THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AN UNFUNDED STATEWIDE CURRICULAR MANDATE

A Dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

---

by

Lyndsey Strahan

Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, Dissertation Supervisor

May 2022

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

THE ROLE OF FACULTY IN THE IMPLENTATION OF AN

UNFUNDED STATEWIDE CURRICULAR MANDATE

presented by Lyndsey Strahan,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of education,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

_____

Dr. Cynthia Macgregor, Committee Chair

_____

Dr. Kennedy Ongaga

_____

Dr. Tracey Glaessgen

_____

Dr. Michael Hudson

DEDICATION

First, many thanks to my family: my dad and Kym, my mom and my sister, Allyson. They supported me in every way, and made it clear their dreams for me had no limits. Here, I also want to remember my grandparents. None of them are here to witness this accomplishment, but boy would they have loved it.

There are no words to thank Jennifer Bump, Bridget Dierks, Sarah Hicks, and Michelle Hudgens for their friendship and support. I can only say that I am infinitely grateful, especially to Sarah for driving several hours to provide meals to get me through a particularly difficult time and that night she sent tacos.

I would also like to thank Barrie Talbott: my teacher, my mentor, and my friend. I wouldn't be here without her friendship and guidance. She saw the potential in me and asked me to pursue it. I'd like to thank her especially for the introduction to Paulo Freire. May we be "co-investigators" always.

To John Chiles: thanks for the many ways you make life sweeter and more fun.

Thanks to the Well Fed Head Book Club for your 17+ years of good reads and conversation. I have no doubt they have shaped my thinking in ways that assisted me in this pursuit of higher knowledge.

Finally, many thanks to Betsy Fogle and Crystal Quade for being my inspiration to turn words into action.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I must begin by thanking Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, my dissertation chair and program advisor, who gave so generously of her time and expertise. When I doubted myself in the research process, she insisted I was capable. For that I will always be grateful. Additionally, I want to thank the other members of my dissertation committee. I was fortunate that Dr. Tracey Glaessgen, Dr. Michael Hudson, and Dr. Kennedy Ongaga shared their gifts, expertise, and feedback to improve this research.

During this program, I was also very lucky to have two supervisors who valued my leadership development and supported me through this dissertation process: Dr. Tracy McGrady and Dr. Drew Aberle. Their guidance and inexhaustible cheering was an essential boon as I finished this race. There's nothing quite like knowing the leaders you admire believe in and value your work.

I would also like to thank Cohort Eleven for their camaraderie and support. Our two years of coursework was a lot sweat and tears but also a lot of laughs and fun. Thanks specifically to my comprehensive exam group: Hillary Roberts, Courtney Smith-Nelson, and T. Michelle Hudgens.

Finally, many thanks to my fellow cohort member, draft reader, and dear friend, Michelle Hudgens, with whom I started this journey and without whom I would not have been able to correctly format this table of contents.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

This case study used qualitative research methods to examine the role faculty play in the application of a general education policy mandate in the state of Missouri. Senate bill 997 required that general education be transferable between all public colleges and universities in the state. To aid in this endeavor, a committee made of faculty representatives from those colleges and universities were to consult on that curriculum and review courses to be included in a shared set of general education courses. For this research, ten members of this committee responded to surveys, eight of those ten members were interviewed, and primary documents were analyzed to search for patterns in structure and power manifestation. This data was analyzed using Freire's (1970/2000) banking concept and Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. The results were that faculty expertise was central to committee selection, but preparation for this work was not a priority. Additionally, selection processes for this committee were inconsistent. The curricular work for this committee was intense and came with little reward or structural support. Faculty expected the work to be more advisory instead of policy creation. And, there were many narratives of power. These findings indicate further investigation into the structure of faculty roles in policy work, especially in regard to curriculum, are needed.

CHAPTER ONE:

INTRODUCTION TO THE DISSERTATION

Background

The landscape of higher education is being vastly affected by private interest groups and not-for-profit groups. For example, the Lumina Foundation (2016) has lobbied and advocated on behalf of outcome-based funding, claiming this is an effective strategy by which to hold institutions of higher education accountable. Meanwhile, Complete College America (CCA) has had sweeping legislative influence that has resulted in major curricular changes in developmental education. In fact, it is their purpose to impact legislation. According to the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (MDHEWD, n.d., -a), CCA has partnered with 40 states to obtain commitments to their agenda, which included drastically changing the structure of developmental education. This begs several questions: how are these and other neoliberal influences changing the role of faculty? Should curriculum be revised through legislation written by business people and politicians?

In Missouri, recent legislation in S. B. 997 (2016) was developed with good intentions. Policy makers observed the difficulty of institutional transfer and the money students lost in unaccepted credits. Thus, this legislation would provide this solution: "the core curriculum and common course matrix will help streamline the transfer of college credit to help students earn a degree in less time and at less cost" (MDHEWD, n.d., -b). This indicated that the main object was to remove cost and obstacles for students who transfer between institutions in the state. This common curricular mandate, referred to specifically as Core 42, required the transferability of general education in public institutions of higher education in Missouri. To determine what this common curricular content would be, S. B. 997 (2016) also required the formation of a faculty advisory

committee, the Common Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC) to make recommendations. However, these policy makers did not consider the complexity of higher education and the many unintended consequences of requiring these transfers and requiring them to happen so quickly.

Statement of the Problem

There is increasing public and political pressure for universities and colleges to demonstrate measurable outcomes that quantify the public goods and services they provide. One example of this pressure is the use of models that assess specific outcomes, like retention, to determine funding for public institutions (Lumina Foundation, 2016). As of January 2018, Missouri joined thirty-five other states in adopting one of these performance-based funding models (Fain, 2018). As the outputs and goals of higher education come under more intense scrutiny, additional policy is put into place that governs how higher education, and thus faculty, function (Levin, Martin, López Damián, & Hoggatt, 2018).

While higher education faculty members at four-year research institutions often have legacies and defined roles of shared governance, community college faculty often have ill-defined expectations of their role in policy-making and how to fill it (Levin, 2017). In addition, higher education faculty members have a more complex role that includes research and service involvement. This allows more time to develop content expertise that better prepares four-year faculty for policy involvement (Levin, 2017; Moore & Ward, 2010). This authoritative disparity has made it difficult for faculty from both community college and universities to collaborate on policy issues that require input from both types of institutions.

Levin, Kater, and Wagoner (2006) discussed the varied and uncertain development of community college faculty member identity. As the multiple missions of the community college are complex, so is the identity of the community college faculty member. The identity of the four-year faculty member is more concrete: they are content experts and knowledge creators in their respective fields of study (Levin, 2017). However, community college faculty members are part content expert, part learning expert, and part higher education guides (Levin et al., 2006). In other words, community college faculty have advanced degrees and experience in their content area, have developed expertise in teaching that specific content, and develop an understanding of how to support and guide students, with little to no external supports, through the process of higher education. Additionally, teaching loads for community college faculty are traditionally higher than their four-year counterparts. At a community college, full-time faculty members are typically expected to teach five classes, or fifteen hours per semester (Jenkins, 2014). In contrast, four-year faculty teaching varies widely depending on research requirements and discipline but is typically not more than nine hours per semester (Hanlon, 2019). The rationale for this disparity is community college faculty members are typically not expected to produce research, but there is no consideration for the time it takes to cultivate these other specializations (Levin, 2017). Therefore, the role of a community college faculty member is overwhelmed with teaching obligation much as four-year faculty members are occupied with research and services. Thus, it is no surprise when little time is left for policy involvement.

As the role of community colleges grows, it is essential that two-year faculty have a defined role to advocate for and protect curricular authority as their four-year partners

do (Levin et al., 2006). Currently, the role of community college faculty can have many and varied dimensions including knowledge expertise, teaching expertise, and being guides to higher education (Levin, et al., 2006). Since community college students are often first-generation students, in addition to being knowledge experts, faculty often "guide" students through the norms and expectations of higher education. Additionally, the National Education Association (NEA, n.d.), stated community college faculty should establish and maintain curriculum. Curricular authority is a distinct issue from policy such as the Core 42 mandate focused on in this study, but it is important to note Core 42 is an example of policy that has significantly affected curriculum. Therefore, curricular authority is essential to establish when discussing the role of faculty in policy that affects curriculum.

Though it is clear faculty have authority in curriculum, Bolman and Gallos (2011) addressed that many faculty do not see policy participation as central to their identity. Even though they have the knowledge and should have the authority to engage in this policy work, faculty members might not be involved because the culture and structure does not encourage or provide enough opportunity to do so. Therein lies the problem: faculty members have curricular authority, but unstructured participation in policy that affects curriculum is allowing for erosion of that authority.

If outcomes are determined by institutional structure as Bolman and Deal (2013) claimed, then the structure of faculty policy work like the Core 42 curricular mandate must be examined to see if the present structure allows for or supports the authority of faculty. In Missouri, a legislated mandate intruded into the curricular authority of faculty. This intrusion and the consequent impacts on the roles and responsibilities of faculty

have not been investigated. Such lack of investigation obfuscates the encroachment of legislation on the authority of faculty in curriculum.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to document the formation of the Core Curriculum Advisory Committee (CCAC) and its implementation of a transferable core curriculum in the state of Missouri. This study will also seek to view this formation and implementation through a neoliberal lens to consider how private entities and non-profit groups have gained legislative influence in higher education curriculum. To pursue this purpose, members of the CCAC described the selection, preparation, and responsibilities of that advisory committee. Current understandings and definitions of faculty roles were discussed to compare expectations of this work with the reality of faculty identity.

One effect of neoliberalism in higher education is that the professional life of the college faculty member has so many essential demands that there is not room for policy work as an essential part of the faculty role (Levin et al., 2006). If the social and political influence of nonprofit groups continue to grow, defining the processes through which faculty shape curriculum policy, and thus knowledge development, will be crucial. Understanding the formation and implementation of these polices will enable the academic community to guide that impact in positive ways. Therefore, this study will document the formation and implementation for one curriculum mandate in the state of Missouri to inform the role of faculty in future legislation that impacts curricular authority.

Research Questions

1. What was the selection process for Common Curricular Advisory Committee members? Specifically, how were the following addressed:
    a. Qualification
    b. Preparation
    c. Selection
2. What were the responsibilities and rewards for serving in the CCAC role?
3. How did faculty roles and the CCAC role align?
4. How was power manifested in the formation and implementation of the CCAC?

Conceptual Framework

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970/2000) explained how an educational structure that does not allow questions or critical development of consciousness denies the humanity of students. He claimed education is a vehicle by which people learn to interact with and question the world or accept the world as it is given to them. Thus, education is either a tool for empowerment or a tool that works in the service of oppression. A specific example of this structural oppression is laid out in Guinier's (2015) collection of research on testing and admission in higher education. Guinier (2015) claimed that higher education supports the current social structure by admitting those from families with wealth and power rather than democratizing the population through education. Thus, structural problems in education are revealed despite the best intentions of teachers and others working to use the system as a means of change and empowerment. Similarly, policy implementation may be shaped by structures of wealth and power.

Organizations (e.g., Lumina Foundation and Complete College American (CCA)), currently driving educational policy changes in the United States are part of a movement that prioritizes efficiency and quantifiable outcomes. These values are central to the political movement of neoliberalism that encourages the application of competitive marketplace principles to education to reduce the need for public funding and increase productivity (Levin, 2017). These private organizations are themselves structures of wealth and power. The CCA has ties to significant power and wealth as their funding partners include the Carnegie Corporation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Complete College America, 2020; Mangan, 2013). Additionally, the Lumina Foundation (n.d. -a) has an endowment that exceeds one billion dollars and was a company originally created to guarantee student loans. Thus, the Lumina Foundation has incredible wealth that was originally built on the reality that students were not able to independently afford college. In other words, the foundation of that wealth came from the oppression of those without wealth or power.

The values of neoliberalism are reflected in the recent legislative influence these organizations have brought to bear. These policies, like the aforementioned performance-based models, have focused on outcomes with measurable tools so that funding for higher education is tied to those outcomes. These policies were directly supported by the Lumina Foundation and other private organizations as part of their state policy agenda (Lumina Foundation, n.d. -b). The Missouri policy that has come to be known as Core 42 is another example of neoliberal influence in educational policy. As Core 42 is a mandate that directly affects curriculum, this begs the question, how is neoliberalism manifesting in the role of faculty in the implementation of a curricular policy mandate?

Freire (1970/2000) provides a critical lens through which to view Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. Central to Freire's theory (1970/2000) is his claim that the structure of education oppressed when students were taught the nature of life, and thus the nature of work, is not to question but to follow orders and accept authority. Since the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) provides a framework for understanding the organization of human capital, combining the two brings a critical consciousness to examining this organization of labor. The framework highlights the nature of work, including selection, responsibilities, rewards, and alignment between roles. One major influence of this framework is Weber's bureaucratic model (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Central to this model is a fixed division of labor, a hierarchical power structure, personnel selection based on qualifications, and employment as central to identify (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The patriarchal approach of Weber emphasized centralized power and authority and will be used to understand the way faculty work is being restructured (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The Core 42 curricular mandate can be seen as an attempt to extend the neoliberal agenda by changing the way faculty work is understood in higher education. For this study, the structural organization of faculty work will be viewed through the structural frame as influenced by Weber's bureaucratic model (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Given the oppression of neoliberal efforts, the structure of faculty work in implementing a curricular mandate will be examined.

Bruffee (1993/1999) defined knowledge as something that lives in professional communities and that is negotiated by those communities through discourse as opposed to something that is held by experts or by proximity to experts. While Freire (1970/2000) will provide a critical lens with which to examine the structural frame (Bolman & Deal,

2013), Bruffee's (1993/1999) ideas of the social construction of knowledge will provide a conceptual understanding of the way power controls discourse. In the case of the Core 42 curricular mandate, a faculty advisory committee was tasked with implementation as facilitated by the Missouri Department of Higher Education. Therefore, this policy is an example of expert knowledge (a common curriculum, or what students should know) being decided through expert conversations (committee meetings and subcommittee meetings and course reviews). By applying a critical lens to the structures used to socially construct this policy, a critical constructivist approach is created. This will allow an examination of how the power structures constrained the discourse possible for socially constructing faculty roles.

Finally, if Freire (1970/2000) argued that structure either oppresses or liberates, then the question of who or what is oppressing in current educational policy is answered by looking at neoliberal influences. Levin (2017) documented these influences in higher education by arguing that political and industrial powers have pressured colleges and universities to increase efficiencies and serve industry needs. However, Levin (2017) followed this by pointing to the logics, or central missions of these colleges, which is to serve students and provided education as a public good. Thus, these policies are having unintended consequences because as the structure is changed to fit new outcomes, other more central outcomes and values are being damaged or diminished.

Design of the Study: Qualitative Methods

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described a central belief of qualitative research as understanding that knowledge is made as work is conducted. Therefore, to examine the way in which work is done is one approach to making knowledge about the work. In this

study, the Core 42 curricular mandate was examined to discover how the formation and implementation of this mandate can offer insight into how political influences are shaping higher education in Missouri. A case study design (Yin, 2017) was used because this study documented and interpreted the formation and implementation of one part of S. B. 997 (2016) The description of this mandate implementation presented itself as a bounded system. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) specified that there is a finite amount of data collection in case studies to indicate the unit of analysis is in fact "bounded." This is the case here as there was one group charged with implementing this mandate for the state of Missouri. Additionally, this case study initially planned to only examine the implementation period of the CCAC, the time the committee had to implement and create the structure for transferability: January 2017 – August 2018. However, that time was expanded to include others working on the implementation currently so as to capture more participants. Thus, this case study design was not generalized, but was specific to this particular mandate. Finally, as Yin (2014) instructed, multiple sources of evidence were triangulated to "create a case study database."

