

**Sabbatical Leave Report
Resubmitted to the Salary and Leaves Committee
February, 2000**

By

**Dr. Terri S. Smith
Professor
Earth Science/Photographics/Astronomy Department**

Table of Contents

	Page
Proposed Sabbatical Activities	1
Project #1	1
Project #2	2
Proposed Timeline	3
Value and Benefit of Proposed Activities	3
Applicant	3
Faculty	4
Mt. San Antonio College	4
California Community Colleges	4
Draft Survey/Interview Questions	5
Sabbatical Report	6
Introduction	6
Project #1	6
Project #2	7
Timeline	8
Value and Benefit of Sabbatical Activities	8
Applicant	8
Faculty	8
Mt. San Antonio College	9
California Community Colleges	9
Appendices	28
A - Summary, Selected Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations	10
B - Survey Questionnaire	28
C - Results of District Evaluations by Panel of Experts ...	33
D - Interview Questions	34

Proposed Sabbatical Activities
Terri Smith
Earth Science/Photographics/Astronomy Department

During my sabbatical I plan to complete the two projects listed below. Each project is part of my dissertation research. The subject of my dissertation is Collaborative Bargaining in California Community Colleges. A qualitative research study will be performed and a collaborative bargaining guidebook for California Community Colleges will be designed. The purpose of the study is to determine what makes community colleges successful in the implementation of collaborative bargaining techniques. The researcher will investigate the forces behind the growth of collaborative bargaining in California Community Colleges including hostile labor relations on campuses, new administrators and campus leaders, new ideas, and changing attitudes of existing staff. In addition, the researcher will gather information regarding the various types of training required for participants in the collaborative bargaining process. The researcher will determine common steps that have been followed as a community college moves through the process of collaborative bargaining. Community colleges will be asked to identify obstacles that they have encountered in the implementation process and to share ways in which the obstacles can be overcome.

At the time of my sabbatical I will have completed all of my course work at the University of Southern California. My doctoral degree will be in Education with an emphasis on Educational Leadership in Higher Education.

Project #1

Administration of a survey to California community colleges utilizing collaborative bargaining techniques.

The purpose of the survey is to identify colleges that have been successful in the implementation of collaborative bargaining on their campuses. A list of California Community Colleges that have participated in interest-based bargaining training will be provided to the researcher from various sources including the Chancellors Office for California Community Colleges, the California Foundation for the Improvement of Employer-Employee Relations (CFIER), the Faculty Association of California Community Colleges (FACCC), and the Community College Association (CCA). These sources should provide the researcher with a comprehensive list of colleges in California that have participated in collaborative bargaining training programs.

The survey, developed by the researcher and reviewed by a small panel of individuals familiar with alternative bargaining practices, will include a series of statements regarding the collaborative bargaining process. The statements will be designed to provide the researcher with information regarding required training, processes followed, problems encountered, relationships between faculty and administrators, and overall satisfaction. Survey participants will be provided with an ordinal scale for responding to the statements. The ordinal scale will allow the respondents to indicate the level to which they agreed or disagreed with the survey statements. The survey will also contain several open-ended questions. These questions will allow the respondents to provide a more detailed evaluation of the collaborative bargaining process in which they participated. Finally, the participants will be asked to assess the overall success of collaborative bargaining on their campus.

The survey responses will be reviewed by a panel of experts familiar with alternative bargaining practices. Using a pre-established list of criteria developed by the researcher, the review panel will provide the researcher with an overall ranking of the responding community colleges. The college determined by the panel to be most successful in the use of collaborative bargaining strategies will be ranked #1. Upon completion of the ranking by the panel of experts, the researcher and her dissertation advisor will select the top three to five community colleges. These colleges will comprise the researcher's final sample group. The researcher will conduct personal interviews with both faculty and district representatives from each of the selected community colleges. These interviews will provide the researcher with more detailed information regarding collaborative bargaining on individual campuses.

Project #2

Interviewing four bargaining team members (two faculty representatives and two district representatives) from each of the selected community college districts.

After the colleges have been selected, the researcher will send letters to members of the bargaining teams from each campus. The letters will explain the purpose of the research and ask each team member whether or not they would be interested in participating in the study. Once the participants from each college have been identified, the researcher will schedule appointments for interviews.

The researcher will travel to the identified colleges and conduct a one-hour interview with each of the participants. The interview questions used by the researcher will be developed with the assistance of the review panel and the researcher's dissertation advisor. Each interview will be recorded in writing and tape recorded. Once all the interviews are complete, the researcher will compile the responses of the participants for further analysis.

Proposed Timeline

Surveys sent to community colleges practicing collaborative bargaining techniques.	October 15th, 1998
Surveys returned to researcher.*	January 10th, 1999
Surveys reviewed and ranked by panel of experts	3 rd week of February
Colleges selected by researcher and advisor	4 th week of February
Identification of participants from selected colleges	2 nd week of March
Interviews scheduled	3 rd week of March
Travel to community colleges to conduct interviews	End of March to May 1
Compilation of data	May 1 st to May 15 th

* Community College Districts that have not returned the survey by December 1st will be contacted by phone. The researcher will emphasize the importance of the survey and will request that it be completed and returned by the end of the first week of January.

