constructs of interorganizational collaboration. Literature documenting successful collaborations between the community college and the community provide evidence that a community college plays important roles as catalyst and leader in dealing with critical community issues (Barnett, 1995; Boone & Associates, 1997; Roueche et al., 1995). However, much of the literature provides models formed from practice with little information about the theoretical background for the models proposed in the community college literature (McGrath, 1998; Roueche et al., 1995). Review of the community college literature and identification of empirical models and theories in other areas of study contributed concepts and constructs that provided direction and support for the examination of interactions and processes used by a community college and its community network of individuals, groups, and organizations.

**Background Context**

In order to study the interactions and processes of interorganizational collaboration between a community college and its constituent groups, this research identified an activity that required collective action resulting in meeting a
common goal. The 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum (HEFB) in North Carolina provided this focused, time-bounded collective activity of community college leaders and staff working together with community leaders and citizens for the benefit of the college and the community. The 2000 HEFB occurred at a crucial period in the history of the community colleges in North Carolina. A large influx of funding was needed to fill gaps left from 40 years of inadequate funding for renovations and new construction of buildings on community college campuses across the state. The 2000 HEFB was also historically significant because it was one of the first collective efforts by the North Carolina Community College System and the University of North Carolina System. The two statewide systems of higher education made a commitment to work together and developed a combined proposal for a bond referendum. Reviewing the results of past bond referenda, the organizers decided upon a campaign strategy that built upon the influence of the supporters of the universities with the wide geographic base of the community colleges.

In this instrumental case study, a specific community college and community were selected for in-depth study. Two criteria were used in this purposeful sampling. State leaders recognized the local campaign effort coordinated by Eastern Community College in Emerson County as a particularly successful community collaboration. Further, Eastern Community College fit the profile of a typical community college in North Carolina. For the HEFB campaign, the college and community developed creative local campaign strategies as well
as participated in regional activities. The collective efforts resulted in passage by 74% of the vote on the state bonds in a county that was reported to be “notoriously anti-bonds” by participants in the study.

This community college and community collective effort provided an opportunity to examine the formation of relationships and interactions of the local campaign committee. Interviews with key formal and informal leaders at the community college and in the community provided perceptions detailing collaborative measures on a variety of fronts. The various collaborations ranged in breadth from those involving state system-wide partnerships to those involving regional, institutional, and individual relationships.

For the local campaign effort in Emerson County, college leadership pulled together a diverse group of business leaders, public school officials, elected government officials, and community leaders. This group quickly identified its common purpose, determined roles and task assignments, and took individual responsibility to fulfill the accepted roles and tasks. Through mailings, a well-attended public forum, media appearances, and personal contacts, the committee members told the story and sold the citizens of the county on the benefits that the HEFB funds would provide to the universities, local college, and the county educational system.

After a very successful campaign that resulted in the passage of the bond referendum in the county by 74%, the relationships and interactions that began with the successful referendum campaign continued into other collaborative
efforts. Most notable was the design process of the educational building that was funded with the bond money. Everyone involved acknowledged the strong tie between the bond campaign and building design process and the continuity of the collaborative efforts. College faculty members and county business leaders were asked to participate in the process of designing the new educational building. This inclusion of input into the design of a community college construction project was recognized as a unique occurrence.

Several benefits resulted from this collaboration. First, work group members actually felt that their input mattered in their areas of interest at the college; therefore, they would bring stronger support and interest in continuing to collaborate with the college in other advisory capacities. Second, when called upon to write letters of support for the grant to help supplement the funding of the construction, they had a better understanding of how the educational programs would impact the local economy. Finally, when the final construction costs were estimated, the business and industry leaders stepped forward with donations that insured that the “building would be built the way it ought to be built” because they had helped identify what was needed to go into the building that would provide for educational programs for training employees in their industries.

In addition to the design and funding of the educational building, more complex collaborations with the regional universities and the public school system developed as a consequence of the connections made during the campaign for bond funding. Because the partners were satisfied with the outcomes of the initial
interorganizational collaborations, they were willing to become involved in more complicated collective efforts.

A Framework for Understanding Interorganizational Collaboration

Given the background of the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum campaign and continuing into the design of the educational building on campus, key understandings developed related to interorganizational collaboration. Primarily, the participants in this instrumental case study described the community college as an organizational entity that had the capacity to exercise leadership within the larger community. Secondly, conditions were in place for the interorganizational collaboration to be successful. Most importantly, two distinct manifestations of collaboration emerged.

An Organization as an Entity

The participants in this case study observed that a community college as an organization has the capacity to exercise leadership as an entity. This point is illustrated by the numerous examples of “the college” organizing activities or alliances, instead of the individuals in formal positions or roles performing the actions. This viewpoint of the community college as a community leader has been communicated for years in community college literature, from Harlacher in 1969 to The Knowledge Net report in 2000. In this case study, ECC formed linkages to various other organizations, agencies, and individuals in the community. By building upon existent relationships and forging new relationships, the college took on the leadership role in modeling and forming new collaborations with business
and industry, the public school system, regional campuses of the university system, and other county governmental agencies.

There is precedence in organizational research literature for stating that an organization has a life of its own. In support of the findings in this study, three different theoretical perspectives found in research literature conceptualize an organization as an entity (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000; O'Toole, 2001; Senge, 1994). These examples also support and provide a framework for a general theory on interorganizational collaboration theory (Gray & Wood, 1991).

Several studies have addressed this theoretical idea of an organization as an entity. In their study on leadership, Ogawa and Bossert propose that institutional theory should be used to discuss leadership that is spread throughout the organization, not centered on “certain organizational corners” as in more traditional, technical-rational theory of organizations (Ogawa & Bossert, 2000). Technical-rational theory emphasizes the two organizational features of goals and formal structure and their effects on the participants within the organization. Institutional theory alternately provides the view that behavior and action of individuals and the collective are not driven by internal goals, but are expressions of external institutional pressures. Therefore, organizational structures are developed that reflect society’s cultural theories or social legitimacy in the institutional environment.

Institutional theory provides a supportive framework for elaborating the findings in this study. Specifically, interorganizational collaboration serves the
purpose of affecting external constituencies. In collaborations with its community, the college must continually build good relations and maintain the perception that the college is involved in and an active member of the community. In this way, the college builds social legitimacy with the external constituencies. Social legitimacy improves the ability of the organization to garner resources from the environment, such as bond money for construction, thereby ensuring organizational survival.

In his theoretical framework on the institutional capacity for leadership, O'Toole provides a similar treatment of leadership, again leading the reader to consider the organization as an entity with the institutional capacity for leadership (O'Toole, 2001). He describes leadership as not dependent on the personality of one individual, but as based in the systems, processes, and culture of the organization. He describes concepts very similar to those found in the study of collaboration among a community college and its community constituencies. In describing the institutional capacity for leadership, O'Toole states that members at all levels are expected to take initiative to solve problems, accept accountability, share common goals, and appreciate the creative problem solving that can occur from the consideration of diverse perspectives.

Within a systems theoretical perspective, Senge addresses the different topic of organizational form, but again discusses the organization as a collective that has the capacity to learn and renew itself (Senge, 1994). He proposes that organizations should be studied using a systems approach. From this perspective, an organization is viewed as a system that is also connected to the external
environment. “Systemic structure is concerned with the key interrelationships that influence behavior over time” (Senge, 1991, p. 44). In the systems viewpoint, in order for one entity to succeed, others must succeed as well.