In this specific case study, the influence of power dynamics is a central component of this study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described this kind of examination as an intersection between qualitative research and critical theory where questions are asked about who has power and how structures support that power. The goal of this kind of research was to reveal these power dynamics in order to affect change (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In this study, the structure of a specific policy implementation was made visible in order to examine the power dynamics of curricular policy in Missouri's higher education system.

Setting

The setting for this study uses the structural frame from Bolman and Deal (2013) to consider Weick's (1978/1983) description of loosely coupled systems as the structure within which institutions of higher education function. Additionally, the history and influence of the Lumina Foundation and Complete College America provide the context for how neoliberal ideas have been enabled by these loosely structured institutions. Since the legislation being studied, the Core 42 mandate contained in S. B. 997 (2016), was passed into law by the Missouri Senate and then implemented by the Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development, their loosely coupled structure with colleges and universities in Missouri is also relevant context. Thus, instead of the structure of one institution or set of institutions, the setting is a particular time and set of places where structures and influences enabled a significant shift in the curricular functioning of general education in Missouri.

Participants

The original CCAC was the intended participant pool. S. B. 997 (2016) required that the CCAC be made up of one faculty representative per public institution of higher education. Thus, the original group included twenty-seven faculty members: fourteen from the public two-year colleges and thirteen from the public four-year universities. Each member was contacted by the researcher. However, there was a low response rate. Thus, the participant group was expanded to CCAC representatives beyond the original twenty-seven. Ten participants responded to the survey, and of those ten, eight agreed to and responded to an interview invitation. While the goal was to have equal representation between two-year and four-year representatives, more two-year faculty responded. Thus,

there were three interview participants from four-year institutions and five participants from two-year institutions. Additionally, the researcher participant was also full-time faculty at a two-year institution. With this in mind, it was important to give institutional context for the data.

Sampling Method

The sampling method for this study was classified as both purposeful and snowball sampling. Creswell (2014) explained that unlike quantitative methods, qualitative methods often do not rely on random sampling and large numbers of participants. In this case, the researcher's access to the original members of the CCAC made the sample purposeful. In this case, the CCAC are a group with a unique experience that will be examined for this study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described a group with an unusual experience a unique sample, so for this study the type of purposeful sampling used is unique sampling. Since there was a low response initially, snowball sampling was added as way to add more participants. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that initial participants could be asked to refer other relevant participants. In this care, original members of the CCAC who agreed to participate were asked if they could refer other CCAC members who might be willing to share their experiences in these surveys and interviews.

Researcher Positionality

Creswell (2014) stated that is essential for researchers to identify their potential biases and personal background which may shape their interpretations of data in a qualitative study. In this study, it was especially important since the researcher was also a former member of the CCAC making her a researcher participant. She represented her

institution, a two-year college in the southern part of Missouri and served on the committee for three years. Merriam and Tidell (2016) explained the importance of reflecting on "insider/outsider" issues. In this case, the researcher was an insider as someone who was part of and privy to the process. This benefits the research as this position provided access to data and context that outsiders would not have. However, with insider status come bias, and therefore, the data analysis had to be carefully constructed to avoid results that reflected that bias.

Data Collection

Ethical Considerations

Prior to beginning data collection, it was necessary to apply to the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for the University of Missouri for the research to be approved (Creswell, 2014). It was also necessary to review the code of ethics from the American Educational Research Association (AERA) to ensure the researcher considered the ethical guidelines of the field of educational research (Creswell, 2014). Additionally, as a part of the IRB process, it was necessary to design and submit informed consent forms (see Appendix A) to protect both the participants' privacy and the integrity of the data (Seidman, 2013). Finally, Fink (2017) warns of bias with qualitative survey data. In this case, the researcher collected data from a group of which she is also a member. Thus, the researcher must acknowledge participation in the group. Creswell (2014) stated the importance of the researcher explicitly stating how their experiences could shape interpretation. This will be especially important for the researcher to do as an original member of the CCAC. To ensure validity of the results, triangulation and peer debriefing will be used to confirm the results from the qualitative data. Additionally, triangulation of

the data was first done by excluding the reflections of the researcher. These methods described by Creswell (2014) were particularly important to demonstrate the results as valid and not a verification of the researcher's view of events.

Surveys

Surveys are the data collection tool that was used to begin the study. Fink (2017) explained that open-ended questions are more insightful regarding individual experiences, but are more difficult to analyze. For this study, individual experiences are needed to better understand this specific case of policy implementation, so many open-ended questions were used to survey all original members of the CCAC. The same set of questions was sent to CCAC members at the same time (see Appendix B).

Semi-Structured Interviews

After the survey data was collected, some survey participants were identified for follow-up interviews. Since the population of survey participants was small, the interview participants became an additional convenience sample. In this case, only eight survey participants were both willing to be interviewed and responded to the interview invitation. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that maximum variation sampling looks for characteristics that are representative of the group and that are relevant to the study. For this study, an equal number of two-year and four-year representatives would have been ideal, but not enough participants responded to use maximum variation sampling.

While some questions were planned for all interviews, the structure of the interviews were flexible to allow for follow-up questions that varied (see Appendix C). Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that this structure allows for the unexpected to emerge from the responses. Ideally, these interviews would have been in person to build

rapport by observing visual cues (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). However, due to Covid-19, all interviews were conducted via Zoom. By using a video call, the "spontaneity of oral responses" and the visual cues were preserved (Seidman, 2013). However, though recording a visual provided a capture of these interactions, it is worth wondering if the lack of in-person presence had any effect on established rapport.

Document Analysis

Documents relevant to the formation and implementation of the mandate were analyzed. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained that documents should not be the primary source of data but are supplementary. In this case emails, training materials, and agendas were analyzed and coded along with the surveys and interviews. The researcher had these materials in her records.

Data Analysis

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) specified that open coding is the process of making notes in the data to determine categories, and following that process with axial coding is the process by which these categories are grouped to determine answers to research questions. Next, "in vivo" coding was used to capture themes based on participant responses. This was the data analysis protocol for this study. With each set of data, the researcher will made list of categories and then compared to look for patterns. Again following the instructions of Merriam and Tisdell (2016), the researcher was foremost thinking about the purpose of the study and how those categories could answer the research questions and keep in mind the conceptual framework that provides the lens for the study.

Limitations

This study was limited by the number of participants. Yin (2014) explained that case studies typically require multiple sources of data because, unlike grounded theory, data saturation is not the goal. Rather since the data is "bounded" (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), triangulation is most essential. However, this also means that this study did produce results that can be generalized. Instead they capture the experience of a small group of people who had a specific experience.

Significance of the Study

Understanding how this policy mandate about curriculum was implemented is essential to understanding the impact of legislation on the structure of higher education and the authority of faculty in curriculum. Both policies like the Core 42 mandate and organizations like the Lumina Foundation and Complete College America are firmly entrenched in higher education. Thus, this research was an important contribution to scholarship because defining these processes and the neoliberal effects on these processes will be important for advocates of higher education to be strategic and proactive as this kind of influence continues to grow. To evaluate the impact of these mandates, the implementation and current political influences must be understood.

Summary

S. B. 997 (2016), the legislation passed in Missouri mandating transferability of general education classes amongst all public institutions of higher education, is reflective of nationwide patterns of neoliberal influence. The structure and implementation of this legislation was examined with qualitative research methods of coding surveys, interviews, and document analysis. To guide this inquiry, a framework was used that

combines Freire's (1970/2000) idea of education as a system of power with Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. Additionally, Bruffee's (1993/1999) theory of socially constructed knowledge was intended to inform this study. This research was significant and should inform faculty methods of advocating for their curricular authority in the now quickly changing world of higher education.

SECTION TWO:

PRACTITIONER SETTING FOR THE STUDY

Introduction to the Practitioner Setting

The setting of this study is unusual because instead of one institution or set of institutions, the setting is the context that framed the work of the statewide faculty advisory committee charged with implementing the Core 42 curricular mandate. This particular context is one that has been influenced by key private and non-profit organizations that have shaped legislation nationwide. The pattern of influence in Missouri legislation affecting higher education is representative of nationwide changes. By considering Weick's (1978/1983) loosely coupled systems together with Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame as an overlay for private foundations influencing higher education policy in the state of Missouri, it can be seen that the current political context indicates a need to investigate faculty authority in general education curriculum.

Structural Frame and Loose Coupling

Bolman and Deal (2013) used a structural frame as a device to examine how an organization's objectives and values are supported by its structure. Institutions of higher education have been structured to preserve their institutional authority. Traditionally, this has meant each institution has their own curricular processes facilitated by faculty with the assumption that faculty hold authority over curriculum as the discipline experts. However, the recent legislation discussed in this study has bypassed those processes exposing a weakness in the structure of faculty authority in higher education.

Weick's (1978/1983) work described the structure of educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. The term "loosely coupled systems" indicated that groups or events respond to each other but have their own separate identity. Loosely coupled systems are slow to respond to each other and have ties that are easy to dissolve. Weick

explained this type of system can be positive because it allows for "localized adaption" (p. 22). For higher education, a body less standardized than K-12, this allowance for adaptation is essential for each institution to serve its unique population and institutional objectives. So, for example, institutions might work together on transferability agreements, but neither is beholden to the other's institutional mission. Thus, there is room for collaboration without coercion because each institution preserves their autonomy. Additionally, however, this means there is often no incentive to collaborate and there is not much centralized and organized advocacy for higher education as a whole. In this case, institutions of higher education were slow to address issues of transferability and outside organizations took advantage of these loose couplings and decentralized authority to influence curricular policy change.

Lumina Foundation

One of the organizations that played a significant role in influencing legislation is the Lumina Foundation. The name Lumina is almost ubiquitous with educational grants and initiatives, a nonprofit brand associated with PBS sponsorships, which gives the foundation a certain cultural capital. However, the Lumina Foundation story starts not in the world of nonprofit grant making and policy-influencing, but in the world of business, more specifically loan guarantees. The history of the Lumina Foundation is detailed on Lumina's own website in a document that details their rise to nonprofit prominence. Before they became the Lumina Foundation, they were USA Group Inc., parent company to USA Funds, "the nation's largest private guarantor and administrator of education loans" (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -c). In July 2000, USA Group sold their operating assets to Sallie Mae for $770 million and used the money to restructure from a public

charity to a private foundation to be renamed the Lumina Foundation (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -c). According to a letter to Sallie Mae shareholders shortly after the merger, this combination brought together "one of the nations' leading student loan providers, USA Group, with Sallie Mae, the largest student loan capital provider" (Sallie Mae, 2000). In a report from the United States Treasury Department on the privatization of Sallie Mae it was stated that this acquisition allowed Sallie Mae to diversify their revenue, specifically by increasing their fee-based revenue (U.S. Department of the Treasury, 2006). This history provides a relevant frame for the current work of the foundation.

On their website, the Lumina Foundation describes the organization as follows:

> Lumina Foundation is an independent, private foundation in Indianapolis that is committed to making opportunities for learning beyond high school available to all. We envision a system that is easy to navigate, delivers fair results, and meets the nation's need for talent through a broad range of credentials. Our goal is to prepare people for informed citizenship and for success in a global economy. (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -d)

More specifically, Lumina's state policy agenda specifies five ways states should shift their educational policies: ambitious, measurable goals should be set, invest in a strategic finance plan, prioritize student outcomes, increase affordability, and innovate by developing alternative career paths (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -b).

Currently, the Lumina Foundation is a private foundation led by president and CEO Jamie Merisotis (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -e). Their board of directors is made up of thirteen members with one as chair (Lumina Foundation, n.d., -f). According to their

most recent financial statement, they hold a diversified investment portfolio and accept monetary donations (Lumina Foundation, n.d. -g).

Complete College America

Complete College America is a non-profit group, which also has a president and board structure, though their board has nine members and none is designated with a chair position. Their financial information is not openly published on their website, but they have announced funding on their website. Most recently in January of 2020, Complete College America received $1.5 million from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (Complete College America, 2020). According to *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, The Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation helped start Complete College America with an $8 million donation (Mangan, 2013).

Complete College America has more direct ties to the legislative changes happening in Missouri and across the nation than the Lumina Foundation. They present their mission as one of equalization. On their informational page, Complete College America states that they envision higher education in America as one that is an equal playing field where no matter what a student's social background or cultural challenge, they are supported throughout the system to a completed degree (Complete College America, n.d., -a). CCA has six policy priorities, or what they refer to as "game changers": 15 to finish, math pathways, co-requisite support, momentum year, academic maps with proactive advising, and a better deal for returning adults (Complete College America, n.d., -a).

Though separate entities, Lumina Foundation and Complete College America have similar platforms and often collaborate as such. One example of this was bringing

guided pathways to Indiana's higher education system (Complete College America, 2014). Additionally, The Lumina Foundation often funds grants for Complete College America (Lumina Foundation, n.d. -h). These partnerships demonstrate a united, if not completely unified, approach to influencing policy in higher education in the United States.

Influence on Missouri Legislation

In large part due to lobbying from Complete College America, two of CCA's initiatives have been accomplished in Missouri, math pathways and co-requisite support. According to a report from the Missouri Department of Higher Education, their work and development of math pathways through the Missouri Mathematics Pathways Taskforce (MMPT) was co-sponsored by Complete College America and the Charles A. Dana Center at the University of Texas –Austin. This resulted in a major policy change in higher education institutions: no longer was College Algebra the math class required for every college graduate. As a result of this work, there are now many "paths" for completing the math requirement for a bachelor's degree depending on the program of study selected by students (MDHEWD, n.d., -c). Academic pathways for all undergraduate programs were included in the same senate bill as Core 42. As a result, many colleges now provide "maps" for their undergraduate programs. For example, when exploring a business degree from Ozarks Technical Community College, several pathways, or requirement maps, are prominently displayed (Ozarks Technical Community College, n.d. -a).

While The Lumina Foundation and Complete College America did not directly advocate for the transferability legislation included in S. B. 997 (2016) that resulted in the

creation of Core 42, they are a part of that larger pattern that made that kind of legislation possible. Their advocacy on behalf of pathways and co-requisite restructuring of developmental education laid the groundwork for the idea that curriculum was not being handled appropriately by faculty. Additionally, the loosely coupled structure (Weick, 1978/1983) amplified this opening. No authority or advocate was in place to challenge the coming changes.

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development

The Missouri Department of Higher Education, recently re-named The Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development (MDHEWD) is directed by the Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE). This nine-member board is appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate (MDHEWD, n.d. -d). The CBHE then appoints a Commissioner who leads the board and together they accomplish their duties through six offices: Office of Operations, Office of Postsecondary Policy, Office of Workforce Development, Office of Performance & Strategy, Office of Communications and Outreach, and Office of General Counsel (MDHEWD, n.d. -e). MDHEWD directs and implements the higher education policies in efforts to increase the quality of, and participation in, Missouri's institutions of higher education. The state system overseen by MDHEWD consists of thirteen public four-year universities, fourteen public two-year colleges, one public two-year technical college, twenty-six independent colleges and universities, and more than 150 proprietary and private career schools (MDHEWD, n.d. -f).

Senate Bill 997 (2016) was passed into law June 16th, 2016. This senate bill specified that the Coordinating Board for Higher Education in Missouri must determine a

set of common curricular courses that every public institution of higher education in Missouri must accept. It also mandated that an advisory group of faculty must "assist" in choosing and defining those courses and that the advisory group must include representatives from each public college and university in the state. The due date set for this to be accomplished was also in the bill: January 1, 2018.

Each public institution of higher education was contacted by what was then MDHE and asked for the names of three faculty members who could represent their respective institution on the Common Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC). Many institutions assumed that all three faculty members would serve on this committee (G. Westerwald, personal communication, 10 Jan 2017). However, MDHE selected one faculty member from the three names selected and thus formed the committee (G. Westerwald, personal communication, 10 Jan 2017).