Value and Benefit of the Proposed Sabbatical Activities

The proposed sabbatical activities will benefit the applicant, the faculty at Mt. San Antonio College, and the college as a whole. In addition, the results of the research study could benefit collective bargaining teams at any of the 106 California Community Colleges.

Applicant

The sabbatical leave will allow the applicant the time she needs to conduct the research for her dissertation. The applicant will be able to travel to the selected community colleges during the Spring 1999 semester. The interviews will be conducted during the normal academic year. This time frame should be convenient for both faculty and district members of the collective bargaining teams. In addition, most bargaining is completed by the end of the calendar year. The fall semester is ideal for interviewing participants in the bargaining process as specific strategies, processes, and problems should be easily recalled and discussion of these procedures will be more accurate.

Faculty

Subsequent to conducting extensive research on collaborative bargaining, the applicant will be knowledgeable of successful strategies and processes used at other community colleges. This knowledge will be shared with both faculty and district members of the bargaining teams at Mt. San Antonio College. In addition, the applicant plans to continue serving on the bargaining team at Mt. SAC and will work to educate both faculty and administrators and improve the interest-based process currently being utilized. Improving the bargaining process should result in better faculty contracts.

Mt. San Antonio College

The model developed by the researcher should bring recognition to Mt. San Antonio College. Ultimately, the researcher plans to share her findings with other community colleges through the publication of journal articles. The researcher may ultimately serve as a consultant to community colleges interested in learning more about successful collaborative bargaining strategies that have been utilized by other California Community Colleges.

California Community Colleges

The researcher will distribute her research findings to all California Community Colleges. The compilation of data from community colleges that have been successful in the collaborative bargaining approach should be useful to colleges searching for strategies that have proven to be successful in a community college environment. The research should also provide interested colleges with solutions to common problems encountered in the negotiation process. The successful colleges could also benefit by incorporating new ideas and solutions into their processes.

DRAFT

Survey/Interview Questions

1. Does your community college practice collaborative bargaining techniques in the collective bargaining process?
2. When did you begin utilizing these alternative techniques?
3. Which of the following techniques do you practice?
 - Interest-based bargaining
 - Win-win bargaining
 - Mutual gains bargaining
4. What were the factors/forces that initiated a change to alternative bargaining?
5. How many members serve on the faculty and district bargaining teams?
6. Is training required of all bargaining team members?
7. What kind of training is required?
8. If a team member has been trained in a prior year, are they required to attend training sessions again?
9. If a team member misses the training session, are they removed from the team?
10. How long do the training sessions last?
11. During the bargaining process, are caucuses allowed?
 - If so, are there any guidelines to caucusing?
12. How much time elapsed between the beginning of the bargaining process and the signing of the last contract?
13. Are contracts negotiated every year?
 - If no, what is the period of each contract?
14. What significant changes were negotiated in the last contract?
15. Do you feel that the atmosphere during the bargaining process is one of mutual trust between the district and the faculty representatives?

Sabbatical Report

Introduction

During my sabbatical leave I completed the two projects listed below. Each project was part of my dissertation research. The subject of my dissertation was Interest-Based Bargaining in California Community Colleges – A Study of Contract Negotiations Involving District and Faculty. A qualitative research study was performed to identify common interest-based bargaining practices that have proven to be successful in community colleges. The study provided information to community college faculty and administrators to assist them in identifying the key elements of successful interest-based bargaining and therefore enabling them to maximize their efforts in implementing alternative bargaining strategies. The researcher investigated forces that initiate the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining, buy-in techniques, training requirements, team composition, characteristics of team members, successful strategies, common problems, and viable solutions. The summary, selected findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study can be found in Appendix A.

At the time of my sabbatical leave I had completed all of my course work for a doctorate degree in Education from the University of Southern California. I received my degree on July 13, 1999.

Project #1

Administration of a survey to California community colleges utilizing collaborative bargaining techniques.

The purpose of the survey was to identify colleges that have been successful in the implementation of interest-based bargaining on their campuses. A list of California Community Colleges that had participated in interest-based bargaining training was provided to the researcher by the California Foundation for the Improvement of Employer-Employee Relations (CFIER), the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS), and the California Teachers Association (CTA). Twenty-three community college districts in California were identified as having participated in some kind of interest-based bargaining training.

The survey questionnaire, developed by the researcher and reviewed by a panel of experts, consisted of thirty-eight questions (Appendix B) divided into three parts. Several questions on the survey questionnaire were intentionally duplicated and presented in different formats. Consistent responses to these questions determined the reliability of the instrument. Part 1, general information, included questions regarding team composition, facilitation, experience as a bargaining team member, factors that resulted in the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining, and training requirements. Part 2 of the

questionnaire consisted of statements on interest-based bargaining in which the personal experiences of respondents was solicited using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. These statements were designed to determine the extent to which interest-based bargaining practices and techniques were being implemented. Part 3 of the survey questionnaire consisted of several open-ended questions. The questions, related to specific strategies, common problems, and viable solutions, allowed respondents to provide a more detailed account of their personal experience and perceptions of the interest-based bargaining process. Finally, respondents were asked to assess the overall success of interest-based bargaining in their district.