The systems perspective provides an additional lens to add depth to the study of interorganizational collaboration. In learning organizations, the goal of team learning is to develop the group process skills and group interaction skills to look beyond its own personal agendas and view an issue with a larger perspective (Senge, 1994). In successful collaborations, high performing teams have shared vision and purpose (Senge, 1994). Interorganizational collaboration theory is also based on the development of group process skills and common goals based on a larger systemic perspective. In this study on community college-community collaboration, partners viewed the mutually defined goals from the broader countywide connections.

These examples provide precedence for the study of interorganizational relations, particularly collaborative ones, using a broader perspective. Gray and Wood (1991) claim that in order to develop a comprehensive theory on the process of collaboration, the phenomenon must be studied at the domain or interorganizational level, not just at the individual organizational level where most studies are centered. Domain-level questions have not been applied to the study of collaboration between a community college and the numerous groups in its community.
**Conditions Leading to Interorganizational Collaboration**

In considering the findings of this study, several conditions set the stage for interorganizational collaborations to occur. Individual mental models, organizational culture, and environmental preconditions increased stakeholder motivation to participate in an alliance and structurally make collaboration possible. As a backdrop to elaborating the findings of this study, these key elements were present.

Mental models were how an individual perceived the world and were the internal images of how the world worked (Senge, 1994). Stakeholders were motivated to join in collaboration when they perceived a shared purpose and linked their self-interest with the community interest through mental models. The community leaders responded to the requests for their help with the referendum campaign because they were mutually interested in the broader educational outcomes for the county. College and community leaders saw an opportunity to use an interorganizational collaborative process to meet needs identified by local leaders for the broader local educational needs. The college leaders recognized the need for renovation and new space for projected enrollment increases. The community leaders recognized that this increase in enrollment would come partially from the larger number of students coming through the public school system who either did not have the capability or interest to pursue other forms of higher education, or did not have the resources to attend other institutions of higher education. The other component of the increased enrollment would come
from adults returning to community colleges for training to maintain their current employment or retrain to change careers.

Second, organizational culture is the collective of mental models held by the members of the organization. From the perspective of an organization as an entity, organizational culture is the mind and soul of that entity. Organizational culture is shared values and beliefs held by the members of the organization that identify their place in the world (Yukl, 2002). Culture also relates to the shared assumptions about human nature and human relations. Both the conscious and unconscious beliefs and assumptions that make up the culture help determine how the organization will respond to environmental stimuli.

North Carolina community colleges have had a long tradition of collaborating with their communities (Segner, 1974). The mission of the community college, and specifically the North Carolina community colleges has been to serve the community, therefore, to participate as an active part of the community based on shared values and common goals. Community colleges in North Carolina were established to address local educational and training issues. Many citizens participated in advisory and decision-making roles for the local community college. Therefore, members of the community have expected and were expected to participate in major issues that relate to the local community college. Based on this tradition, the state leadership of the community colleges mustered a major effort by the local colleges to involve the community in campaigning for the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond referendum.
Organizational culture also influenced the selection of top management leaders (Yukl, 2002). At the crucial period in state community college history covered by this study, the local community college was also making important transitions. During this same time period, the Eastern Community College board of trustees selected and hired a new formal leader for the first time in over two decades. The ECC board of trustees used a collaborative process to conduct the search for a new college president. The college held receptions for members of the community to meet the candidates for president. Borden stated, “We made a big point to include the public, in trying to get input as to what they felt the community college should be doing for this community… People have always had a good perception of our college and I think we reinforced it.” After the new president was chosen, the college also included the community in the public confirmation ceremony and the following reception. Unger, a community leader who was also involved in the bond campaign through the university system, specifically remembered meeting President Andrews for the first time at the reception and initiating a discussion about the bond referendum at that time.

Organizational culture also influenced the role expectations for the new leader (Yukl, 2002). The ECC board of trustees described the characteristics they wanted to look for in the new leader. They specifically wanted the candidate selected to have collaborative leadership traits and to improve community relations. In the words of Borden, the chairman of the trustees, “We wanted a
president who would strengthen and develop good ties in our community. We felt that could be improved upon. And we got that with the man we hired.”

In turn, leaders also influenced the culture by modeling traits and behaviors, and by what they attended and reacted to as important (Yukl, 2002). As the new president at ECC, Andrews modeled collaborative leadership characteristics. The new president had to rally the people and the resources quickly and efficiently to initiate the local bond referendum campaign. As the president modeled collaborative behaviors such as sharing information, involving others in decision making, including diverse perspectives, and facilitating cooperation and teamwork, others became excited about the collaborative processes. The community college president who was new to the position had an excellent opportunity to influence organizational culture by changing structures, policies, and practices to support a collaborative environment. These new structures, policies, and practices could be under the jurisdiction of an organization, or in the case of interorganizational collaboration, they were formed externally to established organizational structures, policies, and procedures (Kanter, 1994). As the president demonstrated a real and consistent commitment to collaborative leadership, his subordinates and the community supporters developed respect and trust in not only the man, but also in the idea that collaborative leadership was a viable management or leadership process for the college and the community.

Finally, environmental preconditions are the institutional forces that can either enable or inhibit interorganizational collaboration (Gray & Wood, 1991). An
opportunity to gain a strategic advantage or to recognize the need for a collective response enabled the formation of interorganizational alliances. Alternately, a perceived threat to core ideologies or lack of negotiating structures at the domain level can inhibit collaboration. The college and community leaders agreed that there was a broad need in the community for trained and competent craftspeople in construction, manufacturing, and agricultural industries. The college leaders emphasized the need to rebalance the vocational education component with the college transfer component of the community college mission. The community leaders recognized that the public schools did not have the resources to maintain their own vocational programs. All groups saw the potential for receiving bond money to help construct facilities on the local community college campus as an opportunity to provide for the broader community need for vocational education. These preconditions and mental models were in place and necessary for the interorganizational collaboration to occur between Eastern Community College and the various groups in its community. As stated in this section, the conditions of mental models, organizational culture, and environmental preconditions supported the theoretical framework of interorganizational collaboration.

Two Models of Collaboration

In exploring the nature of the interorganizational collaboration between ECC and the community, it was evident that there were specific understandings regarding the relationships and processes in the interorganizational collaboration. Based on analysis of the behaviors, interactions, and perceptions of individuals
who participated in this study, two distinct manifestations of interorganizational collaboration were observed. These differences suggested that interorganizational collaboration could not be described as a single phenomenon.

The two distinct manifestations of collaboration delineated through examination of this case study are described as the Goal-based Collaboration Model and the Issue-based Collaboration Model. These two models are presented denoting their salient characteristics of purpose, initial leadership, group characteristics, attitudes and values, group processes, and outcomes. Previous literature has identified a number of these individual characteristics. In other literature, several characteristics have been combined. These models were developed to reflect understandings derived from this case study and were proposed to expand and add to previous models and theories.