The CCAC participated in a webinar training explaining the mandate. The committee then met for the first time January 11, 2017 and divided into workgroups based on discipline. The CCAC subsequently met 4-6 times per year with each workgroup completing tasks in between. The work of the CCAC has become necessary maintenance for general education in Missouri and the CCAC continues to meet though membership has changed as institutions have rotated different faculty members to work on the CCAC.

Faculty Identity and Missouri Institutions of Higher Education

The context of this legislation and the tasks set before the CCAC were further complicated by the nature of faculty identity. Levin et al. (2006) has demonstrated the neoliberal effect on community colleges and how those influences strained the

expectation of what authority community college faculty members have and how it can be implemented. This work was updated by Levin (2017) to consider universities as well as community colleges. As the S. B. 997 (2016) required faculty members to participate as representatives on an advisory committee, it is important to consider how the varied type and size of institution could affect role of faculty and this variance could affect the way faculty approach policy involvement.

In the setting for this study, the original CCAC was composed of one faculty representative for each two-year and four-year public college and university in Missouri. The variety of public colleges and universities further demonstrate the complexity of the role of faculty.

Four-Year Universities

According to MDHEWD, there are thirteen public four-year universities in Missouri. Within this group is a wide range of institutional types including Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU), regional universities, and one research I university. They are as follows:

Harris-Stowe State University

Harris-Stowe is an HCBU founded in 1857 and located in St. Louis, Missouri. Their website listed fall 2018 enrollment as 1,716 students and their website listed 162 faculty members (Harris-Stowe State University, n.d.).

Lincoln University

An HCBU located in Jefferson City, Missouri, Lincoln University listed fall undergraduate enrollment as being 2,377 students (Lincoln University, n.d. -a). Their website includes a list of 101 faculty members (Lincoln University, n.d. -b).

Missouri Southern State University

Founded in 1937, Missouri Southern State University stated recent total enrollment as being 6,006 students. While total faculty is not listed, a student to faculty ratio of 19:1 is listed (Missouri Southern State University, n.d.).

Missouri State University

Currently, this university system claims 26,001 students. A unique cornerstone of the undergraduate programs is a public affairs mission that focuses on ethical leadership, cultural competence, and community engagement (Missouri State University, n.d., -a). As of Fall 2018, Missouri State University lists 235 assistant professors, 130 associate professors, 13 distinguished professors, 41 faculty without rank, 157 instructors, and 223 professors (Missouri State University, n.d., -b). Graduate assistants and adjunct instructors are not listed.

Missouri University of Science & Technology

Located in Rolla, Missouri, this university prides itself on a robust set of programs in engineering and computing (Missouri University of Science & Technology, n.d., -a). In 2016, the student enrollment was 8,838 students (Missouri University of Science & Technology, n.d., -b). Total faculty members are not listed, but an 18:1 student-to-faculty ratio is listed (Missouri University of Science & Technology, n.d., -a).

Missouri Western State University

Founded in 1915, this university offers a range of programs from master's degrees to associate degrees (Missouri Western State University, n.d., -a). In fall 2019, total enrollment was 5,418 students (Missouri Western State University, n.d., -b). Number of

faculty or a student-to-faculty ratio was not found (Missouri Western State University, n.d., -a).

Northwest Missouri State University

The undergraduate curriculum is described as "profession-based." This means internships and other experiences that expose students to their intended profession are emphasized in the undergraduate programs. Currently, an estimated enrollment of 7,000 students is listed along with a student-to-teacher ratio of 20:1 (Northwest State University, n.d.).

Southeast Missouri State University

Founded in 1873, this university has over 145 majors and 75 graduate programs (Southeast Missouri State University, n.d., -a). Current undergraduate enrollment is 9,524 students, and the student-to-faculty ratio is 20:1 (Southeast Missouri State University, n.d., -b).

Truman State University

Located in Kirksville, Missouri, and founded in 1867, Truman State University prides itself on an integrated curriculum and small class sizes. Student enrollment is estimated to be approximately 5, 200 students with a 16:1 student-to-teacher ratio. Additionally, it is listed that 97% of classes will have 40 or fewer students in those classes (Truman State University, n.d.).

University of Central Missouri

This university was founded in 1871 and is in Warrensburg, Missouri. More than 150 programs of study are offered. Their website claimed more than 12,300 students as

current enrollment (University of Central Missouri, n.d.). Faculty numbers and student-to-faculty ratio are not listed.

University of Missouri –Columbia

Missouri's largest university offers over 300 degree programs, including 69 doctoral degrees. Current enrollment is 30,046 students. Their website lists 2,017 full-time faculty (University of Missouri, n.d.).

University of Missouri –Kansas City (UMKC)

Part of the University of Missouri system, but a distinctly separate university with separate leadership and branding, UMKC has an enrollment of over 16,000 students and lists a 14-1 student-to-faculty ratio as way to emphasize their personalized approach to education (University of Missouri –Kansas City, n.d.).

University of Missouri –St. Louis (UMSL)

Like UMKC, UMSL is also part of the University of Missouri system but is a distinctly separate campus with separate leadership and branding. Also like UMKC, UMSL has over 16,000 students. Faculty members are listed for fall 2018 as numbering 785 (University of Missouri –St. Louis, n.d.).

Two-Year Colleges

The MDHEWD lists fourteen two-year colleges in Missouri. However, it is important to note that one, Missouri State University –West Plains, is not a community college but a campus of one of the four-year universities that is focused on granted two-year degrees. The two-year colleges vary widely from vast systems with as many as five campuses to small, individual colleges that serve a specific community. They are as follows:

Crowder College

This college offers associate's degrees and certificates in over eighty programs. The main campus is in Neosho, but there are five additional "attendance centers." The most current enrollment published on their website is from fall 2017 and 4,960 students. Full-time faculty members are listed as numbering 119 (Crowder College, n.d.).

East Central College

Located in Union, MO, this college has one location but serves six public school districts (East Central College, n.d., -a). The enrollment in spring of 2020 was 2,334 students (East Central College, n.d., -b). Faculty numbers and student-to-faculty ratio were not listed.

Jefferson College

With two campus locations in Northern Missouri, Jefferson College is one of the smaller community colleges in the state. However, their website is insistent about their quality and affordability. This college offered five associate's degrees and many other career and technical certificates (Jefferson College, n.d.). Faculty and student populations were not found.

Metropolitan Community College

This college is one of the largest in Missouri with five campuses throughout the state. Their fall 2019 enrollment was 16,063, and they offer over 125 associate's degrees and certificate programs. This college has 243 full-time faculty members (Metropolitan Community College, n.d.).

Mineral Area College

Founded in 1965, this college serves six public school districts. Currently, 35 career and technical programs and many required general education courses are offered (Mineral Area College, n.d.). Student enrollment and faculty numbers were not found.

Missouri State University –West Plains

This campus is part of the Missouri State University system. However, it is a two-year, open admission college that is separately accredited (Missouri State University – West Plains, n.d., -a). As of Fall 2018, enrollment was 1,800 students. One hundred-twenty one faculty are listed on their faculty page (Missouri State University –West Plains, n.d., -b).

Moberly Area Community College

With five locations and more than 40 areas of study, this college has a variety of options for students including associate's degrees and certificate programs (Moberly Area Community College, n.d.). Student enrollment and faculty numbers were not found.

North Central Missouri College

Founded in 1925, this college offers thirty-two different programs to its 1,746 students. They have a student-to-faculty ratio of 18:1 (North Central Missouri College, n.d.).

Ozarks Technical Community College (OTC)

One of the newest colleges in Missouri, OTC opened in 1990. This college system has six locations, and offers a wide range of associate's degrees, and programs in technical education and allied health. In 2019, this system served 11,762 students (Ozarks Technical Community College, n.d., -b). Faculty information was not found.

St. Charles Community College

This college, like OTC, is another of the newer colleges that has rapidly grown. Though it has one location, it served 9,349 students in the 2017-2018 academic year. A college transfer program with over thirty-four areas of interest is offered along with 45 career programs. Ninety-eight full-time faculty members are engaged at this college (St. Charles Community College, n.d.).

St. Louis Community College

One of the largest community colleges in the state, this institution currently serves 17,294 students. Their four campuses offer 15 transfer options and more than 80 career-focused programs. They employ 324 full-time faculty and state a 19:1 student-to-faculty ratio (St. Louis Community College, n.d.).

State Fair Community College

This college served 4,742 students in 2017 with eight locations and with 78 full-time faculty. Six associate's degrees are offered along with skills and professional certificates (State Fair Community College, n.d.).

State Technical College of Missouri

Located in Linn, Missouri, this college had 1,471 students enrolled in fall of 2018. Over seventeen accredited programs are offered (State Technical College of Missouri, n.d.). Faculty information was not found.

Three Rivers College

With five locations, this college serves 3,076 students. Sixty-two full-time faculty members are employed. This institution confers four associate's degrees and other certificates (Three Rivers College, n.d.).

Implications for Research in this Setting

It is expected this study will result in recommendations for faculty to have more defined roles in policy that affects curriculum. There is potential for structural changes in how faculty roles are defined and in how faculty are chosen and prepared for policy implementation. Better structural support for faculty in this kind of implementation could result in stronger collaboration between community college and four-year faculty on issues related to curriculum.

Access to Data

Access to data will come from the insider status of the researcher. As an original member of the CCAC, documentation of the committee formation and communication about the committee is accessible. Additionally, contact information for the other original members is possessed so as to procure interviews for a major component of the qualitative research.

Dissemination and implementation of any recommendations

This study will be submitted for presentation at the annual ASHE (Association for the Study of Higher Education) conference. Faculty from across the country are the practitioner audience because their curricular authority is directly affected by mandates such as Core 42. Disseminating to faculty will allow for discussion from faculty in other areas of the country to compare how these influences are having similar or different affects at their institutions.

Summary

The work of organizations like The Lumina Foundation and Complete College America has normalized political influence in higher education so as to diminish the

expertise and authority of educators. Though the loosely coupled systems of higher education originally served to keep the locus of control within each institution and community, this organization has resulted in a disenfranchisement of power. Senate bill 997 and the resulting Core 42 mandate is one manifestation of this loss of power and the effects on higher education as a whole.

CHAPTER THREE

SCHOLARLY REVIEW FOR THE STUDY

Introduction to the Scholarly Review

This review will briefly introduce the problem of practice and purpose of the study as context for the scholarly review. Following this context is a review of the conceptual framework for the study using Freire's (1970/2000) critical theory to inform both Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame and Levin, Martin, López Damián, and Hoggatt's (2018) use of community college logic. There is then a review of literature on neoliberalism and its influence on the community college mission, community college faculty identity, and curriculum in higher education.

Problem of Practice

There is increasing public and political pressure for universities and colleges to demonstrate measurable outcomes that quantify the public good and services they provide. One example of this is the use of models that assess specific outcomes, like retention, to determine funding for public institutions (Lumina Foundation, 2016). As the outputs and goals of higher education come under more intense scrutiny, more policy is put into place that governs how higher education, and thus faculty, function (Huang, 2017; Levin, Martin, López Damián, & Hoggatt, 2018). This is a problem because faculty are hired to be content experts who have the authority to determine curriculum and the standards students must meet to indicate academic comprehension. These policies are replacing faculty authority with oversight from members of the state government.

Purpose of Study

To address this problem, the structure that is allowing this replacement of authority to happen should be explored. The purpose of this study is to investigate the formation of a faculty advisory committee used to implement a statewide curricular

mandate. The study will also seek to understand how these faculty members' perceptions might align with neoliberal values. This forthcoming examination of faculty identity and the disparity between four-year and community college mission and identity is relevant because this mandate is bypassing institutional curricular processes.

Conceptual Framework

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970/2000) explained how a strict structure of education that does not allow questions or critical development of consciousness denies the humanity of students. Freire (1970/2000) claimed education is a vehicle by which people learn to interact with and question the world or just accept the world as it is given to them. Thus, education is either a tool for empowerment or tool that works in the service of oppression (Freire, 1970/2000). This theory was developed out of Freire's (1970/2000) literal experience with an oppressive government using the denial of education as a tool for oppression.

There is contemporary research to support Freire's claims of structural oppression. A specific example of this structural oppression is laid out in Guinier's (2015) collection of research on testing and admission in higher education. Guinier claimed that higher education supports the current social structure by admitting those from families with wealth and power rather than democratizing the population through education. Through this inequity, structural problems in education are revealed despite the best intentions of teachers and others who have worked to use the system as a means of change and empowerment.

Freire's (1970/2000) "banking concept of education" can be compared to current neoliberalism trends in education that result in the reduction of community college

faculty to workers who have no role or a limited role in curriculum. Freire (1970/2000) explained that teaching students to follow directions and produce answers instead of pursuing inquiry denies their development of "becoming" or being in process. This process is one Freire (1970/2000) described as "prophetic" and "hopeful" because it indicated that students can participate in what is to come; it is not determined for them (p. 84). These ideas can be applied to faculty identity. As knowledge-makers and inquiry seekers, faculty should have authority in the process of curriculum, or they are being denied their professional process of becoming. Thus, they are de-professionalized as their expert role is diminished or removed.

Understanding Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame offers additional support to Freire's (1970/2000) theory. Freire (1970/2000) claimed that the motivations of a teacher are not the cause for oppression, but that it is the structure of education itself that is set up to continue the oppression. In other words, the intentions of the teacher do not matter so long as they are working within the system that aims to oppress. This aligns with Bolman and Deal's (2013) claim that the structure of an organization must align with its mission because an organization can have good intentions that are unmet if the structure does not intentionally support that mission through its structure. This is essential to consider in this study because so many of the obstacles are structural despite the best intentions of many educators and administrators who work within the current educational system.

Bolman and Deal's (2013) emphasized structural impact informs Freire's (1970/2000) claims about the dangers of structural oppression in education. These ideas find meaning together after considering the work of Levin et al. (2018) on the impact

neoliberalism had on the institutional logics of community colleges. Freire (1970/2000) said that structure is an essential tool for oppression; Bolman and Deal (2013) claimed the structure must be aligned with mission. Levin et al. (2018) demonstrated that outside influences affect the mission of a community college by altering its organizational structure.

In considering the mission it is helpful to think about how Levin et al. (2018) defined institutional logics as "the dominant meaning or belief systems of an institutional type" (para. 3). It is illustrated that community colleges place mission priority on access, community, and teaching (Levin et al., 2018). However, neoliberal politics pressure them to focus on efficiency and productivity. This is where Bolman and Deal (2013) applied because the political system, which provides funding, has instructed the system to make structural changes that do not align with their missions or their institutional logics. What Levin et al. (2018) found is that while some logics were preserved, many were compromised or blended. Freire (1970/2000) might have suggested these compromises have driven community colleges to be structural supporters of societal oppression rather than democratizers of higher education access.

Finally, Freire (1970/2000) addressed power dynamics in his theory. In order for education to have a liberating structure, students must have power in the classroom *with* their teachers. Bolman and Deal (2013) claimed the organization must have a structure that supports its intentions. Thus, according to Freire (1970/2000), faculty would need to have power *with* administrators and other stakeholders if the organization truly intended to support a community college mission of access to a democratic education.

Current Status of Literature

Neoliberalism and Higher Education

The neoliberalist movement has gained political power and the influences of this movement have significantly changed the structure of education in the United States. Neoliberalism can be defined as "a theory of political economic practices that proposes human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). These free markets demand accountability to provide evidence of the expected result, just as a company would provide quarterly returns to justify the investment of the stockholders (Harvey, 2005). Accountability measures in K-12 have resulted in viewing education as a product that can be universally measured (Dar, 2016; Shober, 2016). This movement began with a foothold in K-12 and has now crept into higher education (Davis, 2013). As community colleges have become more closely associated with workforce development, accountability measures from K-12 have been proposed for community colleges (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016). While higher education is not yet held to learning outcomes as in K-12, other measures, such as retention, are being used to distribute funding (Dar, 2016; Davis, 2013). As accountability measures increase for community colleges and as community colleges share career preparation responsibilities with high schools, some scholars have argued that high school and community be considered two parts of the same system (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016).