The panel of experts reviewed the survey responses. Using a pre-established list of criteria developed by the researcher, the review panel provided the researcher with an overall ranking of the responding community college districts (Appendix C). Upon completion of the ranking by the panel of experts, the researcher and her dissertation advisor identified the top three community college districts in California. These three community college districts comprised the researcher’s final sample group.

The researcher conducted personal interviews with both faculty and district representatives from each of the selected community college districts. These interviews provided the researcher with more detailed information regarding the interest-based bargaining process in community college districts.

Project #2

Interviewing four bargaining team members (two faculty representatives and two district representatives) from each of the three-selected community college districts.

After the top three college districts were identified, the researcher sent letters to faculty and district bargaining team members informing them that they would be contacted by the researcher within the following week for the scheduling of personal interviews. The researcher was able to schedule four interviews, two with faculty bargaining team members and two with district bargaining team members, at each campus.

The researcher traveled to the three community college districts and conducted the personal interviews. The interview questions used by the researcher were developed with the assistance of the review panel and the researcher’s dissertation advisor (Appendix D). Each interview was recorded in writing and tape-recorded. Once all the interviews were complete, the researcher compiled the responses of the participants for further analysis.

Timeline

Surveys sent to community colleges practicing Interest-based bargaining techniques.	January 15, 1999
Surveys returned to researcher.	February 7, 1999
Surveys reviewed and ranked by panel of experts	3 rd week of February
Colleges selected by researcher and advisor	4 th week of February
Identification of participants from selected colleges	2 nd week of March
Interviews scheduled	3 rd week of March
Travel to community colleges to conduct interviews	End of March to May 1
Compilation of data	May 1 st to May 15 th

Value and Benefit of the Sabbatical Activities

The completed sabbatical leave activities benefited the applicant, the faculty at Mt. San Antonio College, and the college as a whole. In addition, the results of the research study will benefit collective bargaining teams at any of the 106 California Community Colleges.

Applicant

The sabbatical leave allowed the applicant the time she needed to conduct the research for her dissertation. The applicant was able to travel to the selected community colleges during the spring 1999 semester. The interviews were conducted during the normal academic year. This time frame was convenient for both faculty and district members of the collective bargaining teams. In addition, most bargaining is completed by the end of the calendar year. The spring semester was ideal for interviewing participants in the bargaining process as specific strategies, processes, and problems were easily recalled and discussion of these procedures was more accurate.

Faculty

Subsequent to conducting extensive research on interest-based bargaining, the applicant is knowledgeable of successful strategies and processes used at other community colleges.

This knowledge will be shared with both faculty and district members of the bargaining teams at Mt. San Antonio College. In addition, the researcher is currently serving on the faculty bargaining team at Mt. Sac and will work to educate both faculty and administrators in an effort to improve the current process. These improvements should ultimately result in better contracts between the district and the faculty.

Mt. San Antonio College

The model developed by the researcher should bring recognition to Mt. San Antonio College. Ultimately, the researcher plans to share her findings with other community colleges through the publication of journal articles. The researcher may ultimately serve as a consultant to community colleges interested in learning more about successful collaborative bargaining strategies that have been utilized by other California Community Colleges.

California Community Colleges

The researcher plans to distribute her research findings to all California Community Colleges. The compilation of data from community college districts that have been successful in the interest-based bargaining approach should be useful to colleges searching for strategies that have proven to be successful in a community college environment. The research should also provide interested colleges with solutions to common problems encountered in the negotiation process. The successful colleges could also benefit by incorporating new ideas and solutions into their processes.

APPENDIX A

Summary, Selected Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter reviews the study, summarizes the selected findings, discusses the conclusions drawn from the findings, and sets forth recommendations and identifies areas for future research.

Summary of This Study

The purpose of this study identified in Chapter 1 was to identify common interest-based bargaining practices that have proven to be successful in community colleges. It proposed to provide information to community college faculty and administrators to assist them in identifying the key elements of successful interest-based bargaining and therefore enabling them to maximize their efforts in implementing alternative bargaining strategies.

Methodology

The methodology of this study consisted of two primary undertakings. The first was to gather information from California

Community College bargaining team members using a survey questionnaire and the second was to conduct personal interviews with faculty and district team members from colleges determined to be exemplary in the area of interest-based bargaining.

The survey questionnaire was developed based on the literature and the personal experience of the researcher as a bargaining team member. The questionnaire was pilot tested using Mt. San Antonio College bargaining team members. The questionnaire featured a variety of formats, including forced choice questions, Likert-type attitudinal scales, and open-ended questions. Several questions on the survey questionnaire were intentionally duplicated and presented in different formats. Reliability was established through consistent responses to these questions.