**Goal-Based Collaboration Model**

From analysis of the perspectives and interpretations of the participants in the study, one distinct manifestation of interorganizational collaboration was identified as goal-based collaboration. The state and local campaign committees were formed based on the primary goal of gaining additional funding for construction and renovations of buildings on college campuses across the state. State and local community college leadership chose to use a collaborative group process as a tool for the completion of the goal. By identifying and including a diverse cadre of stakeholders, the state and local college leadership hoped to utilize the resources of the prospective committee members and the creative
problem-solving capability that is believed to be a characteristic of diverse groups. While the coordinating leaders actively participated in the collective and defined the group processes, members of the state and local campaign committees recognized their interdependence and their mutual interest in passing the bond referendum. Individual committee members used their resources and formal authority to take on responsibility and were accountable for the completion of the goal. The committees began the goal-based collaborative process expecting to disband after the November vote, in spite of the result of the vote. The following discussion expands on these key characteristics of the goal-based collaboration model.

*Purpose for group formation.* Two occurrences of goal-based collaboration were found in this study. Both were based on the accomplishment of the same goal – to obtain funding for community colleges and universities through passage of state-level bond issuances. In the first occurrence, the top state leadership of the University of North Carolina (UNC) System and the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) established the initial goal of gaining bond funding through passage of appropriations legislation in the North Carolina General Assembly. This goal was a key objective for the state level interorganizational collaboration. When appropriations bills did not pass in the legislature, the leadership of the University of North Carolina (UNC) System and the North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) worked together with the North Carolina Citizens for Business and Industry (NCCBI) to gain passage of state
legislation for the 2000 HEFB referendum. The goal then became passage of this large funding initiative for the community colleges and universities by encouraging the citizens of North Carolina to vote affirmatively on the referendum.

As the second occurrence of goal-based collaboration, in conjunction with and subsequent to this state-level collaboration on the bond referendum, the local community college established a local campaign committee to help advocate for the state bond funding. This local committee included college leaders, local business people, elected officials, and other local influentials to assist with campaigning for a positive vote in the local bond referendum. The question posed by the local college leaders of “How can we work together to have a positive outcome?” was perceived by the local campaign committee members as an invitation to join in a collaborative process. Wilson, the executive director of the Chamber of Commerce, said that she did not feel that the request came across as “this is what we want you to do,” which would have implied a more cooperative than collaborative form of alliance. Instead, this local interorganizational effort was viewed as a collaborative effort.

In previous literature, most interorganizational collaborations are formed initially for a specified purpose (Gray & Wood, 1991; Kanter, 1994). New collaborations may form from the grassroots level of issue identification (Lawrence, Phillips, & Hardy, 1999) or from the leadership level to accomplish a specific goal (Kanter, 1994). In the case of goal-based collaborations, groups were formed to accomplish a specific goal set by organizational leadership. In this
study, the specific goal was to gain a large one-time input of state funding to the local community colleges, along with the state universities, for renovations and new construction of facilities on campuses.

*Key initiating roles of organizational leadership.* When the need for additional funding for renovations, repairs, and new construction at university and community college campuses was identified, leaders of the universities and community colleges determined that an interorganizational collaboration was the best management tool for the process. They identified potential group members for this effort by determining who throughout the state could provide the resources and influence to help gain passage of legislation in the General Assembly (Cunningham & Lanier, 2001). Once the bond referendum legislation was passed by the General Assembly, an independent group, North Carolinians for Educational Opportunity (NCEO) formed, because state laws forbid direct public advocacy by employees of the institutions and organizations (Cunningham & Lanier, 2001). NCEO was formed to develop strategies and provide information to the state and local campaign efforts. The state university and community college leaders actively participated in the process.

One of the NCEO strategies was for each community college to form a local campaign committee that included community college personnel and local community leaders. In Emerson County, this community-based advocacy approach was contrasted to past, and often unsuccessful, bond issues where the college mainly encouraged students and employees to advocate as citizens for the
bond issues. Study participants identified the college president and the college foundation director as coordinating leaders in initiating and coordinating the local campaign committee. The college president and foundation director identified select local citizens who could provide resources and advocacy at the local level. As college president, Andrews legitimized the formation of the committee. The foundation director utilized his network of established relationships to form the group. Group leadership was then transferred to Gardner, the college foundation director, who participated as the coordinating leader for the interorganizational committee that worked on the local bond campaign.

As a characteristic identified in previous literature, organizational leadership played a role in defining the goal, initiating and legitimizing the group, and helping define the processes of collaboration (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Johnson and Johnson referred to this role as a coordinating leader. In this model of collaboration, participants recognized specific individuals and institutions as coordinating leaders at the state and local level.

*Characteristics of the group.* At the state level, the interorganizational collaboration included representatives from a diverse group of stakeholders, who had mutual interests in the state postsecondary educational system and its benefits to the economy of the state. Leaders of the three large constituencies – universities, community colleges, and the state Chamber of Commerce - provided their expertise and influence in working with the General Assembly to get the bond referendum legislation passed. Andrews noted that “by joining together,” the
universities purposefully combined the influence of their "big alumni base" with the "broad geographic base" of the 58 community colleges.

As part of the local initiative, the leaders of Eastern Community College formed an interorganizational collaborative group made up of volunteers with an interest in the larger goal of bringing state resources to the college and, by association, the local community. At the local level, the group was made up of diverse perspectives for the stated purpose of influencing key constituencies in the county. According to Masterson, the committee members were chosen because "they were people who touched many people and had shown previous civic commitment." Members of the group also provided resources, including their time to advocate for the benefits of the bond funding.

As suggested in previous literature, there were a number of characteristics that typified the groups (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). The groups in this study were composed of participants who represented a number of key stakeholder constituencies and interests (Lawrence, Phillips, & Hardy, 1999). In addition to being chosen for their mutual interest in education, the group members had diverse perspectives, had the potential to influence large numbers of individuals, and had expertise and resources that could be tapped to accomplish the goal of advocating for the referendum passage (Gray & Wood, 1991). In goal-based collaborations, the group members brought the formal authority from their respective roles in the community to bear in the collaboration (Legler & Reischl,
They were most often invited for the authority of their position over the strength of their advocacy.

**Attitudes and values.** The next characteristic of goal-based collaboration related to the attitudes and values of group members and how these were observed in the relationships and interactions. Attitudes are manifestations - actions, thoughts, or feelings - that show the disposition or opinion of the individual, group, or organization (Senge, 1994). At the organizational level, attitudes are often discussed as organizational culture. Values are the social norms or standards that are held by the individual, group, or organization (Yukl, 2003).

As identified in previous literature, an attitude of collaboration was built on the values of interdependence, trust building and respect, tolerance for differing views, and taking responsibility and being accountable for tasks and outcomes (Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Senge, 1994; Vangen & Huxham, 2003).

Interdependence exists when stakeholders recognize that they are linked with other groups of stakeholders such that they cannot fully achieve their goal unless the entire network of stakeholders attains its goal (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Related to the concept of interdependence is trust and trust building. Senge states that trust occurs when “each team member remains conscious of the other team members and can be counted on to act in ways that complement each others’ actions” (Senge, 1994, p.236). Trust is taking risks based on expectations of future action, therefore, building trust is a cyclic process of interactions. “Each time an
outcome meets expectation, trusting attitudes are reinforced” (Vangen & Huxham, 2003, p.11). Once partners recognized their interdependence and built trust, they were more tolerant toward differing views and took responsibility for task completion and relationship management.