A brief explanation of how community colleges are often viewed is helpful context for this discussion. Many community colleges have enjoyed a fairly non-controversial reputation in their communities as a less expensive option for students with a goal of transferring to a four-year university or for students pursuing a technical career or allied health profession. However, closer examination reveals the foundations of the community college and its purpose and role in education are filled with great controversy in the world of education. In Dougherty's (2001) history of the community college, he explained how both the typical supportive view and the typical critical view of the community college do not tell the whole story. Critics of the community college have stated that the institution primarily serves to enforce the social and economic structure already in place. Supporters of the community college have insisted that this institution is the great democratizer of education, the primary option for those without typical access to higher education. However, after Dougherty (2001) explained these two mindsets, he claimed that the truth is more complex than either admits: community colleges have democratized admission to higher education, but they have also played a part in hindering the completion of baccalaureate degrees. Additionally, the vocational graduates produced often have not matched market demands (Dougherty, 2001). Thus, Dougherty (2001) called for structural reform that would require community colleges and four-year universities to tackle obstacles together.

A prime example of neoliberal influence can be seen in the current description of the role of community colleges in the higher education system of the United States. The American Association of Community Colleges (2019) described the community college as "the gateway to the American dream—the learning resource needed to sustain

America's economic viability and productivity." Dougherty and Townsend (2006) explained that the mission of the community college is multi-dimensional and is not static. Many forces and influences have been responsible for shaping the community college mission so that the mission is often represented differently to various stakeholders (Dougherty & Townsend, 2006). Typically, the mission of the community college includes the following roles: technical and vocational training (often labeled workforce development), general education in pursuit of transfer, and continuing educational opportunities for the community (Dougherty & Townsend, 2006; Levin et al., 2018). These missional descriptions have contributed to the co-opting of community colleges as ideal testing grounds for neoliberal agendas as they indicate that to democratize education means to reduce education to measurable outcomes and highly specified job training.

When one speaks of neoliberal ideas, one speaks of free markets and an atmosphere that offers efficiency and precisely measured outcomes (Harvey, 2005). As neoliberal ideas have gained influence in the K-12 education system, these ideas have also begun to take hold in higher education (Davis, 2013). The growth of community colleges and a mission that is increasingly focused on workforce development has offered an opportunity for neoliberal ideas to gain momentum.

Collegiate Faculty Identify and Authority

The fractured cultural development of neoliberal influence has greatly impacted the role of faculty in the community college. Levin et al. (2006) wrote that the influence of neoliberalism has not only brought conflict to multiple missions of the community college but also to the identity and function of the community college faculty member. As this study will focus on a mandate that challenges faculty authority in curriculum,

faculty authority is the area that will be focused on here. While there is an increase in the appearance of faculty inclusion in decision making, Levin et al. (2006) argued that when it comes to decisions about the mission and resources of the college, faculty were often not an important part of the process. This was not by faculty choice but by institutional decision. Furthermore, Levin et al. (2006) described community college shared governance under neoliberalism as the "commodification of cooperation" (p. 49). In other words, faculty members are rewarded with increased authority, rather than higher pay, if they are productive in their teaching duties (Levin et al., 2006). Only faculty who "produce" more, i.e. teach more classes and demonstrate more results, are eligible to participate in more decision-making. However, this will not also result in higher pay. Thus, it appears that these increasing neoliberal influences have resulted in a reduction, or at least a reshaping, of the role of faculty authority in the community college as only faculty who are willing to participate in this commodification will have the opportunity to be a part of college governance.

To understand more specifically how neoliberal influences are structurally reshaping the role of faculty authority, the originally intended role of faculty authority should be defined. For this, the faculty authority expected at four-year universities provided a road map for the structure of general education programs. This is primarily because general education programs at community colleges typically serve the purpose of offering an associate's degree so that students may transfer to a four-year university to earn a Bachelor's degree. According to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP; n. d.), their *1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities* is the document that defines the role of faculty members in the university.

According to this statement, “When an educational goal has been established, it becomes the responsibility primarily of the faculty to determine the appropriate curriculum and procedures of student instruction” (AAUP, 1966). Thus, according to the primary advocacy organization for university professors, the faculty should be the primary governors of curriculum.

The role of faculty authority in community colleges is more difficult to define since the history of this role is less straightforward and gets much less attention than that of their four-year counterparts. Even in Dougherty’s (2001) history of the community college and its origins, not only is there no section devoted to faculty roles, but faculty do not even have an entry in the index. This is representative of a common gap in the literature where outside influences, community needs, and student needs are highlighted, but consideration of the unique role of faculty members in the community college are often absent as an essential part of the conversation.

When the role of community college faculty members has been studied, it is typically their teaching identities that are developed. Gregory and Burbage (2017) discussed teaching philosophies and what they call “critical friendships,” or professional, supportive work relationships, as a way to develop their professional identities. Additionally, the work of Flynn, Mathien, Mitchell, and Whalen (2017) posited that faculty fulfilled the democratic mission of the college by reaching their potential through pedagogies that engage and empower their students. Obviously, the teaching identity of faculty members is important, essential in fact, to the work they do. However, a faculty member’s mastery of pedagogy must work in tandem with their mastery of content. To truly be effective advocates for quality teaching and learning, faculty members must not

only have professional authority in their classrooms, but they must have an authority in college decisions that affect the structure and content in the classroom.

Authority often comes with work that is considered prestigious. Professors in four-year universities draw their authority in large part from being content experts who generate and contribute to knowledge in their respective fields. However, even though community college faculty members are primarily labeled teachers, their teaching work is not measured or valued in the same way. Levin (2017) detailed this in how the workload is divided. Levin (2017) indicated that university professors typically teach one to two classes per semester when a high value is placed on research, but that a typical community college workload is five classes per semester. Thus, though teaching is considered a type of research, the structure does not allow equivalent time for faculty members to complete this work. Thus, though community colleges are teaching institutions in name, structurally they do not value teaching in the same way universities value research (Levin, 2017). If value is in fact connected to prestige, this leaves community college faculty with both less authority and less time to be curricular advocates.

A call for faculty identities to evolve beyond teaching has begun. Toth, Sullivan, and Calhoon-Dillahunt (2016) insisted that the professional identity of community college faculty members must shift to that of the "teacher-scholar-activist" so as to advocate of behalf of their work in light of these neoliberalist influences. In this case, Toth et al. (2016) described a model of mutual responsibility, rather than accountability, between faculty and lawmakers. Instead of colleges simply reporting progress to lawmakers, those passing policy would also commit to understanding the work of

education and to consider the reality of this work when they pass policy. Additionally, faculty members would commit to translating the work that they do to those who make policy (Toth et al., 2016).

The neoliberal impact on faculty authority is one example of the wide-reaching influence of this approach to education. The discrepancies between faculty identity in community college faculty members and four-year-faculty members also contribute to the complexity of the issue of faculty authority in curriculum. Both the neoliberal impact on faculty identity and the wide-ranging interpretation on what faculty identity should be complicate the role of faculty authority in curricular policy.

Curriculum in Higher Education

These contemporary dilemmas have deep historical roots. Tierney (1989) recorded the intent of universities to have efficient curriculum and noted that administrators were under pressure to treat education as a market and students as customers. Even three decades ago, curriculum researchers found tension between the democratic ideals of higher education and the market-based structure of neoliberalism theory. As community colleges have developed their general education programs to provide transfer for students intending to finish a bachelor's degree at a four-year institution, understanding curriculum development at the university level is the starting place for understanding curriculum.

Even defining curriculum illustrates the fluid and convoluted nature of the term. Pinar (2011) called curriculum "a complicated conversation" (p. 1). Armstrong and Stewart-Gambino (2016) offered a more complex assessment when they described curriculum as "a highly textured, asymmetrical phenomenon shaped by structural

differences in disciplinary norms, institutional power structures, and social identities that exist, interact, and help explain the uneven and/or weak results produced on any given campus" (p.114). In both definitions, it's clear that the authors see curriculum as something unpredictable, changing, and participatory.

Though Tierney (1989) historically established a disconnect between institutional mission and curriculum, there is more evidence of the essential alignment between mission and curriculum. Yob et al. (2016) examined the importance of aligning the university mission with curriculum to enact social change with institutions of higher education. Yob et al. (2016) discussed the recent trend of service learning and admitted the positive results, but argued that to yield more and long last impact, social change should not be an additional component of curriculum but should be embedded throughout the whole curriculum. Thus, though curriculum is directed by faculty, many believe the curriculum must be tied to larger elements of the college structure, such as the mission, for larger curriculum concepts, such as social change, to be accomplished.

Another example of the connection between institutional change and curriculum is the work of Armstrong and Stewart-Gambino (2016) who argued for using a multidisciplinary approach to curriculum that incorporates many discourse communities. While this article did not specifically state a connection between the college mission, Armstrong and Stewart-Gambino (2016) discussed how to use curriculum to engage in the bigger concept of "diversity" which is a value. Since a mission is a set of values to be prioritized in an organization, the comparison is valuable. Taken together, these studies tell us that structural elements, such as mission, cannot be separated from curriculum (Armstrong & Gambino, 2016; Tierney, 1989; Yob et al., 2016).

Current work in curriculum has indicated that there is a movement to bridge the divide between research and education (Carnell & Fung, 2017) through a model called The Connected Curriculum framework. This framework has six elements that include factors such as making connections between disciplines and to workplace learning (Carnell & Fung, 2017). In their recent work, *Developing the Higher Education Curriculum*, Carnell and Fung (2017) edited a collection of various approaches to adapting this framework to current curriculum. The underlying, though unstated, assumption throughout this work is that faculty control curriculum so that this adaption would be possible.

In community colleges, there is a dearth of curricular process description. However, in 1989, the National Education Association (NEA; n.d.) published their "Statement on Community College Governance" as an extension of their 1987 "Statement on Faculty Governance. In this statement, it is specified "faculty should establish the general curriculum or course of study leading to associate degrees and certificates. Changes are to be initiated by the faculty and be implemented only with their prior consent" (NEA, n.d.). Therefore, though the process is not widely published, curricular authority is supported both by the historical authority of university faculty and this statement by the NEA.

Though guidelines are clear that community college faculty should have curricular authority, when authority is discussed, it is usually discussed under the label of shared governance. Kater (2017) studied how community college faculty perceived the concept of shared governance, but admitted more work is needed to understand perceptions of how efficient the shared governance is. Kater (2017) also called for further

study regarding how community college faculty members are socialized into their roles. While word choice was not addressed here, the argument could be made that continual use of shared governance as the sole description of faculty roles, and not the term authority, could be an important part of how community college faculty members are socialized into their roles at the college.

Curricular history demonstrated that neoliberalism has strained issues of curriculum for decades. Through this history is varied and complex, it is clear that curricular authority should be owned by the subject-matter experts, faculty (NEA, n.d.). Thus, it is essential that faculty develop a strategy for being involved in policy mandates that impact curriculum.

Conclusion

In higher education, neoliberal influences have shaped policy that influences curriculum decisions. The proposed study will examine the community college curriculum process and faculty perceptions of their authority within that process. To examine these problems of structure, Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural will be considered alongside Freire's (1970/2000) theory of structural oppression in education. To frame this problem in light of the unique culture of the community college, Levin et al. (2018) and their discussion of the effect neoliberal influences are having on the logics, or missions, of community colleges will tie the framework together.

By impacting the community college mission, the influence of neoliberalism has trickled down from the mission and structure to affect the identity of the community college faculty member (Levin et al., 2018; Levin et al. 2006). This fracturing of the community college identity is cause for concern about the impact on curriculum as

mission alignment with curriculum has been shown to be essential to structural impact. The fracturing of the community college faculty authority is cause for concern as faculty members would typically take on the role of preserving the integrity of mission/curriculum alignment.

Though professional organizations such as the AAUP and NEA have clearly stated that curriculum is a process that should be governed by faculty, how faculty members understand their roles in this process is uncertain. While shared governance is typically the wording used to describe how decisions are made within collegiate institutions, neglecting to use the word authority in reference to faculty control over curriculum could be a rhetorical indication of a gap in how organizations lack structural support for this essential faculty role.

SECTION FOUR:

CONTRIBUTION TO PRACTICE

Submitted to the 2022 ASHE Conference as a Roundtable Discussion

Proposal for ASHE Research Paper

Purpose and Context for Inquiry

The transfer of general education curriculum is not a new issue in higher education. Institutions have been caught between the desire to develop unique, meaningful curriculum and the need to offer a smooth transition for transfer students. In Missouri, this tension has resulted in recent legislation that required all public universities and colleges to agree on a block of general education courses that would be universally accepted by those institutions. This legislation, S. B. 997, was developed with good intentions. Policy makers observed the difficulty of institutional transfer and the money students lost in unaccepted credits. Thus, this legislation would provide this solution: "the core curriculum and common course matrix will help streamline the transfer of college credit to help students earn a degree in less time and at less cost" (MDHEWD, n.d., -b). This indicated that the main object was to remove cost and obstacles for students who transfer between institutions in the state. This common curricular mandate, referred to specifically as Core 42, required the transferability of general education in public institutions of higher education in Missouri. To determine what this common curricular content would be, S. B. 997 (2016) also required the formation of a faculty advisory committee, the Core Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC) to make recommendations. However, these state senators did not consider the complexity of higher education and the many unintended consequences of requiring these transfers and requiring them to happen so quickly.

Theoretical Framework

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970/2000) explained how an educational structure that does not allow questions or critical development of consciousness denies the humanity of students. He claimed education is a vehicle by which people learn to interact with and question the world or accept the world as it is given to them. Thus, education is either a tool for empowerment or a tool that works in the service of oppression. Similarly, policy implementation may be shaped by structures of wealth and power.

Freire (1970/2000) provided a critical lens through which to view Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. Central to Freire's theory (1970/2000) is his claim that the structure of education oppressed when students were taught the nature of life, and thus the nature of work, is not to question but to follow orders and accept authority. Since the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) provides a framework for understanding the organization of human capital, combining the two brings a critical consciousness to examining this organization of labor.

Finally, if Freire (1970/2000) argued that structure either oppresses or liberates, then the question of who or what is oppressing in current educational policy is answered by looking at neoliberal influences. Levin (2017) documented these influences in higher education by arguing that political and industrial powers have pressured colleges and universities to increase efficiencies and serve industry needs. However, Levin (2017) followed this by pointing to the logics, or central missions of these colleges, which is to serve students and provided education as a public good. Thus, these policies are having

unintended consequences because as the structure is changed to fit new outcomes, other more central outcomes and values are being damaged or diminished.

Selected Literature Review

Policies like Core 42 are a result of neoliberal influences in education. The neoliberalist movement has gained political power and the influences of this movement have significantly changed the structure of education in the United States. Neoliberalism can be defined as "a theory of political economic practices that proposes human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). These free markets demand accountability to provide evidence of the expected result, just as a company would provide quarterly returns to justify the investment of the stockholders (Harvey, 2005). Accountability measures in K-12 have resulted in viewing education as a product that can be universally measured (Dar, 2016; Shober, 2016). This movement began with a foothold in K-12 and has recently crept into higher education (Davis, 2013). As community colleges have become more closely associated with workforce development, accountability measures from K-12 have been proposed for community colleges (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016). While higher education is not yet held to learning outcomes as in K-12, other measures, such as retention, are being used to distribute funding (Dar, 2016; Davis, 2013). As accountability measures increase for community colleges and as community colleges share career preparation responsibilities with high schools, some scholars have argued that high school and community colleges be

considered two parts of the same system (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016).