The sample utilized in the survey questionnaire portion of this study was faculty and district bargaining team members from community colleges in California using an interest-based approach in contract negotiations. In addition to gathering general information about interest-based bargaining practices, data were collected and used to answer the 12 research questions posed in this study.

After receiving a 58% response rate from the 19 community college districts using interest-based bargaining between district and faculty, the data were analyzed. Data was also summarized according to individual districts and evaluated by a panel of experts to identify the community colleges most successful at implementing interest-based bargaining strategies and techniques. Construct validity was established as the panel members and the researcher independently identified the same three districts as being exemplary in the area of interest-based bargaining. The results of the study are presented in Chapter 4 with a series of tables, figures, and narratives describing bargaining team members' responses to the survey questions.

The second portion of the study encompassed personal interviews with faculty and district bargaining team members from the three community college districts determined to be exemplary in the area of interest-based bargaining by the panel of experts. The researcher interviewed two faculty and two district bargaining team members from each of the three districts. In addition, the researcher was able to interview the College President from one of the three districts.

The interview questions were developed by the researcher based on the review of the literature, personal experience, and responses to the survey questionnaire. The interview questions were grouped into six categories that closely corresponded with the research questions. The categories included factors that initiate a change from traditional to interest-based bargaining, team composition, training, successful strategies, common problems and viable solutions, and general information. The researcher compiled and analyzed the responses to the interview questions. Responses to many of the interview questions were grouped into common themes or conceptual frameworks for clear and concise reporting. The data gathered from the personal interviews are presented in Chapter 4.

Selected Findings

Selected findings of the study were:

1. At least 20 community college districts in California (including Mt. San Antonio College) were using interest-based bargaining in contract negotiations between the district and the faculty at the time of the research study.

2. Eighty-five percent of the districts surveyed have been using interest-based bargaining for at least 2 years.
3. All but 4% of the survey respondents participated in interest-based bargaining training.
4. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents indicated that the interest-based bargaining training sessions lasted 2 or more days.
5. Almost half of the survey respondents participated in interest-based bargaining training offered by the California Foundation for the Improvement of Employer-Employee Relations (CFIER).
6. Nine out of 10 respondents indicated that the training was necessary for the effective implementation of interest-based bargaining.
7. The training organization does not determine whether or not a district will be successful in the implementation of interest-based bargaining.
8. Hostile labor relations were the greatest single factor initiating the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining.
9. District bargaining teams typically consist of three or more representatives whose membership is a function of the position they hold at the college.

10. Faculty bargaining teams are commonly composed of five or more representatives who volunteer to serve as negotiators.

11. Bargaining team members should be open-minded, committed to the process, and possess good communication and listening skills.

12. Meeting as a team prior to negotiations is a strategy that may lead to more successful interest-based bargaining.

13. Bargaining teams should keep an ongoing list of problems that arise throughout the year to ensure that important items are discussed at the table.

14. Only 24% of the respondents indicated that an outside facilitator was used during negotiations.

15. Half of the survey respondents indicated that the level of trust between the district and the faculty was very high throughout the negotiation process.

16. Eighty-six percent of the respondents indicated that the interests of both teams were discussed at the beginning of the negotiation process.

17. All but 14% of the respondents indicated that solutions were reached through discussion and consensus.

18. Seventy percent of the respondents indicated that the relationship between the district and the faculty was improved through the interest-based bargaining process while 18% indicated that the relationship stayed the same.

19. Communication throughout the interest-based bargaining process was deemed essential by 72% of the respondents.

20. Sixty-five percent of the respondents indicated that the district and the faculty bargaining teams were very successful in implementing interest-based bargaining.

21. Interest-based bargaining was a very positive experience for 63% of the respondents.

22. Survey respondents identified effective communication, adhering to the IBB process, trust and commitment, and extensive training as strategies and techniques that made the process work for their district.

23. Survey respondents identified money issues, time requirements, lack of commitment, and adjusting to change as problems encountered in implementing interest-based bargaining.

24. Survey respondents suggested training, persistence, effective facilitation, appropriate team representation, full financial

disclosure, and strong communication as solutions to some of the problems encountered in interest-based bargaining.

25. Districts preparing to implement IBB should work to ensure buy-in and commitment on the part of all constituents.

26. Getting campus-wide buy-in was not a problem in the three exemplary districts due to the overall dissatisfaction with traditional bargaining techniques.

27. Training was required of all bargaining team members in the three exemplary districts.

28. Members of the district and the faculty bargaining teams were consistent in their responses to both the survey questions and the interview questions.

29. It takes time to develop an environment for successful interest-based bargaining. All three exemplary districts have been using IBB for at least four years.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were derived from the analysis of the data and the findings of this study.

1. Community college districts initiate the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining primarily as a result of adverse labor relations. The outcomes and relationships that

resulted from the traditional approach were unsatisfactory. Representatives from both the district and faculty bargaining teams begin looking for a better way of doing things. The emergence of literature advertising a non-confrontational, win-win approach appealed to many community college district staff. In many situations, a unique combination of factors including hostile labor relations, the introduction of new ideas, and changing attitudes of staff precipitated the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining in the community college districts studied.