Representatives of the state and local organizations recognized this interdependence among the stakeholders. In the state campaign, the collaboration between the universities and the community colleges was perceived as the first time that the post-secondary institutions of education recognized the interdependence between the institutions of post-secondary education (Cunningham, 2001). By working closely together, the leaders of the educational systems built trust and broke the longstanding tradition of competition. The leaders also took responsibility for the outcome by participating in activities held at both the universities and the community college campuses across the state. Even during the public forum held at ECC, the example was given of a president at another community college who kept literature in her purse and gave it out at her stops at the grocery store. Everyone realized active participation was needed to meet the goal.

In the local campaign, the participants also recognized their interdependence within the county educational system. They recognized the interdependence of the various educational institutions in the county, and the importance of education to the economy of the county. All participants agreed that the additional funding provided by the bond issue would benefit the county
educational system, thereby, the citizens of the county. Members of Gardner’s network had already worked together on numerous funding initiatives for the public schools, as well as the college. Having built relations and trust through working together on previous contentious issues, they had also developed tolerance for dissenting views, another key characteristic of interorganizational collaboration.

All participants in the study spoke about the attitude of taking personal responsibility and being accountable for results. As an example of taking responsibility, Wilson, the director of the Chamber of Commerce, talked about providing a mailing list “so that together we could send out information to the general community.” The Chamber director did not just hand it to the college to use, rather the Chamber and college staffs worked together to develop and process the mailing. One of the business owners also talked about spending time doing radio interviews and talking to customers in his store about the bonds.

*Group processes.* Participants in this study provided information about the group processes of the local campaign committee. A key characteristic of goal-based interorganizational collaborations identified in the literature was that the initiating leadership defined key group processes before the group was formed. Key group process activities included procedural, operational, as well as reporting activities (Johnson & Johnson, 2003). Procedural activities represented what is going to happen and how the group is going to function. At the first meeting of the individuals invited to participate in the bond campaign, college leaders described the strategies proposed by the NCEO for conducting the bond campaign. Then the
college leaders took the lead in defining the procedural activities, which included such actions as meeting planning and management. Operational activities represented what was expected of the group participants and included task, role, and responsibility assignments by the leaders. In the local campaign, all participants agreed that the additional funding provided by the bond issue would benefit the county educational system, thereby, the citizens of the county. The group brainstormed and delegated the tasks that would be needed to accomplish the goal. Then they agreed to provide resources and influence to gain passage of the bond referendum. Because many had previously served on numerous committees, boards, and councils where they were exposed to and practiced the procedures and norms of working in groups, they quickly divided tasks that needed to be accomplished to gain the end goal. The group members assumed responsibility to fulfill those tasks and took responsibility for the outcomes of the goal. The college foundation director took on the reporting processes, which represented the communication activities. The reporting processes included such activities as meeting notification and exchanging information for effective task completion.

*Outcome for group collaboration.* In this case, the outcome was successful passage of the bond referendum in November 2000, which provided additional state funds for construction and renovations of buildings on college campuses. The participants felt that not only had the passage of the bond referendum provided needed funding to the local community college and the various
universities to which they were linked, but it also provided an opportunity for the community to work together toward a larger goal of fulfilling a community educational need. Members of the committees began the process with the expectation that the committees would dissolve at the end of the bond campaign. When the bond referendum passed by the majority of the popular vote, the work was at an end and the groups no longer had a reason to meet at the state and local level.

In the literature, the characteristic of this aspect of outcome focused upon attainment of the goal that brought the group together. For these goal-based interorganizational collaborations, participants expected that the group would be dissolved once that goal had been completed or the goal changed. Termination of the group was not dependent upon whether the goal was achieved or not (Gray & Wood, 1991). Most goal-based interorganizational collaborations have a set deadline for the goal to be completed (Kanter, 1994).

*Issue-Based Collaboration Model*

During analysis of the interpretations and perspectives in this study, a second form of interorganizational collaboration was revealed. This second manifestation of interorganizational collaboration was identified as issue-based interorganizational collaboration. In this study, work groups were initially formed to identify key characteristics to be incorporated into the design of the vocational building that would provide state-of-the-art training and hands-on experience for potential employees of the local industries. These interorganizational groups were
formed to address a broad issue or group of issues. This was different from addressing a specific goal or series of tasks, as in goal-based interorganizational collaboration. In the issue-based interorganizational collaboration, college leaders initiated the formation of a collective in order to address issues that were of mutual interest to the college faculty, college administration, industry managers, and industry executives. Because the group was formed based on a mutual interest, there was a strong culture of shared values and cohesiveness inherent in the group from the beginning. This early cohesiveness came from shared understanding of implicit assumptions. Because of the shared values, the members of the group were more inclined to promote inquiry regarding problem solving versus strong advocacy of their interests.

Once the initiating college leaders identified the diverse group of stakeholders, the large group was convened and a collaborative process using work subgroups was promoted. Although college leaders and faculty remained as members of the work groups, they did not take an active leadership role in the work of the collective. Participation, leadership, decision-making, and power were distributed among the members of the groups. The work groups decided what group processes they would use. The groups worked toward addressing the initial issue or multiple issues. As the inquiry process brought to light more issues, the groups realigned to continue to address issues of additional community fundraising and supporting the grant proposal. These key aspects of issue-based
interorganizational collaborations are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

*Purpose for group formation.* For the participants of this issue-based interorganizational collaboration, a key focus was supporting the construction on the community college campus of a building to be funded from the 2000 HEFB issuance. Initially, college leadership identified and defined the need for a building that would meet the needs for training programs in vocational fields. College leadership also recognized, from past experience with previous construction projects, that the college on its own was unable to adequately address the need. Therefore, there must be assistance from the community. The college president recognized that using a collaborative effort, first, brought together the users of the building to provide input into the design of the building to get the “most building for the money,” and, secondly, involving members of the community tapped into their experiences and resources “to build it the way it ought to be built.”

In previous literature, interorganizational collaborations may form from the grassroots level of issue identification, as well as from a need for advocacy and creative problem solving (Lawrence, Phillips, & Hardy, 1999). In contrast to a goal-based collaboration, the purpose for group formation underlying issue-based collaboration is to identify a number of mutual issues and then work toward addressing one or more of them (Boone & Associates, 1997). For Emerson County, the overshadowing issue was to improve opportunities for training and
education in fields such as construction, industrial maintenance, and agricultural industries throughout the local educational system.

Key initiating roles of organizational leadership. Andrews was the “convening leader” (Wood & Gray, 1991) who established and legitimized the issue-based collaboration of designing the vocational building. In this way the ECC president became the facilitator of this issue-based collaboration. He facilitated the work of the organization by identifying and officially inviting the right people together to address important problems. He asked other members of college leadership to help identify stakeholders in the college and the community. Once the stakeholders were identified, brought together, and the project described to them, the president loosely guided the formation of work groups and defined the reporting and review process. He promoted a process where the college leadership would step out of the key roles and everyone’s input was important. As Madison stated, the president “set the tone of the whole thing in that first meeting.” He meant that the president set the collaborative tone from the first meeting.