Since these accountability measures often take root in community colleges, a brief explanation of how community colleges are often viewed is supportive context. Many community colleges have enjoyed a fairly non-controversial reputation in their communities as a less expensive option for students with a goal of transferring to a four-year university or for students pursuing a technical career or allied health profession. However, closer examination reveals the foundations of the community college and its purpose and role in education are filled with great controversy in the world of education. In Dougherty's (2001) history of the community college, he explained how both the typical supportive view and the typical critical view of the community college do not tell the whole story. Critics of the community college have stated that the institution primarily serves to enforce the social and economic structure already in place. Supporters of the community college have insisted that this institution is the great democratizer of education, the primary option for those without typical access to higher education. However, after Dougherty and Townsend (2001) explained these two mindsets, he claimed that the truth is more complex than either admits: community colleges have democratized admission to higher education, but they have also played a part in hindering the completion of baccalaureate degrees. Additionally, the vocational graduates produced often have not matched market demands (Dougherty and Townsend, 2001). Thus, Dougherty and Townsend (2001) called for structural reform that would require community colleges and four-year universities to tackle obstacles together.

Study Methods

This study examined the perceptions of four-year and two-year faculty from public institutions in Missouri who have served or currently serve on the Common Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC) which was charged with implementing the Core 42 curriculum. The researcher used a case study since there is, as Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained, a finite amount of data collection in case studies to indicate the unit of analysis is in fact "bounded." In this specific case study, the influence of power dynamics is a central component. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described this kind of examination as an intersection between qualitative research and critical theory where questions are asked about who has power and how structures support that power. The goal of this kind of research is to reveal these power dynamics in order to affect change (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Since the researcher was also a member of the CCAC, she holds the position of researcher participant. Creswell (2014) stated the importance of the researcher explicitly stating how their experiences could shape interpretation. To ensure validity of the results, triangulation and peer debriefing were used to confirm the results from the qualitative data. Additionally, the data collected from participants were triangulated with the document analysis prior to considering the experiences and reflections of the researcher herself. These methods described by Creswell (2014) were particularly important to demonstrate the results as valid and not simply a verification of the researcher's view of events.

Research Questions

1. What was the selection process for CCAC members? Specifically, how were the qualifications, preparation, and selection of faculty addressed?
2. What were the responsibilities and rewards for serving in the CCAC role?
3. How did faculty roles and the CCAC role align?
4. How was power manifested in the formation and implementation of the CCAC?

Data Sources

In this study, ten survey responses were collected, eight interviews were conducted, and ten documents were analyzed. All original members of the CCAC were contacted as participants. When that initial response was minimal, snowball sampling was used to include other CCAC members. Primary documents, such as meetings minutes and emails, were used to triangulate the data gathered from the surveys and interviews.

Analytical Plan

Merriam and Tisdell (2016) specified that open coding is the process of making notes in the data to determine categories and following that process with axial coding. Axial coding is the process by which these categories are grouped to determine answers to research questions (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). With each set of data, the researcher made a list of categories and then compared to look for patterns. The researcher followed the instructions of Merriam and Tisdell (2016) and primarily focused on the purpose of the study and how those categories could answer the research questions, keeping in mind the conceptual framework for the study.

Findings

This data revealed that though the professional criteria for the selection process was clear, the institutional process for selection and the process used by MDHE for selection was not. The responsibilities were heavy with few rewards in terms of time compensation. Additionally, most faculty involved in this study did not have a clear idea of what exactly would be required of them; The role they imagined was not the role they ended up playing. There were multiple power dynamics in this process, but instead of one power dynamic rising to the top, many were at play in a way that seems to have resulted in power dispersal rather than one narrative of power. When all these themes are considered together, a lack of structure is seen in the way the CCAC was put together, the way the CCAC worked together, and the power that was present in the CCAC.

Importance of the Study for Higher Education

These findings are useful to higher education faculty and administrators. Politicians and policymakers are legislating policy without a full understanding of the impact and resources needed for implementation. Faculty need structure and support to collaborate effectively on policy that affects higher education.

These findings indicate a lack of structure in the selection of and preparation for the members of the CCAC. Organizational structure should align with and support an institution's mission (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Freire (1970/2000) argued that educational structures are either a tool for liberation or oppression. Structure, therefore, is an critical consideration for accomplishing the mission of education. The legislation which created the CCAC is evidence that the missions of four-year and two-year institutions are no longer separate. Thus, a better structure for policy collaboration between four-year and

two-year faculty would facilitate a united voice for faculty, especially when it comes to curriculum policy.

The implementation of the CCAC resulted in a pattern of intense faculty work without reward or compensation. While faculty are accustomed to service being a part of their "duties as assigned," this example of intense policy work could be discouraging to faculty willingness to engage in service. In this case, the CCAC, through a small set of faculty, shaped, evaluated, and defined curriculum for public higher education for an entire state. Faculty in other states without this kind of mandate could heed this example for legislated curriculum changes in their own organization. Ideally, faculty could advocate for time to collaborate with their other higher education partners and instigate the shaping of policy instead of being mandated to align with political objectives.

Ultimately, legislatively driven curriculum initiatives, delivered without adequate structure and compensation, have the potential to inflict great damage to higher education curriculum in the United States. Perhaps there is also great opportunity for faculty who are willing to collaborate across four and two-year colleges if administrators and others with power are willing to create space for that faculty-level collaboration.

SECTION FIVE:

CONTRIBUTION TO SCHOLARSHIP

Article for submission to *The Journal of General Education*

Abstract

This case study used qualitative research methods to examine the role faculty played in the application of a general education policy mandate in the state of Missouri. Senate bill 997 required that general education be transferable between all public colleges and universities in the state. This legislation also required the formation of a committee with faculty representatives from those colleges and universities to advise on the curriculum and review courses to be included. For this research, ten members of this committee responded to surveys, eight of those ten members were interviewed, and primary documents were analyzed to search for patterns in structure and power manifestation. This data was analyzed using Freire's (1970/2000) banking concept and Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. The results were that faculty expertise was central to committee selection, but preparation for this work was not a priority. Additionally, selection processes for this committee were inconsistent. The curricular work for this committee was intense and came with little reward or structural support. Faculty expected the work to be more advisory instead of policy creation. And, there were many narratives of power. These findings indicate further investigation into the structure of faculty roles in policy work, especially in regard to curriculum, are needed.

Keywords: Post-Secondary Education, Policy, General Education, Curriculum, and Faculty Roles.

The Role of Faculty in the Implementation of an Unfunded Statewide Curricular Mandate

The transfer of general education curriculum is not a new issue in higher education. Institutions have been caught between the desire to develop unique, meaningful curriculum and the need to offer a smooth transition for transfer students. In Missouri, this tension has resulted in recent legislation that required all public universities and colleges to agree on a block of general education courses that would be universally accepted by those institutions. This legislation, S. B. 997, was developed with good intentions. Policy makers observed the difficulty of institutional transfer and the money students lost in unaccepted credits. Thus, this legislation would provide this solution: "the core curriculum and common course matrix will help streamline the transfer of college credit to help students earn a degree in less time and at less cost" (MDHEWD, n.d., -b). This indicated that the main object was to remove cost and obstacles for students who transfer between institutions in the state. This common curricular mandate, referred to specifically as Core 42, required the transferability of general education in public institutions of higher education in Missouri. To determine what this common curricular content would be, S. B. 997 (2016) also required the formation of a faculty advisory committee, the Core Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC) to make recommendations. However, these state senators did not consider the complexity of higher education and the many unintended consequences of requiring this new transfer structure to be created and implanted in the short time frame of eighteen months.

Selected Literature Review

The neoliberalist movement has gained political power and the influences of this movement have significantly changed the structure of education in the United States. Neoliberalism can be defined as "a theory of political economic practices that proposes human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, p. 2). These free markets demand accountability to provide evidence of the expected result, just as a company would provide quarterly returns to justify the investment of the stockholders (Harvey, 2005). Accountability measures in K-12 have resulted in viewing education as a product that can be universally measured (Dar, 2016; Shober, 2016). This movement began with a foothold in K-12 and has now crept into higher education (Davis, 2013). As community colleges have become more closely associated with workforce development, accountability measures from K-12 have been proposed for community colleges (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016). While higher education is not yet held to learning outcomes as in K-12, other measures, such as retention, are being used to distribute funding (Dar, 2016; Davis, 2013). As accountability measures increase for community colleges and as community colleges share career preparation responsibilities with high schools, some scholars have argued that high school and community be considered two parts of the same system (Davis, 2013; Rosenbaum, Ahearn, Ng, & Lansing, 2016).

Since these accountability measures often take root in community colleges, brief explanation of how community colleges are often viewed is helpful context here. Many

community colleges have enjoyed a fairly non-controversial reputation in their communities as a less expensive option for students with a goal of transferring to a four-year university or for students pursuing a technical career or allied health profession. However, closer examination reveals the foundations of the community college and its purpose and role in education are filled with great controversy in the world of education. In Dougherty's (2001) history of the community college, he explained how both the typical supportive view and the typical critical view of the community college do not tell the whole story. Critics of the community college have stated that the institution primarily serves to enforce the social and economic structure already in place. Supporters of the community college have insisted that this institution is the great democratizer of education, the primary option for those without typical access to higher education. However, after Dougherty (2001) explained these two mindsets, he claimed that the truth is more complex than either admits: community colleges have democratized admission to higher education, but they have also played a part in hindering the completion of baccalaureate degrees. Furthermore, he explained the vocational graduates produced often have not matched market demands. Thus, Dougherty called for structural reform that would require community colleges and four-year universities to tackle obstacles together.

By impacting the community college mission, the influence of neoliberalism has trickled down from the mission and structure to affect the identity of the community college faculty member (Levin et al., 2018; Levin et al. 2006). This fracturing of the community college identity is cause for concern about the impact on curriculum as mission alignment with curriculum has been shown to be essential to structural impact.

The fracturing of the community college faculty authority is cause for concern as faculty members should take on the role of preserving the integrity of mission/curriculum alignment. If community college faculty identity is fractured, and those faculty must work with university faculty on curriculum policy, this is cause for cause for all to be concerned.

Conceptual Framework

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Paulo Freire (1970/2000) explained how an educational structure that does not allow questions or critical development of consciousness denies the humanity of students. He claimed education is a vehicle by which people learn to interact with and question the world or accept the world as it is given to them. Thus, education is either a tool for empowerment or a tool that works in the service of oppression. A specific example of this structural oppression is laid out in Guinier's (2015) collection of research on testing and admission in higher education. Guinier (2015) claimed that higher education supports the current social structure by admitting those from families with wealth and power rather than democratizing the population through education. Thus, structural problems in education are revealed despite the best intentions of teachers and others working to use the system as a means of change and empowerment. Similarly, policy implementation may be shaped by structures of wealth and power.

Freire (1970/2000) provides a critical lens through which to view Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. Central to Freire's theory (1970/2000) is his claim that the structure of education oppressed when students were taught the nature of life, and thus the nature of work, is not to question but to follow orders and accept authority. Since the

structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013) provides a framework for understanding the organization of human capital, combining the two brings a critical consciousness to examining this organization of labor. The framework highlights the nature of work, including selection, responsibilities, rewards, and alignment between roles. One major influence of this framework is Weber's bureaucratic model (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Central to this model is a fixed division of labor, a hierarchical power structure, personnel selection based on qualifications, and employment as central to identify (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The patriarchal approach of Weber emphasized centralized power and authority and will be used to understand the way faculty work is being restructured (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The Core 42 curricular mandate can be seen as an attempt to extend the neoliberal agenda by changing the way faculty work is understood in higher education. For this study, the structural organization of faculty work will be viewed through the structural frame as influenced by Weber's bureaucratic model (Bolman & Deal, 2013). Given the oppression of neoliberal efforts, the structure of faculty work in implementing a curricular mandate will be examined.

Bruffee (1993/1999) defined knowledge as something that lives in professional communities and that is negotiated by those communities through discourse as opposed to something that is held by experts or by proximity to experts. While Freire (1970/2000) will provide a critical lens with which to examine the structural frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013), Bruffee's (1993/1999) ideas of the social construction of knowledge will provide a conceptual understanding of the way power controls discourse. In the case of the Core 42 curricular mandate, a faculty advisory committee was tasked with implementation as facilitated by the Missouri Department of Higher Education. Therefore, this policy is an

example of expert knowledge (a common curriculum, or what students should know) being decided through expert conversations (committee meetings and subcommittee meetings and course reviews). By applying a critical lens to the structures used to socially construct this policy, a critical constructivist approach is created. This will allow an examination of how the power structures constrained the discourse possible for socially constructing faculty roles.

Finally, if Freire (1970/2000) argued that structure either oppresses or liberates, then the question of who or what is oppressing in current educational policy is answered by looking at neoliberal influences. Levin (2017) documented these influences in higher education by arguing that political and industrial powers have pressured colleges and universities to increase efficiencies and serve industry needs. However, Levin (2017) followed this by pointing to the logics, or central missions of these colleges, which is to serve students and provided education as a public good. Thus, these policies are having unintended consequences because as the structure is changed to fit new outcomes, other more central outcomes and values are being damaged or diminished.

Research Questions

1. What was the selection process for CCAC members? Specifically, how were the qualifications, preparation, and selection of faculty addressed?
2. What were the responsibilities and rewards for serving in the CCAC role?
3. How did faculty roles and the CCAC role align?
4. How was power manifested in the formation and implementation of the CCAC?

Methodology

This study examined the perceptions of four-year and two-year faculty from public institutions in Missouri who have served or currently serve on the Common Curricular Advisory Committee (CCAC). The researcher used a case study since there is, as Merriam and Tisdell (2016) explained, a finite amount of data collection in case studies to indicate the unit of analysis is in fact "bounded." In this specific case study, the influence of power dynamics is a central component of this study. Merriam and Tisdell (2016) described this kind of examination as an intersection between qualitative research and critical theory where questions are asked about who has power and how structures support that power. The goal of this kind of research is to reveal these power dynamics in order to affect change (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). In this study, ten survey responses were collected, eight interviews were conducted, and ten documents were analyzed. Participants were identified with purposeful, snowball sampling.

Since the researcher was also a member of the CCAC, she holds the position of researcher participant. Creswell (2014) stated the importance of the researcher explicitly stating how their experiences could shape interpretation. To ensure validity of the results, triangulation and peer debriefing were used to confirm the results from the qualitative data. Additionally, the data collected from participants were triangulated with the document analysis prior to considering the experiences and reflections of the researcher herself. These methods described by Creswell (2014) were particularly important to demonstrate the results as valid and not simply a verification of the researcher's view of events. Importantly, for context, it must be acknowledged that most of the participants were faculty in a two-year college. More specifically, six of the eight interviewees were

two-year faculty. Interviewees one, two, three, four, six, and seven were representatives from two-year institutions, and interviewees five and eight were from four-year institutions. In addition to the legislation itself, which I referred to in my indexing as document A but cited in the findings since it's publicly accessible, there were thirteen documents used to triangulate the survey data and data from interviewees. Document B was the training PowerPoint sent to all initial members of the CCAC. Documents C, D, G, H, J, and K are meeting minutes. Documents E, I, L, M, and N are emails sent to or shared with the committee members. Document F is a presentation given to the Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) by MDHE.

Findings

What was the Selection Process for CCAC Members?

In the selection process for the CCAC, professional expertise was the essential qualification, but preparation was not prioritized. Both institutions and MDHE played an important role selecting members, but those processes were inconsistent and confusing.

Qualifications

Professional Expertise is Essential: "Shall Be Faculty." The most important qualification for being a member of the CCAC was holding a faculty position. This was mandated in the legislation: "A majority of the members of the advisory committee shall be faculty members from Missouri public institutions of higher education (S. B. 997, 2016, 22). Additionally, the legislation defines faculty as "a person who is employed full-time by a community college or other public institution of higher education as a member of the faculty whose primary duties include teaching, research, academic service, or administration" (S. B. 997, 21). Five of the ten survey respondents identified as "faculty"

or “professor.” Additionally, the researcher (R) identifies primarily as faculty. The other five survey respondents identified as having a role that was partial or mostly administration: two department chairs, one dean, one program director, and one division chair. Therefore, though all members surveyed and interviewed had a faculty role, about half had a primary role as an administrator.