2. District and faculty bargaining team members indicated that training is essential for the successful implementation of interest-based bargaining. Team members emphasized the importance of group training. Respondents felt that it was crucial for all team members to be trained at the same time so that they receive the same information and have a consistent understanding of the interest-based bargaining process.

3. Community college bargaining team members indicated that the training workshops provided them with what they needed to know about the basic principles of the interest-based bargaining

process. The hands on activities and group dynamics established during the sessions were identified as strengths of IBB training.

4. Bargaining team members did not identify any significant weaknesses in interest-based bargaining training. The only criticism offered was that in some situations the training can be a little too rehearsed or standardized.

5. District bargaining teams are typically made up of three to five representatives while faculty teams typically consist of five or more individuals.

6. District team members are commonly appointed by the College President and include top level managers in the areas of business, human resources and instruction. Members of the faculty bargaining teams most commonly volunteer to serve as negotiators.

7. Successful bargaining team members should have good communication and listening skills, patience, and a genuine commitment to the interest-based bargaining process. Effective negotiators are open-minded, objective, and reasonable in their expectations of the process and its outcomes. A diverse bargaining team whose members have unique strengths and backgrounds is considered ideal.

8. Bargaining team members identified effective facilitation, mutual trust, and a genuine commitment to the interest-based bargaining process as requirements for successful interest-based bargaining. In addition, respondents stressed the importance of adhering to established guidelines and procedures, the need for proper training, adequate preparation before and after negotiation sessions, and open and honest communication as factors that contribute to successful negotiations.

9. The most common problem encountered by community colleges utilizing interest-based bargaining is money. Team members indicated that resolving financial matters can be difficult when using an interest-based approach. In addition to money, respondents indicated that the time commitment is difficult. Staying focused on the issues and avoiding a lapse into a traditional mode of bargaining were also identified as common problems. Finally, being able to transition into an interest-based approach in negotiations requires attitudinal and behavioral changes that many people find difficult.

10. Bargaining team members proposed a variety of solutions and recommendation for dealing with the problems that arise with interest-based bargaining in community colleges. Respondents

suggested the hiring of an outside facilitator to deal with problems related with process and procedures. Selection of team members with the desired characteristics and qualities will increase the likelihood of success at the bargaining table. Finally, maintaining open and honest communication throughout the negotiation process may solve some of the problems that might otherwise have emerged.

11. Respondents indicated that the individuals serving on the bargaining teams play the biggest role in the success or failure of interest-based bargaining in community colleges. The integrity, honesty and character of the actual team members are the most important determinants for success. Respondents also identified the importance of campus wide buy-in and a genuine commitment to the IBB process as essential requirements for success.

12. In preparing for the implementation of successful interest-based bargaining, respondents emphasized the importance of open meetings and discussions to educate college staff on the interest-based bargaining process. Bargaining team members indicated that the campus climate needs to be open to accepting change and new ideas. Community college districts that are considering adopting an interest-based approach to negotiations need to

genuinely commit to the process and acknowledge the fact that a successful transition will take tremendous amounts of time and effort.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were developed from the findings of this study:

1. All bargaining team members should be trained prior to the start of negotiations. It is also recommended that team members be trained at the same time.
2. Districts implementing interest-based bargaining for the first time should include as many key players as possible in the initial training sessions (i.e. Board members, Faculty Association representatives, the College President, managers).
3. Bargaining team members need to be genuinely committed to the interest-based bargaining process.
4. Bargaining team members should be good communicators as well as good listeners. They should be open-minded, honest, and fair and have an overall understanding of the college and its mission. The careful selection of team members is vital to the success of the process.

5. Community college districts dissatisfied with their current negotiation practices should explore the possibility of switching to an interest-based approach.

6. School districts looking to implement interest-based bargaining for the first time should make every effort to educate staff on the process and establish campus-wide buy-in and commitment.

7. Bargaining teams should attempt to establish high levels of trust between the district and the faculty teams. Increased levels of trust can be accomplished through consistent actions and follow through by all parties involved.

8. Bargaining teams should prepare for negotiations by gathering relevant material that addresses individual team interests.

9. Groundrules should be developed and distributed to team members before negotiations begin.

10. Meeting times and dates should be established during the planning stages of negotiations.

11. Individual teams should solicit feedback from their constituents in the development of interests.

12. Teams should plan to meet prior to each negotiation session to ensure that all members are on the same page with respect to the issues.

13. Bringing in an outside facilitator or providing refresher-training courses may be ways to solve some of the problems encountered with IBB.

14. The gathering of information can be assigned to subcommittees.

15. Each team should attempt to maintain some level of consistency in terms of membership from one negotiation period to the next.

16. Districts who are inexperienced in the use of IBB need to be persistent in their endeavors and accept the fact that the behavioral and attitudinal changes required for interest-based bargaining take time.