Collaborative leaders focus on the belief that autonomous, interdependent stakeholders should work together to transform an individual vision into a richer understanding of the issues and shared interests to a collective vision (Komives, 2000). According to Wood and Gray, a comprehensive theory of interorganizational collaboration “must be able to articulate the role of the convener in establishing, legitimizing, and guiding the collaborative alliance” (1991, p. 149). Once the convening college leadership identified the potential group
members and introduced the issue, they promoted a collaborative process and remained connected to the collaboration through the reporting and review processes.

Characteristics of the group. In order to design a building that would meet the needs for vocational training in the county, work groups were formed for the different curriculum areas. These work groups were representative of the clusters of industries found in the county - animal sciences, plant sciences, manufacturing, building trades - and a fifth exploratory group. Each group included members from the appropriate industry, the college faculty, and the board of trustees to provide a diverse perspective for creative problem solving. The trustee members were assigned to the work groups according to their interest and expertise. For example, one trustee worked in the construction industry, so he was assigned to the building trades work group. The college faculty members and program advisory members, who already had a mutual interest in improving education opportunities for vocational education in the county, recognized and appreciated that their input was requested and used in designing a building, a unique occurrence in the history of the college. When Andrews established the groups, he directed that a college member should not take the role as chair of the work group. This act represented a conscious distribution of power. Power was purposefully distributed within the group in order for the group work to “not look like a rubberstamp of college decisions.” The roles of leadership were transferred to the
work groups, which decided their own roles within the group and decided how they were going to make decisions.

Groups in issue-based collaborations have characteristics that follow the definition of collaboration found in previous literature; that is, they are inclusive of diverse viewpoints and members are chosen for their interest, expertise, and resources (Legler & Reischl, 2003). The issue-based collaborations in this study tended to be different from goal-based collaborations in that they were characterized by broader distribution of participation, leadership roles, and decision-making authority. They also tended to have a greater distribution of power among the members based on expertise and access to information. Power relationships within the collaboration were not strictly tied to formal roles that the representatives held in their respective organizations or stakeholder groups.

*Attitudes and values.* The characteristics of attitude and values in the issue-based collaboration observed in this case study were actually extensions of characteristics observed in the goal-based collaborations. In this study, the business representatives on the work groups shared the belief that training in the vocational fields was important to the industries and economy of the county. They also shared a mutual understanding of implicit assumptions that hands-on training in a realistic work environment was a necessary component of training programs offered by the local community college. Most of the community representatives on the work groups were already serving in some form of advisory role for the college, either as advisors to a curriculum program or as trustees. These individuals were
already strong advocates for their specific training programs and the college. Because of their interest, a number of the representatives even took time out of their schedules to visit and research other training programs to incorporate best practices in the training of employees for the industries.

As suggested in previous literature, these characteristics of attitude and values included a strong culture of shared values and cohesiveness, mutual understanding of implicit assumptions, and inquiry balanced with advocacy (Yukl, 2002). First, Yukl suggests that for issue-based collaboration, a strong culture of shared values and beliefs contributes to a cohesive group identity (Yukl, 2002). This is an extension of the recognition of interdependence and tolerance of differing views. Partners moved from agreement to work on a common goal based on shared beliefs related to personal or institutional interests to working toward a common vision held by the collaborative group. Second, just as in goal-based collaboration, the building of trust and establishing an attitude of trust were important in issue-based interorganizational collaboration. Trust building was cyclic (Vangen & Huxham, 2003). According to Vangen and Huxham:

Each time partners act together, they take a risk and form expectations about the intended outcome and the way others will contribute to achieving it. Each time an outcome meets expectations, trusting attitudes are reinforced. The outcome becomes part of the history of the relationship, increasing the chance that partners will have positive expectations about joint actions in the future (p.11).
After numerous cycles of building trust and working together toward common visions, members of issue-based collaborations began to operate from implicit assumptions. Implicit assumptions were derived from explicit commonly held values or the assumption of commonly held values. Finally, as a result of possible multiple encounters or a committed belief in the value of the collaboration for a greater good, group members in the issue-based collaboration transformed their sense of responsibility and accountability to specific stakeholder groups to inquiry balanced by advocacy. The attitudes and values indicated a progression toward creative problem solving instead of serving a role to complete a task that will benefit the various constituencies.

*Group processes.* As soon as the work groups for designing the building were established, the top college administration turned over the group management processes to each group. The work groups chose to use different processes for determining leadership roles, procedural matters, and operational processes within the group. Each work group also developed their own communication processes and internal review processes. One work group used a brainstorming process, and the member of the group who had experience in using computer-aided design developed plans based on these suggestions. This group decided to meet only twice. Another group worked together on each detail, and the design was developed over several meetings. Over several sessions, they compiled and refined their design. Another group decided to assign members to research best practices, and members of the group either visited sites exhibiting
those best practices, or they invited experts to meet with the group to describe the best practices being used in the industry. This integrative problem solving was key to the issue-based collaboration. Members of the groups reported that representatives from the industries were credited with providing the more novel proposals in the designs. In addition to the internal group review and reporting processes, Andrews established an external reporting and review process for each work group to keep him informed.

As proposed in previous literature, group processes in issue-based collaboration became more group-defined (Komives, et al, 1998). Once the initiating leadership had promoted a collaborative process and set any initial conditions, such as external reporting, the group began to determine and manage their own procedural, operational, and review processes (Johnson & Johnson, 2003; Yukl, 2002). An interorganizational collaboration based on issues usually has a prescribed internal and external reporting process, whether it results in reporting the findings of a federal commission, such as the report of the President’s Commission on Higher Education (1997), or periodic reports to the individuals or organizations that initiated the collaboration (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988).

Outcomes for group collaboration. Several times in this study, participants expressed that they thought that one of the outcomes for the issue-based interorganizational collaboration would be to create the “ideal” educational facility. The input of the industry members and the creativity came from the autonomous
group process. The fact that members involved in the design of the building also felt accountable to raise the remaining funding needed to construct the building was noted by several participants. All participants in this case study considered the outcome of a fully funded building that met the needs of the final users a success.

Over time, the work group purpose changed from advising the college administration to advising the architects to eventually providing support of the grant proposal. In a more goal-based collaboration, they would have presented their reports to the president and turned over their design ideas. However, the work groups in this study continued to be involved beyond the design process through a series of meetings with the project architects. Daniels suggested that it seemed that the architects were working with the local industries, not just the college. In addition, after the construction details were finalized, group members continued to be involved in other aspects of construction for the building and other college functions, such as providing letters of support for the grant and fundraising efforts.

Although these kinds of interorganizational collaborations may initially be based on a single broad issue, they may be a strategy used to address multiple issues. In this study, the original purpose for forming the issue-based collaboration evolved from designing a building to raising additional funds needed to complete the building as designed. The group itself realigned to address the additional
issues beyond the initial issue rather than forming new groups to address the
different issues.

Outcomes for the issue-based collaborations tended to be as much
relationship based as task oriented. The issue-based work groups worked on
developing common values and building trust in addition to drawing building
blueprints and developing presentations. Generally, collaborative groups are
considered temporary, but they often realign and continue to work on other issues
of mutual interest (Wood & Gray, 1991). Because of the trust building, members of
the work groups willingly continued to work on the additional issues and tasks that
needed to be addressed in order to have the building built in the manner in which
the work groups proposed.