Preparation

Preparation is not Priority: “Just Show Up.” All eight interviewees stated that they had no formal training prior to the committee service. The was an optional webinar that defined terms and requirements from the legislation (Document B). However, no survey respondents or interviewees mentioned this webinar –a potential indication that many did not attend or did not remember attending. Interviewee three, who had prior knowledge of general education in the state of Missouri, explained that she contacted the organizer of the committee to inquire about sending out relevant documents and context, and summarized his response by saying, “he didn’t seem to think that was important.” Others indicated a lack of emphasis on preparation. Interviewee one stated, “I just got a call…asking if I could show up the next day to a meeting” and interviewee four stated, “I mean, you just kinda show up and find out [the purpose] when you got there.” Interviewee two added, “I just got kind of thrown in.” Thus, there is evidence that preparing members for this work was not a priority for this committee.

Selection

Institutional Selection was Inconsistent: “I Don’t Know Why.” There are variety of reasons why faculty feel they were chosen by their institution to serve on the CCAC. Four of the ten survey responders stated that they volunteered and the other six

understood or assumed that their CAO or dean nominated them to be an institutional representative. Two of the eight interviewees had no idea. Interviewee one responded "I don't know why" and interviewee two explained "I was not given any specific [reason]". Four interviewees speculated by offering that perhaps their expertise or discipline was valued or that an administrator thought highly of them. Two interviewees reported that they volunteered. When the researcher was asked to serve by her department chair, she was told that the institution wanted a representative from the English department to serve (R). Thus, it seems that different institutions had different motivations and processes for selecting representatives, but there was not a consistent process used by all institutions.

MDHE Selection was Confusing: "Appointed by Dr. Dion ". The institutional process may have been inconsistent, but the process used by MDHE to select from the representative options is even less clear. None of the interviewees indicated that they understood why they were the chosen representative selected by MDHE to serve. In fact, the process was unclear from the beginning. As emails indicate, many institutions thought they were sending two representatives, only to find out that MDHE had chosen one of the two, and that one would be the representative for their institution on the CCAC. In one email, a chief academic officer forwarded materials because he assumed that MDHE would invite the two or three faculty whose names were submitted to be on the CCAC (Document L). In another email, a faculty member followed up because he was still not receiving information about the CCAC meetings as he understood he should (Document M). The only reason given was "only those committee members appointed by Dr. Dion will receive the calendar invites and will be expected to attend in-person meetings" (Document M). Dr. Dion was initially the MDHE official tasked with organizing this

committee. When another email was sent thanking the MDHE staff member for clearing up the issue, the response stated: "You're very welcome. I have received the same questions from other institutional representatives, so you are definitely not alone" (Document N). Thus, the process was not only unclear; it was confusing to the point that many institutions submitted names with the understanding that all those submitted names would be attending as representatives. Together, these documents indicate that many representatives and their institutions were not given a transparent explanation of the process for how institutional representatives were selected.

What Were the Responsibilities and Rewards for Serving in the CCAC Role?

The primary responsibility of the members of the CCAC was to define common curriculum for the state of Missouri. This work was intense and there was no expectation of reward by means of course reduction or stipend.

CCAC Defined Curriculum: "Authored by Me"

The primary responsibility for CCAC members was curriculum evaluation. From the first two meetings, the director of MDHE charged the CCAC with identifying the courses that would make up the 42-hr block and for deciding how to accomplish the goals set forth by the legislation. This is documented in the minutes of the first two meetings (Documents C and D). Six of the eight interviewees discussed conducting or facilitating course reviews as the primary responsibility. As courses were chosen to be a part of the Core 42 curriculum, the committee was then tasked with writing definitions for those courses and reviewing every course that might fit that definition (Documents C, D, G, H, J, and K). The most detailed description came from an interviewee who co-chaired a discipline workgroup, interviewee four: "I get a list of reviewers. I summarize the course

descriptions and then all the syllabi and then disseminate them to all the different potential reviewers. Then I collect the reviews and tally the scores and then give my vote." Interviewee two who was not a chair or co-chair of a discipline workgroup, but who leads a subgroup described that he had "led faculty reviews" for his discipline and currently is "developing course objectives." Similarly, the researcher was a co-chair who facilitate course reviews and wrote state definition for required composition courses: "It was humbling to think that the state definitions for courses were being authored by me. I shared my work as much as possible to ensure transparency and acquire buy-in" (R). These answers describe much more specific involvement in curriculum that was initially communicated to members in the CCAC. In the introductory document initially sent to all members, the responsibilities were defined as "guide development of core curriculum" and "lead work groups in specific areas" (Document B).

CCAC Work is Intense: "I Gotta Hunker Down"

It's clear that most members could not precisely measure how much time they spent on their CCAC work during a given week. Four of the eight interviewees detailed that the ebb and flow of the works makes it difficult to measure. Interviewee four described time spent on the CCAC as work that "fluctuates." The same interviewee made this statement: "I mean, it's a lot of work for a few people." Interviewee five described it as "bursts of activity." Additionally, interviewee six said "if you spread it out, it would like a couple hours a week, but there are some weeks where we don't do hardly anything, and then other [times] I was like okay, I gotta hunker down and get a lot of this done." Finally, interviewee two estimated that some weeks averaged 5-6 hours of work with four months being particularly busy with course reviews. This is similar to another

interviewee's estimation of 5-8 hours per week. However, it is worth noting this interviewee gave a caveat: this 5-8 hours represents weeks where there is little work and weeks where 15 hours or more were spent on the work.

Time was not Rewarded: "Should I Ask for That?"

Members of the CCAC were not compensated for their time. Of the eight interviewees, one described getting a one-semester course reduction for their work on the CCAC due to their own advocacy. According to interviewee six, "I didn't at first…I think I'd done it two full years. And when it went into full effect, I went and talked to my vice president again at the time. And, she offered me three credit hours." This same interviewee described getting a stipend in subsequent semesters. Similarly, the researcher received a three-hour course reduction during one semester. However, that was accidental. One of her assigned classes did not meet enrollment minimums. It was decided that instead of assigning another class, a one-time course reduction would be given to acknowledge this committee work. Seven of the eight interviewees responded that they received no compensation. One of those seven interviewees responded with "is that an option, should I ask for that?" This indicates that though there are a few instances of course reductions and one stipend, for the most part, the idea of committee service is not connected to compensation. This theme is extended in the legislation itself which required the curriculum changes to be made but did not offer or require any funding or compensation to make it so (S. B. 997, 2016).

How did Faculty and the CCAC Roles Align?

There was misalignment between the expectations faculty had of the role they would play and work they were asked to do on the CCAC. Based on the title which included the word "advisory," most expected to advise, but not necessarily create policy.

Faculty Expected an Advisory Role: "I thought it was going to be a lot simpler"

While most members have different initial expectations, the work was different than what each member thought it would be. Each of the eight interviewees discussed how the actual work was different from what they imagined. Interviewee seven cited that they expected the role would be more advisory instead of policy creation since the word "advisory" is in the committee title. This was echoed in an answer from interviewee four, "I thought it was going to be a lot simpler than it was." Two others indicated how the work was different. Interviewee one stated that many issues came up outside of curriculum that they did not feel qualified to answer, like when the discussion arose of bringing in private institutions and transfer decisions that needed input from registrars and other higher education professionals. Yet interviewee two stated that they "did not anticipate [they] would get to do as much on the individual course level." Similarly, the researcher also thought the term "advisory" would be more accurate in that she would be serving to advise instead of being a policy creator (R). CCAC minutes from three meetings during the second year of work indicate that the committee was tasked with defining native and transfer students and guiding principles for accepting courses into the general education curriculum (Documents G, H, & J). These documents together with faculty descriptions demonstrate work that was creating guidelines in a role that is well beyond advisory. Clearly, faculty were in the role of primary creator of these principles

and guidelines. This indicates that what the work itself involved was not clear to faculty from the beginning, and in some cases, representatives were asked to do work beyond the expected role.

How was power manifested in the formation and implementation of the CCAC?

There were many manifestations of power in the work of the CCAC. Most felt that MDHE did not use their power to influence the work, but that there were uneven power distributions between two and four-year institutions, and that one four-year institution in particular had more power and influence that others.

MGHE did not Structure Their Power: "They had Nothing"

Many different power dynamics were present in the work of the CCAC. The power MDHE exhibited was interpreted differently by different members. Interviewee two described MDHE as a more neutral presence, one that "accepts the decisions of the committee…not a demeaning or demanding type of presences, just a…resource." This description is similar to interviewee one who said "MDHE has done a very good job of not driving the meetings." Interviewee three described MDHE as a unifying force stating, "part of what [the MDHE representative] did was basically say we're all in this together, this affects all of us." Whereas even another divergent viewpoint from interviewee seven was that the lack of structure was harmful: "I showed up expecting the Department of Higher Ed to have a program or structure and we advise, tweak it this way, tweak it that way. But we showed up, and they had nothing." Finally, interviewee six said that initially there was more input or structure from MDHE, but that has lessened over time. The others did not specifically mention MDHE and focused their comments more on

institutional dynamics of power. This evidence demonstrates that there was a wide and varying interpretation of MDHE's influence and how they exerted that influence or not.

Power Struggle Among Groups: "Four Versus Two"

There were also varying views of power exerted by different types of institutions. Since each public college and university sent one representative to serve on the CCAC, the two-year and four-year split was close to even: thirteen faculty representatives for each of the four-year institutions in Missouri and fourteen representatives for each of the two-year representatives. However, it is worth noting that not all fall into a neat category. For example, Missouri State –West Plains is a two-year university, but is an extension of Missouri State University. Of the participants in this study, four of the eight interviewees felt that four-year institutions held more power. Interviewee six said more broadly: "it definitely felt four versus two early on…It did not feel that like very many of the four-year institutions were on board with it." Interviewee four framed it similarly saying: "the four universities were, I think they were almost forced to be there, but they really didn't want to listen…the two years were always at the mercy of the four years," and [we would] "continually remind the four-years that the two years operate differently." However, interviewee two recalled that all the institutions seemed to be on "equal footing" and felt that all have had opportunities to contribute. In yet another view, interviewee eight discussed that from the perspective of a four-year representative, the legislation framed this power in a way that felt like "a threat to our ability to innovate." These feelings are further complicated by communication between community college CAOs and MDHE where they submitted concerns via email about issues such as undefined credits and the makeup of Core 42, and the CAOs invited MDHE to present

work from the CCAC at their next meeting (Documents E and F). For example, the CAO's requested that flexible credit hours be eliminated and more clear guidelines be established. These documents show that community college executives understood the potential impact of this legislation and were attentive and active in their advocation for the result to benefit their interests. Though it's unclear how community colleges exerted power, it is clear they attempted to act collectively. Meanwhile, both community college representatives and four-year representatives clearly felt they had less power in the room for different reasons. As a contrast, the researcher worked with her institution's four-year partner on strategy and shared resources (R). For example, together they advocated for mutually beneficial policies and took turns carpooling to the meetings in Jefferson City (R). Thus, there is evidence of four-year and two-year cooperation within this process. Everyone has observations about how power was used or felt, but there is not one story. Each CCAC member has their different story of institutional power.

One Institution Represented More Power: "MU is Gonna Do What MU is Gonna Do"

Three of the eight interviewees mentioned the University of Missouri by name as holding more power and indicated that their unequal power was reason for the legislation in the first place. Interviewee five, one of the four-year representatives, stated: "I think there's a big dynamic, and I really think statewide, it's MU versus everybody else…it just feels like MU is gonna do what MU is gonna do." Interviewee three noted that the MU representative acknowledged "we know we are part of the problem." The researcher assumed that since the legislation was created to improve transferability that the problem was a lack of transferability. Additionally, interviewee four stated "basically this whole thing was created because of MU." These statements offer an interesting contradiction in

that MU is perceived by some as both the reason for this legislation and one who is not invested in following the processes of the CCAC. No other institutions were singled out in this data. While three responses are not a significant pattern, it is yet another example of a different interpretation of power that manifested in this work.

Conclusion

These themes reveal that though the professional criteria for the selection process was clear, the institutional process for selection and the process used by MDHE for selection was not. The responsibilities were heavy with few rewards in terms of time compensation. Additionally, most faculty involved in this study did not have a clear idea of what exactly would be required of them; The role they imagined was not the role they ended up playing. There were multiple power dynamics in this process, but instead of one power dynamic rising to the top, many were at play in a way that seems to have resulted in power dispersal rather than one narrative of power. When all these themes are considered together, a lack of structure is seen in the way the CCAC was put together, the way the CCAC worked together, and the power that was present in the CCAC.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that while the faculty role was centralized, members of the CCAC were not prepared and their selection was not transparent. The responsibilities were significant, and the compensatory rewards were few. The work came with much more authority than faculty expected, and power manifested in differing ways that did not offer one clear narrative of power. These findings confirm and extend the scholarship that has sought to define faculty identity, address how curriculum should be determined, and the influence lawmakers should have on curriculum.

The finding that faculty position was central to selection the CCAC confirms that faculty are still seen as the authority on curriculum as mandated by the AAUP (1966). However, the finding that there was a lack of consistency and transparency in the selection of which faculty were to serve on the committee challenges the curricular authority of all faculty. Requiring some faculty serve on CCAC is not the same as providing representation for all faculty. A transparent structure that offers more opportunities for feedback and input would improve results and increase buy-in.

The finding that curriculum was the primary responsibility of the CCAC extends Dougherty's (2001) claim that four-year universities and community colleges should develop a structure to address challenges together. The CCAC is example of a state mandate where not only are these two different types of institutions required to collaborate, but they are required to agree on curriculum. In this study, faculty reported reviewing courses, writing outcomes, and writing course definitions that would have to be used and accepted by four-year and two-year institutions alike. While Dougherty (2001) called for structural reform, the time has passed for that kind of reform to be forward-thinking. It is now a necessity for the world we live in.

Another finding from this study is that faculty do not expect to be rewarded for policy work and are not given additional time for policy work assigned. This confirms the idea of "commodification of cooperation" (p. 49) from Levin et al. (2006) that faculty often accept more authority instead of higher pay or compensation to participate in decision-making. This confirmation is disturbing when considered with the finding that the CCAC work was both intense and had more authority that faculty expected. It is disturbing that this work is increasing in amount and consequence and there is not a

pattern of compensation of acknowledgement that work needs and deserves compensation.

It was expected that Bruffee's (1993/1999) theory of the social construction of knowledge would inform this study, however this was not the case. Bruffee (1993/1999) discussed how conversation is used as a vehicle to socially construct meaning in education. It could be that intense timeline of the CCAC meant less time for those kinds of conversations or that different questions would have revealed more relevant themes. Nevertheless, the themes that emerged did not lend themselves to Bruffee's (1993/1999) concepts of knowledge development through conversation.

In this study, it was found that many power dynamics were present and were interpreted in various ways: MDHE was present but did not provide much structure in which to apply the expectations of the senate bill; both two-year and four-year institutions had their respective interests, and the largest public institution presented power in a way that was different that the other institutions. These complex power dynamics confirm the need for what Toth et al. (2016) described as a model of mutual responsibility, instead of accountability, between faculty and lawmakers. The differing narratives of power add support to that idea. These complex dynamics necessitate a process where all parties concerned understand the work and participate together instead of dictating broad mandates that must be fulfilled.

Implications

This study demonstrated the challenges in collecting research about faculty policy involvement and why it is important to do so. This research is significant because if recent neoliberal trends are followed, lawmakers will continue to ask faculty to

participate in the streamlining and commodification of general education curriculum. Considering Freire's (1970/2000) banking concept and Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame increased the relevance by showing how attentiveness to processes and rules of curriculum mandates and faculty roles in the application of these mandates is essential to the future of higher education in the United States.