17. Districts may want to interview the various interest-based bargaining training organizations and select the organization best suited for their individual needs.

18. A goal of the initial training sessions should be to establish positive, open relationships among participants.

19. Participants in the interest-based bargaining process need to recognize and accept the time commitment associated with it.

20. Bargaining teams should distribute a mutually agreed upon communiqué reporting the status of the negotiation process to all staff.

21. The facilitator of the negotiation sessions needs to be familiar with the interest-based bargaining process and able to keep the teams focused and on task.

22. Food and drink should be provided at each negotiation session.

23. Bargaining teams may elect to set aside a time period prior to the actual negotiations for the collection and gathering of information.

24. Logistical preparations for interest-based bargaining should be accomplished together (faculty and district teams). Preparations should include determining exactly how things will be done and a commitment to a timeline.

25. Districts may want to consider adopting an ongoing negotiation process whereby teams meet regularly and items are discussed as they arise.

Recommendations for Future Study

It is recommended that this study be replicated with both public and private four-year colleges and universities in California to determine if the current findings are consistent throughout higher education institutions in the state.

Second, a study targeting community colleges in California that have been unsuccessful in the implementation of interest-based bargaining would reveal useful information and insights to both community college districts considering interest-based bargaining for the first time and those currently utilizing IBB strategies.

Third, it is recommended that a study be conducted to investigate specific strategies and preparedness techniques that have led to the successful transition from traditional to interest-based bargaining in California Community Colleges.

Fourth, a similar study investigating interest-based bargaining involving community college classified staff and district representatives be conducted to determine if the current findings are consistent with other community college bargaining units.

Finally, it is recommended that additional research be conducted to further identify successful strategies, training

requirements, team composition, and problems and solutions commonly associated with interest-based bargaining in California Community Colleges.

Appendix B – Survey Questionnaire

Part 1: General Information

Please answer questions 1-19 on the scantron answer sheet provided. A number 2 pencil must be used in completing the form. You do not need to fill in any of the additional information requested on the scantron answer sheet.

1. I have served as a member of the _____ bargaining team.
 - A. District
 - B. Faculty

2. I have participated in negotiations for _____ contract(s).
 - A. One
 - B. Two
 - C. Three
 - D. Four
 - E. Five or more

3. We have been using a collaborative or interest-based approach in contract negotiations for _____ year(s).
 - A. One
 - B. 2-4
 - C. 5-7
 - D. More than 7
 - E. Do not know

4. Have you participated in some kind of interest-based bargaining training?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No **If no, skip to question #13**

5. Have you participated in more than one interest-based bargaining training workshop/session?
 - A. Yes
 - B. No

If yes, please answer questions 6-10 based on the most effective training session in which you have participated.

6. How long did the training session last?
 - A. Less than one full day
 - B. One full day (8 hours)
 - C. Two days
 - D. Three days
 - E. More than three days

7. The training was provided by:
- A. California Federation for the Improvement of Employer-employee Relations (CFIER)/Public Employment Relations Board (PERB)
 - B. Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS)
 - C. California Teachers Association (CTA)
 - D. In house (district) trainers
 - E. Outside trainer/private consultant
8. The training workshop/sessions took place:
- A. On campus
 - B. Off campus
9. All bargaining team members were required to participate in the training sessions.
- A. Yes
 - B. No
10. All team members (district and faculty representatives) participated in training at the same time.
- A. Yes
 - B. No
11. In your opinion, was the training necessary for effective implementation of interest-based bargaining?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
12. Team members participating in more than one contract negotiation are retrained each time.
- A. Yes
 - B. No
 - C. Do not know
13. Do you know why your district elected to use interest-based bargaining techniques as opposed to traditional bargaining strategies?
- A. Yes
 - B. No **If no, please skip to question #15**
14. Which of the following (select all that apply) best describe the reason your district switched to an interest-based approach for collective bargaining?
- A. Hostile labor relations
 - B. Hiring of new personnel
 - C. Changing attitudes of staff
 - D. Introduction of new ideas
 - E. Other – Please specify reason on the back of the scantron form.

Answer questions #15-19 based on your most recent experience at the bargaining table.

15. How many district representatives served on the bargaining team?
- A. One or two
 - B. Three
 - C. Four
 - D. Five
 - E. More than five
16. How many faculty representatives served on the bargaining team?
- A. One or two
 - B. Three
 - C. Four
 - D. Five
 - E. More than five
17. Was an outside facilitator (not a bargaining team member) used during the negotiation process?
- A. Yes
 - B. No
- If yes, please skip to question #19
18. Negotiation sessions were facilitated by:
- A. The Chief Human Resources Officer
 - B. The Faculty Association President
 - C. Facilitation responsibilities were shared by the Chief Human Resources Officer and the Faculty Association President or designee
 - D. Facilitation responsibilities rotated among all bargaining team members
 - E. Other - Please specify on the back of the scantron form
19. How successful was your District in implementing interest-based bargaining techniques?
- A. Very unsuccessful
 - B. Unsuccessful
 - C. Average
 - D. Moderately successful
 - E. Very successful

Part II. Personal opinion of interest-based bargaining.