Summary of Two Models

Two models of interorganizational collaboration were delineated from this
case study of community college and community collaborations. These two
models were developed to organize the understandings from this study and from
previous literature regarding interorganizational collaboration. General theories of
interorganizational collaboration proposed in the previous literature (Gray & Wood,
1991) have not recognized differences in interorganizational collaborations in
practice as observed in this study. Some previous studies (i.e. Legler & Reischl,
2003) described characteristics of what was described in this study as goal-based
interorganizational collaborations. Other previous studies (i.e. Lawrence, et al,
1999) described characteristics of what was described in this study as issue-based
interorganizational collaborations. The characteristics of goal-based interorganizational collaboration and issue-based collaboration were identified in this study as they related to the purpose of the collaboration, the initiating role of organizational leadership, the characteristics of the collective group, the attitudes and values, the group processes, and the outcome. These two models reflect the differences and commonalities found in previous literature and elaborated key aspects of interorganizational efforts to accomplish goals that were beyond the capabilities of one organization, specifically, a community college working alone.

The goal-based collaboration model is a description of collaboration used as a management tool by top organizational leadership. The main purpose of the goal-based collaboration was to obtain much needed state funding for construction and renovation of buildings on university and community college campuses across the state. The main goal was to ensure passage of the HEFB referendum on the November 2000 ballot. In the goal-based model, state level and college level leadership made the major decisions for action. State and college leadership identified constituencies who held a mutual interest in the success of the post-secondary education system in the state and key representatives of each stakeholder group were asked for their input of resources and key support. Once the bond referendum campaign committees were formed, organizational leadership coordinated the key strategies, tasks, and goals of the collaborative groups. The committee members recognized the interdependence of the institutions of higher education and their role in the economic soundness of the
state. They took the responsibility to complete tasks that would help convince the citizens of the state to pass the bond referendum on the November ballots. Because of the influence and resources provided by all participants, the goal was obtained. Once the goal of passing the bond referendum was met, there was no longer a need for the state NCEO or the local campaign committee.

Issue-based collaboration can be viewed as an interorganizational process that brings together several institutional stakeholders to address broad or multiple issues. This model is a description of the process by which ECC asked for help from various industries in the county to design a building on the college campus that would meet the broader issue of addressing the need for training for county-wide industries. In this model, the community college president served as convening leader to identify the issue, to legitimize the formation of a collective, and to promote a collaborative process. The collective was made up of college faculty members, industry representatives, and college trustees who were identified by college leadership as having an interest in the training of employees for the key industries in the county. In this model, the college leadership turned over the decision-making and leadership to the work group membership. By asking that members of the college staff not take on the main leadership role in the work group, the leadership and power were distributed more evenly among the membership. Because many of the group members were already active advocates for the college and the various curriculum programs, they entered the process with a strong culture of shared values, cohesiveness, trust, and respect. They were
able to view the process from a cohesive perspective. The group members were also able to balance the creative problem solving part of the collaborative process with their advocacy role for the group they represented. The work groups were self-managed and determined their own group processes. Once the design of the building was completed, the membership of the work groups realigned to address the issues of funding the construction of the building through supporting grant proposals and community fundraising.

The two distinct manifestations of collaboration delineated through this case study were described as the Goal-based Collaboration Model and the Issue-based Collaboration Model. These two models are presented as a matrix, denoting their salient characteristics of purpose, initial leadership, group characteristics, attitudes and values, group processes, and outcomes (as presented in Table 5.1). The matrix provides a visual framework to connect the characteristics of each model and illuminate differences between the models.
## Table 5.1
Two Models of Interorganizational Collaboration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Goal-based Collaboration Model</th>
<th>Issue-based Collaboration Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Goal set by organizational leadership</td>
<td>Issue(s) identified by organizational leadership or a group having a mutual interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Initiating Roles of Organizational Leadership</td>
<td>- Determines an interorganizational collaborative process is the method by which the tasks will be accomplished; - Identifies potential group members; - Remains an active participant in the group</td>
<td>- Identifies potential group members; - Introduces the issue; - Promotes a collaborative process; - Remains connected through reporting and review procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Characteristics</td>
<td>- Inclusive of diverse perspectives; - Chosen for interest, potential influence, expertise, and resources; - Agrees upon a mutual interest and becomes committed to working towards accomplishing the goal; - Makes decisions by formal authority</td>
<td>- Inclusive of diverse perspectives; - Chosen for interest, expertise, and resources; - Agrees upon a mutual interest and becomes committed to a resolution; - Distributes participation, leadership, and decision-making among group members; - Distributes power based on expertise and access to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes and Values</td>
<td>- Recognition of interdependence; - Tolerance of differing views; - Building of trust and respect; - Responsibility and accountability</td>
<td>- Strong culture of shared values and cohesiveness; - Mutual understanding of implicit assumptions; - Inquiry balanced with advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Processes</td>
<td>Defined by organizational leadership – procedural, operational, and reporting</td>
<td>- Group-defined procedural, operational, and review processes; - Has a prescribed internal and external reporting process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome for group collaboration</td>
<td>- Completion of tasks or goal; - Termination of group upon completion of purpose</td>
<td>- Multiple issues addressed; - Group may realign to address additional issues beyond initial collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications for Future Research

This research was conducted as a case study to examine the interactions and processes used to collaborate by a single community college in rural North Carolina and a small but diverse number of stakeholders in its community. As Stake wrote in 2000, “The purpose of a case study is not to represent the world, but to represent the particular case” (p. 448). Therefore, the value of a case study comes from its contribution to the continuous professional conversation (Stake, 2000). This researcher offers propositions derived from the knowledge constructed from the researcher’s interpretations of the perspectives of the study participants. As always, there is more research work to be done, but hopefully the results of this case study added to the conversation related to interorganizational collaboration between a community college and the individuals, groups, and organizations in its community.

This research revealed several areas for future study in collaborative alliances between community colleges and its community. As stated previously, Gray and Wood (1991) claim that in order to develop a comprehensive theory on the process of collaboration, the phenomenon must be studied at the domain or interorganizational level, not just at the individual organizational level, where most studies are centered. The few prior studies concerning the interrelationships between the college and the community have been primarily a study of the college or even more specifically of certain individuals in leadership roles at the college.
Future research in interorganizational collaboration between a community college and the individuals, groups, and organizations in its community needs to examine issues that are common to the collective or the domain level questions. In the continuing development of interorganizational collaboration theory, some key domain questions are: When and how is the choice made to adopt collaboration as the method to solve problems or otherwise deal with issues facing a network of organizations? When broader community issues arise, community college leadership has to have the theoretical tools to make a choice to participate as one of many to resolve issues of mutual interest. Clearer understanding is needed of the theoretical questions and assumptions that leaders must make regarding either convening a collaborative alliance or participating in an alliance upon the request of other stakeholders.

Another key focus for future studies involving the community college and its interactions with its local, state, or national community would be to examine how a traditionally organized community college might adapt its structures and procedures in certain areas or for certain situations to increase creativity and flexibility in collaborations. Studying these adaptations and their effects on both collaborations as well as the daily “business as usual” of the community college is necessary for understanding and contributing to any developing theory on collaboration. There is also the need to examine how the organizational structures, policies, practices, and cultures of different partners effect--both by helping or hindering--a particular collaboration or broader collaborative relationships.
According to Kanter (1994), institutions originally shape the collaboration, but the institutions are also changed by the interactions. Key questions that still need to be addressed are: Do institutional environments shape collaborations, or do collaborations shape institutional environments? How does this occur, and is change accepted by the management of the organizations involved?