Higher education has a reputation for silos. Silos can be useful for the solitary pursuit of knowledge, but they are not ideal for collaboration. Collaboration is now required to create policy that will support faculty in their research. In fact, this legislation shows that politics will shape the work of higher education whether faculty participate or not. What Bolman and Deal (2013) have shown is that attention must be paid to the processes if an organization wants to accomplish their mission. What this research has shown is that faculty must accept their role as policy makers and advocate for time and compensation to be prepared for this role. The structure of education must change to support this work. Just as Freire (1970/2000) claimed that teachers must present the world to students as something they take responsibility for and as something they can impact, faculty must take responsibility for the shape of policy and administration must support space for faculty to do so.

Before discussing implications for further research, it is important to state what limited this study. Because of the small number of participants, these findings cannot be generalized or even assumed to represent the experience of most faculty who participated in this study. During data collection, repeated attempts to contact original members of the CCAC did not yield the desired response of a least half the committee, thirteen to fourteen members. However, the researcher is hopeful that the perspectives recorded and

triangulated with other documents could be what Tracy (2010) called heuristic significance, or significance that urges additional research and encourages action. Thus, this research has potential to offer some insight into faculty roles in policy and that further research could illuminate the work in a way that could be generalized.

Faculty roles in curriculum policy for both two-year and four-year institutions should be examined further. Levin et al. (2018) demonstrated how teaching is the primary source of identity in community college instructors. More research should survey much larger faculty groups from both four-year and two-year institutions about their preparation for and roles in policy work, especially as related to curriculum. This would establish broad patterns to see where there is alignment and where there is dispute which would indicate where there is already consensus and where work and resources should be devoted. As mentioned above, since this study did not accumulate the number of participants to examine meaningful patterns, larger studies will be important to further this work.

Faculty and administration should investigate what structures are available to train two-year and four-year faculty in policy collaboration. The necessity of this exploration is clear. S. B. 997 is an example of the growing political interest in higher education. Gone are the days of complete institutional autonomy. If structures are not present, faculty should consider how to build these structures. What resources are needed? Who can provide these resources? Additionally, what methods can be used to encourage more trust and collaboration between two-year and four-year faculty? This research illustrates the need for concerned member of higher education to investigate what this collaboration could look like. Neoliberal political actors have made it clear that it will be built.

Research can play an important part in offering how this collaboration might be put together.

References

American Association of University Professors. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Dar, L. (2016). Institutional assessment and accountability. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 103-113). Harvard Education Press.

Davis, O. (2013). 6 ways neoliberal reform is destroying our college system. *Salon*. Retrieved from https://www.salon.com/2013/10/09/6_ways_neoliberal_education_reform_is_destroying_our_college_system_partner/

Dougherty, K. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Community college missions: A theoretical and historical perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* (136), 5-13. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1002/cc.254

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed.* Continuum.

Guinier, L. (2015). *The tyranny of the meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America*. Beacon Press.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Levin, J. S. (2017). *Community colleges and new universities under neoliberal pressures: Organizational change and stability*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levin, J. S., Martin, M. C., López Damián, A. I., & Hoggatt, M. J. (2018). Preservation of community college logic: Organizational responses to state policies and funding practices in three states. *Community College Review*, *46*(2), 197–220.

Merriam, S.B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://dhe.mo.gov/about/legislative/SB997.php

Rosenbaum, J., Ahearn, C., Ng, C., & Lansing, J. (2016). *College for All and the convergence of high school and community college*. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 115-136). Harvard Education Press.

S.B. 997, 2016, 2016 Reg. Sess. (MO 2016).

Shober, A. F. (2016). Individuality or community?: Bringing assessment and accountability to K-16 education. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 67-86). Harvard Education Press.

Toth, C., Sullivan, P., & Calhoon-Dillahunt, C. (2016). A dubious method of improving educational outcomes: Accountability and the two-year college. *Teaching English in the Two-year College, 43*(4), 391-410.

CHAPTER SIX:

SCHOLARLY-PRACTITIONER REFLECTION

1

The process of researching and writing a dissertation in practice has influenced my development as an educational leader and as a scholar. As an educational leader, this dissertation has helped me to better understand why I should prioritize structure, collaboration, accountability, and transformation. As a scholar, this dissertation has helped me better my strengths and weaknesses in crafting scholarship and my role in advocating for resources to be devoted to qualitative research. Finally, this research has been a disorienting experience that has challenged me to accept the unfinished nature of qualitative research.

DIP's Influence on My Practice as an Educational Leader

As a teacher, my pedagogy and identity have been firmly rooted in the idea of sharing power in the classroom (Freire, 1970/2000). Thus, I have not always been comfortable with the label "leader." This dissertation challenged me to redefine what leadership is and consider how structure, collaboration, accountability, and transformation are central to my leadership development.

In my dissertation, I used Bolman and Deal's (2013) structural frame. Using this frame in my research has been helpful in my leadership practice. The structural frame asks that leaders consider how structure and organizational processes support their institutional mission (Bolman & Deal, 2013). In my research, I saw that a lack of structure resulted in frustration and fragmented results. This has helped me understand how essential structure is to my leadership. I love the conceptual aspects of leadership: brainstorming and imagining how to move forward. However, if I focus only on vision and not on structure, all that imagining is for naught because there is nothing to support

the vision moving forward. Core 42 had a great goal, but not much structural support to assist in implementation. As a leader, I hope to avoid that mistake as much as possible.

While structure is essential to leadership, structure is best when paired with collaboration. The ability to work with others is another important aspect of leadership I was led to consider in my dissertation work. Northouse (2016) talks about team leadership as a strategy that helps us consider the increasing complexity and globalization of leadership. This approach to leadership manifested in my dissertation as Core 42 demonstrated the complexity of curriculum requirements and the differing needs of institutions. Levi (2017) discussed the importance of having clear goals understood by every member of a team. Examining the application of this deceptively simply mandate showed the need for leadership that values communication, member-buy in and consideration of various stakeholders. For example, a community college might have a need for a simplified version of a math class for their welding students, but a university curriculum might only have more advanced offerings for their programs. How are these differing needs and missions balanced? There is no easy answer, but the willingness to collaborate and leaders who listen and value that collaboration is the beginning. Levi (2017) would refer to this as developing a team culture. I already believed in the power of collaboration, but this dissertation has been a very concrete example of why this kind of collaboration in leadership is necessary to the future of higher education policy.

Accountability and trust are yet another part of leadership that was emphasized in my dissertation in practice. Lencioni (2002) argued that healthy conflict and accountability are essential for teams to build trust. Additionally, his work stated that dysfunction occurs when there is a lack of clarity and buy in (Lencioni, 2002). To

negotiate the complexity of the curricular legislation that was the focus of my dissertation in practice, trust and buy in was essential, but I found that many who were involved in the implementation did not have clarity in the process or in our objectives. Thus, as I reflected on how this dissertation has impacted my growth as a leader, a respect for the role of clarity and buy-in has most definitely been an important part of that development.

Trust and accountability have to be intentionally supported by leaders. This is in part because oppression can take root where values are not intentionally supported. Freire (1970/2000) discussed the oppressive structure that can be present in education even when teachers and others are well meaning but not paying attention to what their structure is supporting. Similarly, Johnson (2018) discussed how oppressive systems can seem tantalizingly stable. In the case of Core 42, there were many good intentions, but often a lack of structure resulted in confusion and lack of collaboration. It's not that those things are the same thing as oppression, but that the lack of structure and the presence of confusion and disenfranchisement can allow oppression to take root. This dissertation has helped me understand how as a leader I need to carefully think about my structural participation in hopes that I can tip the scales toward clarity and trust.

Finally, the transformational nature of leadership is something that has been apparent throughout the process of writing this dissertation in practice. Northouse (2016) described leadership as a process that changes those involved in leadership. He continued by identifying clear vision and trust as essential elements of transformational leadership (Northouse, 2016). As I listened to my participants discussed their experiences in policy application, it became clear that there was not a unified vision. Additionally, while many trusted their institutions, there was often not trust in the process. One paradox of higher

education is that we are both standard bearers for what it means to be "educated" while we are also responsible for creating new knowledge. So even though we are knowledge creators, it is often difficult to trust the process and our leaders enough to let them change us. George et al. (2011) explained that to lead with authenticity is to have an ongoing commitment to personal development. Likewise, Freire (1970/2000) described learning as a continual process with no end. This work was a reminder that to be an authentic leader I need to hold my ideals but not so firmly that I am not open to the transformational process that leadership can be.

DIP's Influence on My Role as a Scholar

This dissertation also had a significant impact on my role as a scholar. From this work, I gleaned a better understanding of qualitative research and its place in scholarship. Additionally, the difficulty I had in conducting this case study changing my understanding of what it means to be scholar, more specifically, what it means for me to participate in scholarship.

Though I assumed from the beginning of the program that I would conduct qualitative research, conducting the research for this dissertation gave me a much deeper appreciation for the storytelling ability of qualitative research. Bansal and Corley (2012) reminded me that while all research tells a story, this is even more true with qualitative research. More specifically, since I conducted a case study, I learned about how telling one specific story can be helpful to understanding the whole story even when that one specific story can't be generalized (Creswell, 2014; Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). Even though Yin (2014) discussed the use of interviews and documents in a case study,

conducting my own improved my understanding of the benefit of triangulating an experience from different types of data.

One idea essential to Freire's (1970/2000) work is that of praxis: meaningful work includes both action and reflection. This idea emerged in coursework as well when we read about Heikkinen et al. (2015) idea of practitioner research. They defined praxis as "research and theory [that] must be committed to a political and ethical engagement" as an important part of practitioner knowledge (Heikkinen at al., 2015, p. 7). In this dissertation research, my role as a practitioner within this research served these ends. Since I was a participant researcher, I was both engaged in the research and reflecting the experience of mine and others. This work taught me how important this structure is and how it should be cyclical and iterative. Only now that I've tried this practitioner research do I have ideas about how I would do thing differently next time. I've come to see how research is often not linear but circular: something we continually return to in alternate breaths of reflection and action.

I chose qualitative research because it was the best way to ask the questions I wanted to pursue, but I realized as I worked on this dissertation that typically when people reference data, they are referencing quantitative research. In our coursework, we read about the rise of data-informed analytics (Zettelmeyer, 2015), and I realized that I, too, thought of data in this way. As I conducted interviews and read survey data, I realized that when my institution talked about being data-informed, they were talking about enrollment numbers, grades, and data that could be quantified. Collecting qualitative data made me keenly aware of this. The difficulty I had collecting my data helped to understand one reason why this is true: qualitative data takes longer to collect

and analyze. Most importantly, this work emphasized that because this is true, as a scholar, I need to advocate for this kind of research so that we can benefit from the unique views provided by qualitative research.

It's difficult to reflect on a qualitative dissertation process without including Tracy's (2010) "Big Tent" criteria. In this article, Tracy (2010) defined the necessary criteria for qualitative research as being a worth topic, having rich rigor, sincerity, credibility, resonance, significant contribution, ethical practices, and meaningful coherence. As I conducted this research and struggled to get participants, I felt like I was failing. How could my research be a "significant contribution" to the "big tent" if it was that difficult to get participation? But when I returned to Tracy (2010) I found the term "heuristic significance" which is explained as a significance in research that develops further exploration. Its main purpose is to cultivate curiosity, so the audience is inspired to take action or make change (Tracy, 2010). This was a great comfort. I realized that I had fallen into the trap of expecting good research to have answers instead of remembering that more often its role is to ask questions.

Another way this process impacted my role as a scholar is that it offered a different frame for my strengths. When I had to take the Strengths Finder survey for the first summer of this program, my top five strengths were all in the strategic thinking category: Ideation, Input, Intellection, Learner, and Strategic. These strengths were a benefit as I crafted the framework and looked for patterns in the findings of my research. Ideation was especially prominent as the strength that presents as loving ideas simple because they are interesting (StrengthsQuest, n.d.). This was apparent in my dissertation process. I loved the brainstorming and gathering steps, but the shaping and structure parts

were hard for me. I would often get lost in the details and in the act of making sure everything mirrored each other in the various sections. This is where I saw the difficulty in having all my strengths in one bucket. I learned to seek help from other scholars who did have these strengths to get guidance on those parts of the process where I struggled.

As I reflected on this imbalance of strengths, I remembered the theory of the incomplete leader. This theory reminded me that society has crafted this idea of a complete leader, a leader who has all of the strengths and gifts necessary for good leadership (Anacona et al., 2007/2011). Anacona, et al. (2007/2011) explained that instead we should view leaders as incomplete and human who grow through inpute and leadership from others. Similarly, I would argue that this dissertation process has caused me to think of scholarship in the same way: I have grown as a scholar, but I would view my scholarship journey as incomplete and one that needs continue input and leadership from others to continue that growth.

As a writing teacher, the dissertation process asked something very difficult of me: to take the same advice I give my students. This advice includes the following: trust the process, pay attention, and give oneself some grace. The extent to which this process made me uncomfortable is an indication of how much growth and transformation occurred during this dissertation process. Freire (1970/2000) described the learning process as something ongoing and unfinished. We never become, but we are always becoming (Freire, 1970/2000). Chen (2014) quoted Laurent Daloz, “the line between learning and healing is finer than we might think” (p. 408). This quote is relevant because it reminds us that learning, like healing, includes discomfort and a choice to move forward instead of staying in the same place. Together, these ideas were a reminder that

my work as a scholar is a continual process that insists on exchanging comfort for the next lesson.

Both Merriam and Bierema (2014) and Mezirow et al. (2009) discussed the idea of the disorienting dilemma. This ten-step process laid out by Mezirow et al. (2009) explained how a difficult experience or set of experiences can lead to the questioning of one's experience followed by taking action to change one's circumstances. Mezirow (2009) continued by explaining how reflecting on these experiences can result not only in change but in a whole new understanding and perspective. This transformation is a most accurate description of the dissertation process. Whereas I began this process with the assumption that this research would lead to specific answers in which I would feel supremely confident, the result was much less clear. For some reason, though I teach knowledge as a process and scholarship as a process, I began the dissertation with the expectation that it would be linear, more clear. Yet, there was no eureka moment and there remained a nagging feeling that I have absolutely overlooked many important things. I realized that while I have talked about the process of scholarship, I have not participated in it. I have not tried to create and contribute to knowledge with research of my own. I was unprepared for the vulnerability that requires and the disorientation that followed, but that reframing has given me a deeper understanding of the messy, always in process conversation that is qualitative research. The writer Richard Bach (2013) said, "We teach best that which we need to learn." I was unprepared for the disorientation, but it was a lesson I needed.

References

American Association of Community Colleges. (2019). Retrieved from https://www.aacc.nche.edu/about-us/mission-statement/

American Association of University Professors. (n.d.) Shared governance. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/shared-governance

American Association of University Professors. (1966). *Statement on government of colleges and universities*. Retrieved from https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities

Anacaona, et al. (2007/2011). In praise of the incomplete leader. In *On leadership*, (pp. 179-196). Harvard Business Review Press.

Armstrong, M. A., & Stewart-Gambino, H. (2016). Building curricular diversity though a "social movement": How faculty networks support institutional change. *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing, 31*, (p. 112-125).

Association for the Study of Higher Education. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://www.ashe.ws/aboutashe

Association for the Study of Higher Education. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://www.ashe.ws/cpphe

Bach, R. (2013). *Illusions: The adventures of a reluctant messiah*. Random House.

Bansal, P., & Corley, K. (2012). Publishing in *AMJ* --Part 7: What's different about qualitative research? *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(3), 509-513. doi: 10.5465/amj.2012.4003

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (2013). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G. & Gallos, J. V. (2011). *Reframing academic leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Carnell, B. & Fung, D. (2017). Editor's introduction. In B. Carnell & D. Fung (Eds.), *Developing the higher education curriculum: Research-based education in practice* (pp. 1-13). UCL Press.