*Please answer questions #20-34 on the scantron answer sheet provided. Use the scale described below to respond to the statements. Responses should be based on your **most recent experience** as a bargaining team member.*

A – Strongly disagree B – Disagree C – Neutral D – Agree E – Strongly agree

20. During the negotiation process, taking positions, as is commonly done in traditional bargaining, was avoided.

21. The level of trust between the district and the faculty was very high throughout the negotiation process.
22. Each team could expect full disclosure of information from the other team.
23. The interests of both teams were discussed at the beginning of the negotiation process.
24. Solutions were reached through discussion and consensus.
25. During negotiation, the district and the faculty worked as partners engaged in solving mutual problems.
26. Groundrules were established prior to beginning the negotiation process.
27. It was possible for both teams to win.
28. Brainstorming was used in generating options/solutions.
29. Numerous options were explored to address each interest.
30. The relationship between the district and the faculty was improved through the interest-based bargaining process.
31. Communication with constituents throughout the process was essential.
32. Objective criteria were used in evaluating potential solutions/options.
33. The District and faculty bargaining teams were very successful implementing interest-based bargaining.
34. My experience as a bargaining team member was very positive.

Part III: Open-ended questions.

Any additional insights you can provide on the interest-based bargaining process in your district will be very useful. Please answer the following questions based on your overall experience with interest-based bargaining. Answers to questions #35-38 should be written on the backside of the scantron answer sheet. If additional space is needed, feel free to use another sheet of paper.

35. What specific strategies/techniques, if any, do you feel make the process work for your district and/or faculty bargaining teams?
36. What are some of the problems, if any, that you or your team has encountered in implementing interest-based bargaining?
37. What viable solutions, if any, address the problems you have encountered?

38. Please provide names of other community college districts in California that you believe are successfully implementing interest-based bargaining techniques.

Please return the completed scantron in the self-addressed envelope provided.

Appendix C – Results of District Evaluations by Panel of Experts

	Team	Training	IBB Strat. Application	ID success. Strat.	Problems/ Solutions	Overall Ranking
District B	4	4	5	4	5	5
	3	3	4	4	3	4
	5	5	5	5	4	5
District C	5	5	3	3	3	3
	2	4	2	1	1	1
	5	3	2	3	4	2
District D	5	5	3	3	3	3
	2	2	1	3	3	1
	4	5	1	3		1
District G	5	5	5	4	4	4
	3	1	5	3	3	4
	4	3	5	4	5	5
District H	5	5	3	3	3	3
	3	2	3	2	1	1
	4	5	2			2
District I	3	4	5	3	3	3
	3	4	4	4	4	3
	3	5	5			5
District J	3	4	5	3	3	3
	3	2	3	3	1	1
	2	4	4			4
District L	5	4	4	5	5	4
	4	3	2	3	2	2
	5	5	3	4	4	4
District M	3	4	5	5	4	4
	3	2	3	3	3	3
	4	5	5	4		5
District N	3	4	5	5	5	5
	4	3	4	3	4	4
	4	3	5	5	4	5
District O	4	4	5	5	4	4
	3	3	3	3	2	3
	4	4	4	4	4	4
District R	3	4	3	4	4	3
	3	3	1	3	2	2
	2	2	1			1
District S	3	4	3	3	3	3
	2	3	2	1	2	2
	3	5	1	2	2	1
District T	4	4	4	3	3	4
	3	4	3	2	3	2
	4	5	4	3	4	2
District U	4	4	5	5	5	5
	4	3	3	5	3	4
	5	5	4	5	5	5
District V	4	4	5	5	5	5
	2	3	5	5	4	4
	4	5	5	5	4	5
District W	4	4	5	5	4	4
	3	3	3	3	3	3

Appendix D – Interview Questions

Interest-Based Bargaining in California Community Colleges

Category 1 – Conditions or events that initiated the change from traditional to interest-based bargaining strategies.

1. Do you know why your district changed from traditional to interest-based bargaining?
2. Did your district experience hostile labor relations prior to changing to IBB?
If so, please explain.
3. Did the hiring of new staff play a role in initiating the change from traditional to IBB?
Who recommended that the District try IBB?
What position did this person hold?
4. Did the introduction of new ideas and the concept of collaborative bargaining in the late 1980's and early 1990's help to initiate the change?
5. Did the change to IBB occur as the result of changing attitudes of staff members?
If so, what group(s) attitudes had the greatest influence?
6. Were there other reasons that helped to initiate the change from traditional to IBB?
7. Has your district experienced hostile labor relations since changing to IBB?
8. Would you say IBB has been more or less successful than traditional bargaining?
Explain?

Category 2 – Training

1. Have you participated in interest based bargaining training?
2. Was training required of all bargaining team members?
3. How long did the training last?
If you have participated in more than one training session, please provide the duration of each.
4. Who provided the training for your District?