Part of the issue of willingness to adapt by the college and other partners is the question of control of resources and power. A key issue that needs to be addressed is to define who has access to resources and power that influence the interorganizational domain. As perceived by participants of this study, members who felt they had the power to contribute fully were more willing to contribute more fully. Also important to understanding any democratic process is the question of whose interests are served and who does not benefit from the distribution of power and resources in the collaboration between a community college and other stakeholder groups and institutions.

Successful collaborations between a community college and its community groups are dependent upon the interactions and activities of the individuals who represent the various interests and stakeholders. Shifting the examination to the interorganizational domain level also shifts the attention to a systems perspective. Through a better understanding of the individual relationships, interactions, and group processes, it is important to ask how the participants in an interorganizational collaboration learn and adapt their behaviors so that the collective gains are achieved. An expansion on this question is how the
experience had changed their participative behavior in other situations. Also, in a
global interdependence worldview, it would be interesting to explore how group
tasks and roles are allocated among the actors as they participate in solving larger
community social problems.

As a study of community college and community collaboration, this study
suggested a need to further examine interorganizational collaboration as part of a
continuum. A continuum view of relationships including collaboration allowed for
differences in practice and the two distinct forms of interorganizational
collaboration observed in this case. The continuum perspective suggested a range
of characteristics that should be considered when forming a collaboration. College
and community representatives need a clear understanding of the characteristics
of the particular collaboration to effectively and efficiently form a cohesive group. A
clearer understanding of these various characteristics in the continuum is also the
first step to developing a more generalized theoretical model of effective
interorganizational community college and community collaborations. The models
proposed from in this study could be used in future studies to refine and elaborate
a comprehensive theory of interorganizational collaborations.

Implications for Practice in Community Colleges

The findings of this study have several implications for practice in
community college – community collaborations. According to Rendon (1999),
community colleges in the 21st century are becoming more relationship-centered.
Community colleges increasingly collaborate with public schools, universities,
businesses, industries, community-based organizations and groups, elected and appointed officials, health organizations, social service organizations, and the media. These collaborations bring more stakeholders together at one time. Community colleges will continue to work with other organizational entities in order to accomplish “the common work of educating diverse student populations and strengthening their communities” (Rendon, 1999, p. 1). By encouraging others to participate in the planning, to get involved in the work, and to take leadership roles, trust and respect can develop, and organizational creativity and flexibility can increase. This instrumental case study revealed the progressive development of an institutionalized, as well as a community collaborative attitude. Through continually participating in opportunities to successfully collaborate, the community college may well serve as an apotheosis or model for other partners, as well as enhancing the community college’s reputation and role as a community-building institution (Commission on the Future of Community Colleges, 1988).

An important implication for practice relates to being explicit about the type of collaboration to be used. Many partners come together with different views of the term “collaboration.” Recognition of different forms of collaboration at the initiation stage of formation should reduce conflicts in assumptions by the partners. Partners coming from a civic group background can bring assumptions of more equal distribution of power and consensus-based decision-making. Business partners can bring assumptions of autonomy in financial decisions, and may not be aware of the accountability procedures the college must use to do business as
a state agency. An understanding of the characteristics of the specific partnership may even need to be clearly articulated as part of planning documents and agreements reached, for example, in grant proposals. When individual organizations are clear about the kind of partnership in which they are going to be involved, they can choose how many resources and how much trust they are willing to commit.

Another specific area of implication for practice is the increasing pursuit of resources by community colleges in collaboration with partners. The participants in this study recognized the need for collective action to gain additional money through community fundraising as well as grant funding. Although Steven Zwerling of the Ford Foundation noted reservations that a collaborative approach may not always be the best approach, he stated that the trend is for many funding foundations and agencies to support interagency collaborations (Zwerling, 1998). A clear example was observed in this study. The president and other participants interviewed for this study felt that the USDA grant was mainly approved based on the strong support and involvement shown by the business and industries in the county.

Chapter Summary

Community colleges have established a strong tradition of working with individuals, groups, and other organizations in their communities. The community college literature is replete with examples of projects successfully completed as a result of cooperative and collaborative alliances with public schools, universities,
other community colleges, businesses, social welfare organizations, church groups, cultural arts groups, civic organizations, health organizations, local governments, and the media. Several national initiatives have been formed to improve the practices and relationships between community colleges and the various constituencies in their community.

Much of the community college literature provides examples of best practices without attempting to examine or explain the theoretical underpinnings for the interorganizational collaboration. General theoretical constructs help to make sense of this phenomenon, help to predict what follows, and help to guide practice. Qualitative case studies, which look at individual interorganizational collaborations systematically, build the knowledge base of propositions toward identifying common characteristics. These generalizations can then be used to form general theories.

This qualitative research case study examined the processes and interactions that one community college in North Carolina used to work with its community to obtain much needed funding for renovations of old buildings and new building construction. Several manifestations of interorganizational collaborations were observed in this study contextually based on the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond Referendum. The bond referendum was recognized as one of the first collaborative efforts by the state community college system and the state university system to work together to secure a combined funding package from the state legislature, instead of competing for state construction funds. A
major strategy that the state level organizers promoted was the formation of local campaign committees to help promote the benefits of capital funding for the local college and the local community. Key to the success of advocating for passage of the higher education bond referendum was the inclusion of local business leaders, local government leaders, and local public school leaders to the campaign committee. The local and state collaborative efforts provided the majority of the data for one manifestation of interorganizational collaboration.

A second manifestation of interorganizational collaboration occurred related to the design and construction of the building on the college campus. Because the building was initiated based on the availability of funds from the bond issuance, the participants felt that the design and construction of the vocation building was a corollary collaboration to the campaign collaboration. For this collaboration, the community college president promoted a collaborative process from the very beginning, with his administrative staff, with college faculty and trustees, and with local industry representatives. Key characteristics that participants observed were the self-managed group process and the cohesive attitude of the work groups. Also distinct about this manifestation was the morphing and continuation of relationships to ensure that the funding was available from multiple sources to construct the building as designed.

Based on analysis of the perspectives and archives of the HEFB and the design of the building, key findings provided a framework of understanding for interorganizational collaboration between community colleges and the
organizations, groups, and individuals in their community. First, Eastern Community College had a tradition of being seen by members of the community, as its own entity. Individual college leaders came and went, but “the college” was recognized as an active and essential partner in the economic welfare of the community, as well as, a part of the local educational system. From a systems perspective, the community college’s success was dependent upon helping address issues of other organizations in the community. Studying the community college as its own entity was essential to developing propositions related to interorganizational collaboration.

Second, a framework of mental models, organizational culture, and environmental conditions were in place for a succession of successful interorganizational collaborations to occur. Individuals in the community expected to participate in activities to benefit the college and the community. That expectation came from a long tradition following the establishment of community college in North Carolina. Citizens served in many advisory and oversight capacities for community colleges. In their search for the new college president, the ECC Board of Trustees purposefully asked for citizen participation in the selection process and consciously searched for an individual who exhibited collaborative leadership tendencies. Once selected, Andrews espoused and modeled collaborative characteristics in the local bond referendum campaign and in the unique way of including community members’ input into the design for the building that was predicated on the bond issuance funding. Community members
responded positively to requests for the input of their resources and influence because they shared the goal of bringing funding to the county educational system, and they were interested in addressing the issue of increasing opportunities for training in the vocational trades.