Chen, J. C. (2014). Teaching nontraditional adult students: adult learning theories in practice. *Teaching in Higher Education, 19*(4), 406-418. doi: 10.1080/13562517.2013.860101

Complete College America. (2020). Retrieved from https://completecollege.org/article/complete-college-america-receives-nearly-1-5-million-in-grant-funding/).

Complete College America. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://completecollege.org/about/

Complete College America. (2014). Retrieved from https://completecollege.org/article/indiana-selected-for-1-million-luminacomplete-college-america-grant-to-boost-college-completion/

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage.

Crowder College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.crowder.edu/about-crowder/

Dar, L. (2016). Institutional assessment and accountability. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 103-113). Harvard Education Press.

Davis, O. (2013). 6 ways neoliberal reform is destroying our college system. *Salon*. Retrieved from

https://www.salon.com/2013/10/09/6_ways_neoliberal_education_reform_is_destroying_our_college_system_partner/

Dougherty, K. J. (2001). *The contradictory college: The conflicting origins, impacts, and futures of the community college*. SUNY Press.

Dougherty, K. J., & Townsend, B. K. (2006). Community college missions: A theoretical and historical perspective. *New Directions for Community Colleges,* (136), 5-13. doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.mul.missouri.edu/10.1002/cc.254

East Central College. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://www.eastcentral.edu/about-ecc/

East Central College. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://www.eastcentral.edu/institutional-research/wp-content/uploads/sites/35/2020/02/census20200217SPrevised.pdf

Fain, P. (2018). Missouri expands performance funding for public colleges. *Inside higher ed*. Retrieved from: https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2018/01/04/missouri-expands-performance-funding-public-colleges

Fink, A. F. (2017). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (6th ed.). Sage.

Flynn, J., James, R., Mathien, T., Mitchell, P., & Whalen, S. (2017). The overlooked context: Pedagogies for engagement and empowerment at the community college. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue, 19*(1), 69-85.

Freire, P. (1970/2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* Continuum.

George, et al. (2007/2011). Discovering your authentic leadership. In *On leadership* (pp. 163-177. Harvard Business Review Press.

Gregory, K. H., & Burbage, A. K. (2017). Exploring faculty development identity through self-study: Teaching philosophies, reflective practice, and critical friendship. *Journal of Ethnographic & Qualitative Research, 12*, 110-124.

Guinier, L. (2015). *The tyranny of the meritocracy: Democratizing higher education in America*. Beacon Press.

Hanlon, A. (2019). Colleges say more teaching is better. They're wrong. *The Chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Colleges-Say-More-Teaching-Is/245657

Harris-Stowe State University. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://go.hssu.edu/rsp_content.cfm?wid=2&pid=1193

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press.

Heikkinen, H. L. T., et al. (2016). What is good practitioner research? *Vocations and Learning, 9,* 1-19. doi: 10.1007/s12186-9153-8.

Huang, F. (2017). The impact of mass and universal higher education on curriculum and instruction: Case studies of china and japan. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education Research*, *74*(3), 507–525.

Jefferson College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.jeffco.edu/about/about-jefferson-college/why-go-jefferson-college

Jenkins, R. (2014). Why you should consider community colleges. *The chronicle of higher education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/Why-You-Should-Consider/143851

Kater, S. T. (2017). Community college faculty conceptualizations of shared governance: Shared understandings of a sociopolitical reality. *Community College Review*, *45*(3), 234-257. doi: 10.1177/0091552117700490

Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team: A leadership fable* (1st ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Levi, D. (2017). *Group dynamics for teams* (5th ed). Sage.

Levin, J. S. (2017). *Community colleges and new universities under neoliberal pressures: Organizational change and stability*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levin, J. S., Kater, S., & Wagoner, R. L. (2006). *Community College Faculty: At Work in the New Economy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Levin, J. S., Martin, M. C., López Damián, A. I., & Hoggatt, M. J. (2018). Preservation of community college logic: Organizational responses to state policies and funding practices in three states. *Community College Review*, *46*(2), 197–220.

Lincoln University. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://bluetigerportal.lincolnu.edu/web/oira/key-facts

Lincoln University. (n.d. -b). Retrieved from https://www.lincolnu.edu/web/academics/faculty-listing

Lumina Foundation. (2016). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/news-and-views/outcomes-based-funding-round-3.

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/lumina-foundation-faq

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., –b). https://luminafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/08/lumina-state-policy-agenda-2017-20-final.pdf

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., -c). From the ground up: An early history of Lumina Foundation for Education. Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/files/resources/from-the-ground-up.pdf

Lumina Foundation, (n.d., -d). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/about/

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., -e). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/person/jamie-merisotis/

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., -f). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/about/people/board-of-directors/

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., –g). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/about/financials/

Lumina Foundation. (n.d., –h). Retrieved from https://www.luminafoundation.org/grant/9363/

Mangan, K. (2013). How Gates shapes state higher-education policy. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from https://www.chronicle.com/article/How-Gates-Shapes-State/140303

Merriam, S. B., & Bierema, L. L. (2014). *Adult learning: Linking theory and practice*. Jossey-Bass.

Merriam, S.B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. et al. (2009). *Transformative learning in practice: Insights from community, workplace, and higher education*. Jossey-Bass.

Metropolitan Community College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.mcckc.edu/what-drives-us/

Mineral Area College. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://mineralarea.edu/about-us/college-profile/

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://dhe.mo.gov/initiatives/documents/CCAGameChangersOverview.pdf

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://dhe.mo.gov/about/legislative/SB997.php

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -c).

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -d). Retrieved from https://dhewd.mo.gov/cbhe/members.php

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -e). Retrieved from https://dhewd.mo.gov/about/structure.php

Missouri Department of Higher Education and Workforce Development. (n.d., -f). Retrieved from https://dhewd.mo.gov/about/

Missouri Southern State University. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.mssu.edu/advancement/admissions/university-profile.php

Missouri State University. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://www.missouristate.edu/about/

Missouri State University. (n.d. -b). Retrieved from https://mis.missouristate.edu/KeyPerformanceIndicators/kpi2016/index/5

Missouri State University –West Plains. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://wp.missouristate.edu/about/

Missouri State University –West Plains. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://apps.missouristate.edu/wp/faculty/

Missouri University of Science and Technology. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://www.mst.edu/about/academics/

Missouri University of Science and Technology. (n.d. -b). Retrieved from https://enrollment.mst.edu/

Missouri Western State University. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://www.missouriwestern.edu/about/

Missouri Western State University. (n.d. -b). Retrieved from https://www.missouriwestern.edu/ir/wp-content/uploads/sites/169/2020/05/FACTS-F19_v2.pdf

Moberly Area Community College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.macc.edu/programs/degree-programs

Moore, T. L., & Ward, K. (2010). Institutionalizing faculty engagement through research, teaching, and service at research universities. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, *17*(1), 44–58.

National Education Association. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.nea.org/home/34767.htm

North Central Missouri College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.ncmissouri.edu/wp-content/uploads/2020/01/2019-Fact-Sheet.pdf

Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (7th ed.). Sage.

Northwest Missouri State University. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.nwmissouri.edu/aboutus/index.htm

Ozarks Technical Community College. (n.d. -a). Retrieved from https://academics.otc.edu/business/course-pathways/

Ozarks Technical Community College. (n.d. -b). Retrieved from https://research.otc.edu/media/uploads/2020/02/2019-Fast-Facts.pdf

Penn State University Press. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.psupress.org/Journals/jnls_jge.html

Pinar, W. F. (2011). Introduction. In W. F. Pinar (Ed.), *The character of curriculum studies: Bildung, currere, and the recurring question of the subject* (pp. 1-21). Palgrave Macmillan.

Rosenbaum, J., Ahearn, C., Ng, C., & Lansing, J. (2016). *College for All and the convergence of high school and community college*. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 115-136). Harvard Education Press.

S.B. 997, 2016, 2016 Reg. Sess. (MO 2016).

Sallie Mae. (2000). Retrieved from https://www.salliemae.com/assets/investors/shareholder/annual-reports/annrpt_2002.pdf

Seidman, I. (2013). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in education & the social sciences*. (4th ed.). Teachers College Press.

Shober, A. F. (2016). Individuality or community?: Bringing assessment and accountability to K-16 education. In C.P. Loss & P. J. McGuinn (Eds.), *The convergence of K-12 and higher education: Policies and programs in a changing era* (pp. 67-86). Harvard Education Press.

Southeast Missouri State University. (n.d., -a). Retrieved from https://semo.edu/about.html

Southeast Missouri State University. (n.d., -b). Retrieved from https://semo.edu/ir/facts.html

St. Charles Community College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.stchas.edu/about-scc/fast-facts

St. Louis Community College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://stlcc.edu/about/stlcc-by-the-numbers.aspx

State Fair Community College. (n.d.) Retrieved from https://www.sfccmo.edu/about/sfcc-at-a-glance/

State Technical College of Missouri. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.statetechmo.edu/facts/

StrengthsQuest. (n.d.) All 34 CliftonStrengths themes descriptions. *CliftonStrengths for students*. Retrieved from https://www.strengthsquest.com/193541/themes-full-description.aspx

Three Rivers College. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.trcc.edu/about/facts.php

Tierney, W. G. (1989). *Curricular landscapes, Democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education*. Praeger.

Toth, C., Sullivan, P., & Calhoon-Dillahunt, C. (2016). A dubious method of improving educational outcomes: Accountability and the two-year college. *Teaching English in the Two-year College, 43*(4), 391-410.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative inquiry, 16*(10), 837-851. doi: 10.117/1077800410383121

Truman State University. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.truman.edu/about/

United States Department of the Treasury. (2006). Retrieved from https://www.treasury.gov/about/organizational-structure/offices/Documents/SallieMaePrivatizationReport.pdf

University of Central Missouri. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.ucmo.edu/about/fast-facts/

University of Missouri. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://missouri.edu/about/facts

University of Missouri –Kansas City. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.umkc.edu/about/index.html

University of Missouri –St. Louis. (n.d.). Retrieved from https://www.umsl.edu/proud/by-the-numbers.html

Weick, K. (1983). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. In J. V. Baldridge and T. Deal (Eds.), *The dynamics of organizational change in educatio*n (pp. 15-37). McCutchan Publishing Corporation. (Original work published 1978)

Yin, R. K. (2014). *Case study research: Design and methods* (5th ed). Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Sage.

Yob, I. M. et al. (2016). Curriculum alignment with a mission of social change in higher education. *Innovation in Higher Education, 41*, 203-219. doi:10.1007/s10755-015-9344.

Appendix A

Interview Consent Form

Introduction: I am Lyndsey Strahan, lead English instructor for Ozarks Technical Community College and doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis program with the University of Missouri – Columbia. For my disseration, I am collecting data relevant to the mandate in SB 997 to make the common curriculum transferable across all public institutions of higher education.

Research purpose: The purpose of my research is to document the formation and implementation of Core 42.

Your role in the process: If you decide to participate in the research, you will be asked to answer questions in an online survey with the potential for a follow-up interview. You will be asked twenty-two questions about your work on the Common Curricular Advisory Committee.

Time required: The individual interviews will each take approximately 1 hour. If you choose to participate, this will take approximately one hour of your time.

Risks: No risks are anticipated with this project.

Benefit: Potential benefits of this research project may a better understanding of faculty expectations in policy work and could result in better support for faculty policy work.

Confidentiality: Though the interview will be recorded for transcription, your responses will be kept confidential and your identity and university or college affiliation will remain private.

Sharing the results of the research: Nothing that you tell me in the survey or interview will be attributed to your name. By signing this consent form, you are giving written permission for excerpts of your responses during the survey or interview to be included in my dissertation or other later publications; however, your name will not be used.

Voluntary participation and withdrawal: It is your choice whether to participate or not. The choice you make will have no bearing on your current policy work or any related work. You may change your mind and stop participating even if you agreed earlier. If you choose to withdraw at any time, please inform the researcher that you no longer wish to participate (no explanation is necessary and no questions will be asked). You may also

choose to skip any of the questions asked as part of the research process but still choose to continue in the rest of the study.

Questions or concerns? Should you have any questions or concerns about this research project or your part in it, please contact me: Lyndsey Strahan, 214-762-5546; strahanl@otc.edu. You may also contact the dissertation chair supervising this project: Dr. Cynthia MacGregor, 417-836-6046, cmacgregor@missouristate.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board (IRB) at 573-882-3181 or muresearchirb@missouri.edu. The IRB is a group of people who review research studies to make sure the rights and welfare of participants are protected. If you want to talk privately about any concerns or issues related to your participation, you may contact the Research Participant Advocacy at 888-280-5002 (a free call) or email muresearchrpa@missouri.edu.

Agreement:
The nature and purpose of this study has been sufficiently explained, and I have had the opportunity to ask questions about it. Any questions I have asked have been answered to my satisfaction. I voluntarily consent to be a participant in this study, and I understand I am free to withdraw at any time.

Signature: _____

Print Name: _____

Date: _____

Appendix B

Survey Protocol

1. What is your role at your institution?
2. What did you know about the Core 42 mandate before your service on this committee?
3. How were you selected to serve on the CCAC?
4. Describe the work you did for the CCAC.
5. Did you view your role on the CCAC as one where you were responsible for representing your discipline group or your institution or both?
6. How important is it to you to be involved in statewide policy implementation? Please describe.
7. Are you willing to participate in a follow-up interview?

Appendix C

Interview Protocol

1. Please describe your role at your institution.
2. In what ways, if any, does your work at your institution typically involvement policy implementation?
3. In what ways, if any, have you previously served on a statewide committee?
4. From when to when have you/did you serve on the Core Curricular Advisement Committee (CCAC)?
5. In addition to meetings, what additional time did you spend on your work for the CCAC in an average week?
6. What, if any, training did you receive prior to your service on the CCAC?
7. If so, in what ways did this training prepare you for the work?
8. Please describe the story of how you came to be a member of the CCAC.
9. Why do you think you were selected or appointed to serve on the CCAC for your institution?
10. What, if any, leadership roles did you hold for the CCAC?
11. Please describe any course reductions or stipends you received for your work on the CCAC.
12. In what ways, if any, were you responsible for implementation of the Core 42 at your institution?
13. Please describe your role in communicating the mission of the Core 42 at your institution.
14. Please describe your role in communicating with peers in your discipline group about decisions made with the CCAC.
15. Please describe your role in communicating with administrators at your institution about decisions made with the CCAC.
16. How similar or different was your initial understanding of your work with the CCAC to what your work became?
17. Please tell me your story of how power was manifested in the formation of the CCAC and the implementation of Core 42.

Appendix D

Document Analysis Guide

Name: Source:

Date:

Selection	Responsibilities	Role Alignment

VITA

Lyndsey's career in higher education began with a teaching assistantship in the English Department at Missouri State University. She taught the first level of composition courses and basic writing courses during the two years of her master's coursework. Her focus was composition and rhetoric, and her thesis portfolio work included a focus on trauma narratives and the poetry of John Keats. After completing her master's degree, Lyndsey taught as an adjunct for three and a half years at several colleges and universities in Springfield, Missouri until she accepted a position as full-time English faculty at Ozarks Technical Community College.

For the last seven years, Lyndsey has served as a lead instructor for Ozarks Technical Community on the Richwood Valley campus. In this role, she has developed curriculum, evaluated and supported adjunct instructors, and filled other administrative roles for the English department on her campus. Lyndsey has also worked on statewide policy initiatives as a member of the Missouri Consortium for Global Education and as her college's representative on the Common Curricular Advisory Committee. She has also completed service with her alma mater, Missouri State, serving on MSU's Common Reader Committee and the Public Affairs Conference Advisory Committee. Though Lyndsey has enjoyed and learned from her service and policy work, the professional accomplishment that she values most is her work with students, who continue to teach her how to be a better writer and person.