5. Was the training held on or off-campus?
6. On a scale of 1-10, 1 being the worst and 10 being the best, how would you rate the overall training experience?
 - What were some of the strengths or positive aspects of the training?
 - What were some of the weaknesses or negative aspects of the training?
7. Were all bargaining team members trained at the same time?
 - If no, how many different training sessions did team members participate in?
8. How important was the training?
9. Do you feel that training is necessary for the successful implementation of IBB?
10. Do you feel that team members participating in contract negotiations for a second or third time should be retrained?
 - Why or why not?

Category 3 – Bargaining team members

1. How were bargaining team members selected?
 - Did a particular person appoint team members?
 - If yes, who?
 - Did a particular body elect team members?
 - If yes, what body?
2. How many people serve on the faculty team?
 - How many people serve on the district team?
 - Do these numbers seem appropriate?
 - In your opinion, what is the ideal team size?
 - Are there a maximum number of team members?
3. What specific qualities/attributes do you feel that bargaining team members should have?
 - Do you feel that members of your bargaining team possessed these qualities?
4. Who facilitated the negotiation sessions?
 - How were facilitation responsibilities determined?
 - What specific competencies/attributes make an effective facilitator?
 - Should the facilitator have different qualities than team members?

Category 4 – Specific interest-based bargaining techniques that have been successful.

1. Once your district decided to implement IBB, how did they go about getting campus-wide buy-in?
 - Informal meetings with campus groups.
 - Outside speaker/presenter to discuss the process?
 - Open forums allowing for questions and discussion?

2. What was the level of trust between the District and the faculty teams prior to the start of you most recent contract negotiations?
 - How was trust established?
 - Did the trust level improve as negotiations proceeded?
 - Was the level of trust following negotiations better or worse than it was at the start?
 - What specific strategies would you recommend to improve the trust level between District and faculty bargaining team members?

3. What does you team do to prepare for negotiations?
 - Are materials gathered/information collected in anticipation of topics to be discussed at the bargaining table?
 - Who is responsible for the gathering of information?
 - Are team interests discussed/established before the first bargaining session?
 - Did your team meet before negotiations began?
 - How many times?
 - What was discussed?
 - What needs to be done to create a state of readiness before negotiations begin?

4. How were the interests of your team developed/formulated?
 - Did negotiations begin with each side presenting their interests to the other side?
 - Did the faculty and the district team present similar interests?
 - If so, what were they?

5. Were groundrules established before negotiations began?
 - What were some of the groundrules?
 - Did groundrules cover both procedural and behavioral issues?
 - Were the groundrules posted or distributed to team members?

6. Where did the negotiating teams meet?
 - How were the times and dates of the meetings determined?
 - Were bargaining sessions held on or off campus?
 - How often did the teams meet?
 - Did the sessions usually start and end on time?
 - How long were the meetings?

7. Was the process of brainstorming used to generate a list of options/solutions?
 - If no, how were solutions/options generated?
 - Were multiple options to individual interests proposed?
 - Were all team members given the opportunity to propose options/solutions?

8. Once negotiations began, how did the bargaining teams gather needed information?
 - Was there a full disclosure of information on all issues?
 - If no, in what areas was information withheld?

9. What process/procedure did the bargaining teams use to reach final consensus?

10. How long did the negotiation process take?

11. What was the length of the agreed upon contract?

Category 5 – Common problems and viable solutions to IBB.

1. Were there certain issues that caused more problems than others?
 - If so, what were the most difficult issues to discuss?
 - How were these issues resolved?

2. Did money issues create problems?
 - How were these problems addressed?
 - Did the faculty feel that there was full disclosure of budget information?

3. Did the teams adhere to the pre-established groundrules?
 - When pre-established groundrules were not followed, what was done?
 - What groundrules were most commonly broken?

4. Did both teams agree on the procedural and strategic issues related to IBB (the actual process to be followed)?
 - If not, what were some of the procedural issues that caused problems?
 - How were these problems addressed?

5. Did team members come to the bargaining table prepared?
If no, what did they neglect to do?
What do you suggest could be done to avoid this problem in the future?
6. Were there personality clashes among or between individual team members?
Between whom?
Why?
How might these types of clashes between individuals be avoided?
7. Were there arguments over what is and what is not negotiable?
What were some of the issues involved in these discussions?
How were the issues finally resolved?
8. Did team members stay on task?
If not, what were the common topics or causes of distraction?
How did the teams get back on task?
9. Did any conflicting interests arise?
If so, what were they?
How were these conflicts dealt with?
10. What modifications or changes, if any, did your district make to the standard interest-based bargaining process?

Category 6 – General Information

1. Did you serve as a member of the District or the faculty bargaining team?
2. How long has your district been using IBB?
3. How many contract negotiations have you participated in?
4. What would you say is the single most important requirement for successful IBB?
5. What would you say is the most common problem encountered in IBB?
6. In your opinion, what does a district need to do to create an environment for successful interest-based bargaining?

7. Do you have anything that you would like to add regarding your overall experience with IBB?