Lastly, the interorganizational collaborations in this study were perceived as separate and distinct manifestations of collaboration. These manifestations were identified as goal-based interorganizational collaboration and issue-based interorganizational collaboration. The two models were described based on the following characteristics: purpose for the collaboration, key initiating roles of organizational leadership, group characteristics, attitudes and values, group processes, and outcome of the collaboration. The state and local level bond referendum campaign collaborations provided the basis for the goal-based interorganizational collaboration model. The building design process and subsequent additional funding activities provided the basis for the issue-based interorganizational collaboration model. A matrix was developed to visually frame the two models.

Implications for future research and practice were addressed. Hopefully, this research will add to the literature toward a formation of a general theory for interorganizational collaboration. In addition, key understandings were proposed to add to the community college literature related to collaborating with numerous groups in the community. Identifying key characteristics of the relationships and processes of interorganizational collaboration between community colleges and
their communities add to the development of general interorganizational theory. In turn, development of theory can help guide the practice and predict successful interorganizational collaborations. One particular implication noted was the trend by grant funding foundations and agencies to fund interagency collaborations.

In conclusion, this study examined the interactions and processes a community college used to build relationships with organizations, groups and individuals in its community to work toward a common goal. Although it is not always the only or the best tool or process that leaders of a community college may use to solve problems, interorganizational collaboration does bring more resources and creative problem solving to bear on issues that may be beyond the capabilities of the resources of a single institution or group. In addition, the creativity and innovation generated in a successful collaboration creates enthusiasm and encourages individuals and organizations to participate in future collaborations. In order to respond to the rapidly changing world, community colleges must continue to build relationships, overcome barriers to working together, and think inclusively and holistically about their interactions with the numerous and diverse organizations, groups, and individuals in their global community.
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Appendix A

Title of Study: Community College and Community Collaboration: An Instrumental Case Study

Principle Investigator: Rebecca Pulliam Francis
Faculty Sponsor: Dr. Carol E. Kasworm

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to examine the interactions and processes a community college uses to collaborate with its community. One community college will be studied in-depth to provide understanding of how community college leaders build alliances and collaborations with the numerous constituencies in the community in order to achieve a common goal.

INFORMATION

?? You are asked to participate in an interview that will last approximately 60 minutes, with the option of a follow-up interview at a later date.
?? The interview will be tape recorded, so that your perceptions are accurately portrayed in the study results. Notes will also be taken during the interview.
?? Direct quotes from participants will be used to demonstrate the validity of claims made, but quotes that identify the speaker will not be included.
?? Data will be used in preparation of a doctoral dissertation and may be used for future publication and presentation.

RISKS

There is no anticipated physical or mental risk to you. Participation is limited to exchanging information through interviews.

BENEFITS

This research will contribute to the understanding of how leaders in a community college work with their community toward common goals. Awareness of the experiences and processes used by one community college to develop alliances and collaborations with the community leaders and citizens may be of interest for other community college-community collaborations.

CONFIDENTIALITY

The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless written permission is obtained from you to do otherwise. No reference that could link you to the study will be made in oral or written reports.

COMPENSATION

For participating in this study you will receive no compensation. If you withdraw from the study prior to its completion, you will receive no compensation.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, Rebecca Pulliam Francis, at 1543G Yelverton Grove Road, Smithfield, NC 27577, or 919-934-1934. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Matthew Zingraff, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in
PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be destroyed.

CONSENT
I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject’s signature_______________________________________ Date _________________
Investigator’s signature__________________________________ Date _________________
Appendix B

COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION
Semi-structured Interview Guide - College

I. Describe the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign in Emerson County.

II. Individual Role
   a. Describe how you became involved in the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign.
   b. What role or roles did you play in the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign? What activities did you participate in during the 2000 HEFB campaign?
   c. How did your roles and activities change over time?

III. Processes
   a. Who was involved in the planning for the campaign? (Why was it important to get them involved?)
   b. What leadership, management, and group processes were used to develop and maintain the collaboration?
   c. How were the processes agreed upon? Was there training involved?
   d. From the experience with the HEFB, how could the processes be improved?

IV. Interactions and Relationships
   a. Describe the groups or individuals involved in the HEFB.
   b. What kind of interactions and relationships did you have to build and/or maintain?
   c. From the experience with the HEFB, how could the interactions be improved?

V. Individual Context (Background)
   a. Current position and/or role with the college.
   b. How had you worked with the community as a representative of the college prior to the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign?
   c. What other projects, activities or relationships did you have with the community prior to the 2000 bond campaign?

VI. Additions
   a. Is there anything you would like to add?
   b. Could you please suggest other individuals, documents, tapes, files or other sources of information that would help me in this research?
Appendix C

COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION
Semi-structured Interview Guide - Community

I. Describe the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign in Emerson County.

II. Individual Role
   a. Describe how you became involved in the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign.
   b. What role or roles did you play in the 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond campaign?
   c. What activities did you participate in during the 2000 HEFB campaign?
   d. How did your roles and activities change over time?

III. Processes
   a. Who was involved in the planning for the campaign? (Why was it important to get them involved?)
   b. What leadership, management, and group processes were used to develop and maintain the collaboration?
   c. How were the processes agreed upon? Was there training involved?
   d. From the experience with the HEFB, how could the processes be improved?

IV. Interactions and Relationships
   a. Describe the groups or individuals involved in the HEFB.
   b. What kind of interactions and relationships did you have to build and/or maintain?
   c. From the experience with the HEFB, how could the interactions be improved?

V. Individual Context (Background)
   a. Current position and/or role in the community.
   b. What other projects, activities or relationships did you have with the college prior to the 2000 bond campaign?

VI. Additions
   a. Is there anything you would like to add?
   b. Could you please suggest other individuals, documents, tapes, files or other sources of information that would help me in this research?
Appendix D

COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND COMMUNITY COLLABORATION
Semi-structured Interview Guide- Building Design

I. Describe the design process for the proposed vocational building to be built at Eastern Community College using 2000 Higher Education Facilities Bond funds.

II. Individual Role
   a. Describe how you became involved in designing the vocational building.
   b. What role or roles did you play in designing the vocational building? What activities did you participate in during the design process?
   c. How did your roles and activities change over time?

III. Processes
   a. Who was involved in the planning for the building? (Why was it important to get them involved?)
   b. What leadership, management, and group processes were used to develop and maintain the collaboration?
   c. How were the processes agreed upon? Was there training involved?
   d. From the experience, how could the processes be improved?

IV. Interactions and Relationships
   a. Describe the groups or individuals involved in designing the vocational building.
   b. What kind of interactions and relationships did you have to build and/or maintain?
   c. From the experience, how could the interactions be improved?

V. Individual Context (Background)
   a. Current position and/or role with the college.
   b. How had you worked with the community as a representative of the college prior to designing the vocational building?
   c. What other projects, activities or relationships did you have with the community prior to designing the vocational building?

VI. Additions
   a. Is there anything you would like to add?
   b. Could you please suggest other individuals, documents, tapes, files or other sources of information that would help me in this research?